



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

## **Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage**

---

CHPC



NUMBER 067



1st SESSION



41st PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Wednesday, June 5, 2013**



**Chair**

**The Honourable Rob Moore**



## Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

• (1545)

[English]

**The Chair (Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC)):** Welcome, everybody, to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

Pursuant to the order of reference of Wednesday, May 29, we are studying Bill C-49, An Act to amend the Museums Act in order to establish the Canadian Museum of History.

I'm very pleased to have as our first witness the Honourable James Moore, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages.

Welcome, Minister.

As well, we have representatives from the Department of Heritage, whom I'll have you introduce, if you like.

Without further ado, I'll turn the floor over to you, Minister, for your opening remarks.

[Translation]

**Hon. James Moore (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages):** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would also like to thank my colleagues.

I am pleased to be here today to discuss with you Bill C-49, the Canadian Museum of History Act, and to respond to questions you may have. Accompanying me today are Daniel Jean, Deputy Minister of Canadian Heritage and Hubert Lussier, Assistant Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Heritage.

I will keep my remarks brief to allow as much time as possible for discussion and to answer your questions on the bill.

[English]

Bill C-49 is a very short bill. It's not a tough read, of course. It spells out the mandate for the proposed Canadian Museum of History. The mandate is very simple and clear. It reads:

The purpose of the Canadian Museum of History is to enhance Canadians' knowledge, understanding and appreciation of events, experiences, people and objects that reflect and have shaped Canada's history and identity, and also to enhance their awareness of world history and cultures.

That's what the bill says. There is nothing ideological about this. It's actually quite straightforward.

[Translation]

In 2017, we will be celebrating Canada's 150<sup>th</sup> birthday. This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to celebrate all that Canada has accomplished, to look back at 150 years of history, to be thankful for our past, and to think ahead to the next 150 years.

[English]

We have in Canada today, sadly, an entire generation of Canadians who are largely illiterate about Canada's history. It's the truth. With the proposed Canadian Museum of History we are going to start building the national infrastructure that I think this country so desperately needs, so that we can tell our stories one to another so that Canadians can better understand our local histories and our shared histories.

I feel that we've had a constructive debate on this legislation in the House. Some members of Parliament have raised some concerns about what this museum could lead to, and I just want to respond to a couple of the specific concerns that I know were raised in the House by Mr. Simms and Mr. Nantel.

First, let me quote from the Museums Act, particularly on the issue that has been raised that the museum could be interfered with by the government, the minister, or, frankly, any member of Parliament. The Museums Act is very clear. It spells out in a straightforward way the independence of all of our museums, including this museum. Section 27 spells out the independence of our museums when it states: "No directive shall be given to a museum...with respect to cultural activities, including...its activities and programs for the public, including exhibitions, displays and publications; and...research".

Section 27 of the Museums Act is very clear, it's straightforward, and it dispels any false accusations that this bill or the creation of this museum would be in any way a politicization of Canada's history, because it's the law.

[Translation]

In fact, I am pleased by the widespread, non-partisan support this project has received from historians and historical associations across the country.

[English]

I want to say that I'm very pleased with the broad-based support that the proposal of creating a Canadian museum of history has received. Of course, no support for a proposal is ever unanimous, as I said to Mr. Simms in the House.

I remember the debate when the Liberals, at a time of recession, made the decision to create the Canadian War Museum. That was a very controversial decision, and it turns out that today the Canadian War Museum is indeed one of the best museums in this country. It has, as its only peers in the world, Les Invalides in Paris, and the Imperial War Museum in London. It's a fantastic museum that I think all Canadians, regardless of ideology, believe in.

That museum was launched with a great deal of difficulty and if you look at the proposal that we have here to create a Canadian museum of history and the broad-based support this museum has received, I think it's important that this be pointed out. This museum has been supported, for example, by Douglas Cardinal, the original architect of the Canadian Museum of Civilization. It's supported by the Mayor of Ottawa, Jim Watson. It's supported by the Mayor of Gatineau, Monsieur Bureau.

This project also has the support of celebrated historians from across the country, including award-winning historian and author, Michael Bliss, who had this to say about this bill. He said:

it is very exciting that Canada's major museum would now be explicitly focused on Canada's history, thanks to this government for making the museum possible.

Jack Granatstein, of course the former chair of the Museum of Civilization, supports this legislation and the creation of this museum. He said:

This move is exactly what I thought should happen. I'm delighted the government and the museum are doing it.

John McAvery, who is going to be with you later this afternoon, also supports this because he recognizes the value of this large national institution, the largest museum in all of Canada, and the value of creating a pan-Canadian network of all of Canada's museums, which can teach and disseminate information about Canada's history and share resources and collections and move items around the country.

This will be of benefit not only for this great institution here in the national capital but also for every museum across the country, as they could potentially become official partners of the museum, thereby allowing them access to the 3.5 million items that are in the collection of this museum, of which more than 90% are in storage and to which no Canadian now has access.

The Historica-Dominion Institute is also supporting this—which, by the way, is also one of the great organizations across this country, working with and reaching out to children across this country—and recognizes its value as well. The Ontario Museum Association has come out in support of it—also, by the way, important historians who are not Conservative and probably would chastise me or anybody for suggesting that they might in any way be Conservative.

For example, as I noted in the House, John English, a former Liberal member of Parliament and a biographer of Pierre Trudeau, has come out in support of this legislation, congratulating the government for supporting this initiative, as has Richard Gwyn, who is a biographer of both John A. Macdonald and Pierre Trudeau.

Deborah Morrison, the head of Canada's national history society, has said, "the potential for the new Museum to help create a national framework for our history is compelling. And the time is right."

I agree with her. I have to say as well that I was very pleased, when we had the second reading vote in the House of Commons, that an independent member of Parliament, one of our colleagues from Thunder Bay, supported this legislation, as did Elizabeth May, the leader of the Green Party. They support this legislation, as do, by the way, New Democrats on the provincial scene in British Columbia.

I'm also pleased to say that this past weekend I spoke at the national meeting of the FCM, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, in Vancouver. As part of my lunchtime speech to more than a thousand delegates, I presented this project, which was entirely well received; there were no complaints. When I met with the executive of the FCM in a closed-door meeting before my speech, there was unanimous support for this from mayors across the country—from Mayor Nenshi of Calgary, from Gregor Robertson of Vancouver, a former MLA in British Columbia who sees the big value of this project and what it would mean for the city of Vancouver and, indeed, for all of this country.

This is a proposal that we've put forward as we go toward Canada's 150th birthday in 2017. It has broad-based support from Canadians of all kinds of ideologies and all kinds of backgrounds—and, by the way, of non-ideologies, just people who are passionate about the teaching and the learning of Canada's history, who think that we deserve to have our own Smithsonian; that we deserve to have a large national museum about which we can be incredibly proud. We do have that in the Museum of Civilization, but we can do so much better with a new Canadian museum of history, by tying all of our institutions across this country together as we head towards our 150th birthday and celebrate the incredible stories of Canada's history gone by.

Many of you have been in the House and have heard me speak in the House on the details of the reforms we are putting forward. There is \$25 million to do the changes of half the floor space in the existing museum. The Children's Museum, which is in the museum itself, will stay as it is. The Canada Hall will be reformed, in the back. The First Peoples exhibit, which is award-winning and spectacular, will stay as it is.

We're reforming the floor space as well, because it hasn't been updated in over 20 years. As a matter of fact, in the Canada Hall there is virtually no representation of aboriginal Canadians whatsoever, and that needs to be updated and improved.

We can do better; we should do better. We're heading towards our 150th birthday. We have great stories as a country to tell. I think we ought to do a service to them.

I would close by saying to my colleagues that I understand that there are some concerns about this. Maybe this will be a circumstance of "hear me now, believe me later", but I'm here to tell you that this is a project that has broad-based support across the country; it's self-evident in the votes we've had in Parliament and in those who have publicly come out to endorse this project. It's time for this country to think big and to do something bigger than just the obvious stuff and to have great national institutions that bind us together.

As I said to Scott, those are the great moments. I'll say this: in the sweep of Canada's history, the best of the NDP has been seen when they have supported national projects that they thought were national in scope and national in consequence; for example in the support of medicare. That was a national idea, an idea that was good for the entire country and that they advocated, and they went beyond partisanship and reached out to get support. Of course, it was a Liberal federal government that did it, but it was a national idea that they worked with others to get done, because they believed in it.

This is equally true with the Liberal Party; they have had some national projects and national efforts. And Conservative governments in the past, we've had ours as well. Along with the other institutions that we have in this country, I think this museum will be a part of the fabric of what we're trying to do: to strengthen the fabric that binds this country together.

When you think about it, Canada is the second largest country in the world in size, but in terms of population we're the 34th largest country in the world. What unites us as a country? It is language, the arts, culture, a shared sense of history, an understanding of one another, an understanding of our grievances, of the difficulties of the past and how we got over them and how we still struggle, our shared sense of identity.

• (1550)

In a massive country like this, that has historically been divided—English and French, east and west, north and south, aboriginal and non-aboriginal, labour and business, Protestant and Catholic in the early days—we've been able to overcome these divisions through the sweep of Canada's history because we've had a better understanding over time about what it is that we can accomplish.

We are moving forward as a government with this. We're very proud of this project. I deeply and sincerely thank all those who have come on board across this country, from all kinds of different political and ideological backgrounds, to support this effort. I would urge my colleagues on this committee, and indeed all members of this House, to look at it that way. That's how I presented this.

My colleagues know that I presented and discussed this legislation with them. I talked to my colleague, the heritage critic from the NDP, before we tabled this legislation. I told you about this idea. I showed you the legislation. I showed you what we had in mind. I showed it as well to the Liberal critic. I showed it to Elizabeth May, as the leader of the Green Party in the House. It's one of the reasons that she's supporting this bill. I want to work with other members of Parliament to get this project right.

I'll turn it back to you, Chair, and to colleagues for questions about this project. I would urge you all to give this serious thought, to support this institution, to support this effort to build this network, this pan-Canadian network, of great history institutions that will keep this country united and better educated, with a better understanding about our past, so that we can stay united going forward.

Thank you.

• (1555)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Minister Moore.

Now we'll move to our rounds of questions and answers.

First up is Mr. Young, for seven minutes.

**Mr. Terence Young (Oakville, CPC):** Thank you, Chair.

Minister, in debate in the House, the opposition has falsely claimed that our government is interfering with the independence of the museum.

Before I go to specific questions, I'd like to give you the opportunity to address this incorrect assertion.

**Hon. James Moore:** It is flatly false. I can tell you that there's no head of any museum in this country, certainly our national museums, who will tell you that I've ever interfered with anything that any of our national museums have ever displayed.

From time to time, whenever there's a controversial item that's on display in a museum, or seen to be controversial by some in this country, I'm often asked, "What do you think of this display, what do you think of that exhibit, what do you think of this item?", and from time to time I choose to offer my opinion. But at no time can I ever, or would I, as a minister ever tell a museum what they can or cannot display; nor the narrative that they can tell about Canada's history; nor the narrative that they can tell about Canadian science; nor the narrative that they can tell in the National Gallery.

These are independent institutions—protected by law, by the way. You don't have to take my view on this, that, you know, "Trust me, I'm James Moore, the heritage minister, and I won't get involved". It's the law. The law prevents me or any minister or any member of Parliament or any government from interfering with any of our institutions in the way in which they decide to display their items and their collections. It's just the law.

So as a critique, I have to say it's a pretty weak one, because the evidence is pretty obvious about the fact of how our institutions are established in this country.

**Mr. Terence Young:** Thank you.

Minister, in past budgets, our budgets, the opposition has voted against important increases to the arts and culture industry.

Can you provide the committee with some insight as to why the opposition refuses to support our national museums or the arts and culture industry as a whole?

**Hon. James Moore:** Let me focus the substance of the question this way. In Budget 2012, as colleagues know, that was where we put in place what we call DRAP, the deficit reduction action plan of our government, which is the reduction in government spending so that we can arrive at a balanced budget in 2015.

Now, within the Department of Heritage—and by the way, Heritage is the third-largest department in the Government of Canada, not in terms of its budget but its scope—there were a number of decisions that we had to make, some difficult decisions and some that were more self-evident, in order to make budget cuts and make our contribution to arriving at a balanced budget.

We decided to protect all of our funding for the Canada Council for the Arts. I think as all members of this committee know, when you talk to artists across the country, that's one of the most revered and important crown corporations that exist when it comes to supporting culture.

We did make a decision, for example, to cut funding for the CBC.

We also made a decision not to cut funding for any one of our national museums. There were multiple reasons for that. One, we're still in the process of building the Canadian Museum for Human Rights in Winnipeg. They've had some struggles, but financially they're on track. It's a \$351-million build, with a \$21-million-per-year operating budget thereafter. That museum is still being established, so the idea of cutting their budget before they're built, while their build is dependent on some of those funds, is something that would seem to me to be a crazy idea.

Equally, we're creating of course the Museum of Immigration at Pier 21 in Halifax. That museum is just getting off the ground and moving forward, and they're looking to expand, so no reductions there either.

There's also the Canadian Museum of Civilization, which we had the idea to turn into a Canadian museum of history. We didn't want to cut that budget as well, because we wanted to make sure this project is launched and moving forward.

The opposition parties I'm sure have a number of reasons why they may or may not support the government's budget and the budget items. But specifically on the issue of museums, we went out of our way to protect our museums—and by the way, as a consequence, maybe have had to make spending reductions in other areas that were more consequential to those institutions.

But I think we have some of the best museums in this country, some of the largest museums in this country. When the Canadian Museum for Human Rights is just being born, we want to make sure that it has a great launch and is a great institution, not just for Winnipeg, Manitoba, but for all of Canada.

We want to make sure that the Museum of Immigration at Pier 21 isn't just about the story of Pier 21 but has a national perspective, not just a Halifax perspective.

Equally, we want to make sure that the history museum is launched with sound funding so that it can be a success for all Canadians.

**Mr. Terence Young:** As you know, Minister, since 2006 we have invested an additional \$142 million in our national museums.

Could you please summarize why the opposition should support our efforts to promote and maintain our national museums, including the proposed Canadian Museum of History?

**Hon. James Moore:** I think the answers are self-evident. We have great museums and they deserve our support.

But there was another item in the budget, which I didn't spell out—it wasn't in my speech—but is really important because the question has been raised. I think it's Scott who most persistently asks this important question.

As the Government of Canada, we have the indemnification fund. The indemnification fund is what it sounds like: the Government of Canada indemnifies collections and items that can move within the country and come in from abroad to our national museums and galleries. The annual amount that the Government of Canada can indemnify in a calendar year is \$1.5 billion. The problem in years past is that the \$1.5 billion in exposure that the Government of Canada can assume per calendar year is very often consumed by March and April. It's usually the largest institutions in the country that take up that capacity: the ROM in Toronto, Glenbow, and other institutions like that.

In Budget 2012, the budget with the reductions but one that also protected all of our museums, we doubled the indemnification fund from \$1.5 billion to \$3 billion per year. There's \$3 billion per year now of exposure assumed by the Government of Canada for collections, so it's been a doubling. Therefore, all these museums across the country that will have the capacity to become official partners with the Canadian museum of history will now be able to host collections locally that are housed in the national museum and can be eligible for protection and indemnification through the indemnification fund that we've doubled.

As a consequence, all of these museums will now have access to collections that they would never otherwise have had: first, because of the creation of the museum and then the signing of those partnerships; and, second, because we've doubled the indemnification fund so they have access to those collections. These are two key measures that will benefit museums all across the country. That is why, for example, the Canadian Museums Association is supporting this legislation and these efforts. It will benefit everybody. It's not just about an institution here in the national capital; it's about the entire country. These reforms working hand in hand will benefit all of our museums.

● (1600)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Young.

Mr. Nantel, for seven minutes.

[*Translation*]

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

I would like to thank Mr. Moore and the members of his staff for being here with us today.

I would first like to tell you that, in light of the many debates we have had in the House, we were able to see that a lot of people were enthusiastic about the idea of being able to share artifacts and various elements from the displays in the Canadian Museum of Civilization across Canada. We have to admit that, for everyone, this fine project is a great idea.

However, what is a bit confusing in it all is that all those points are already part of the museum act. Your review refers to the same point, which has received a lot of attention. The current display at the Canadian Museum of Civilization could very well have been circulated in the same way.

What don't you like about the current exhibition and theme at the Canadian Museum of Civilization?

**Hon. James Moore:** In my view, it is a great museum. The whole team that works there has certainly accomplished a lot of great things. However, as I said in my speech, no changes have been made to the Canada Hall in more than 20 years. That is a problem.

If we are thinking about Canada's 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary, we must improve things. We must change things to show that Canada has changed a lot since 1980.

We must also look at how some spaces are used. As a result, the Canadian Postal Museum is also part of this, but it rarely received a lot of visitors. It takes up a lot of space and we can include those things in a larger exhibition on Canadian history.

Yes, changes have been made. I think the number of visitors has been a success. However, we can increase the museum's capacity, broaden the programming and increase the number of visitors. We can establish partnerships across Canada, which will be very beneficial. I think those changes are needed.

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** You must know that there are a lot of people here who are museum experts. I have permission to cite Dr. George MacDonald, who is here with us and who reacted to your comments when you said that the First Nations were not included. Let me tell you what he said:

• (1605)

[English]

I just watched James Moore on his new web site in the clip on the 2nd reading of Bill C-49 and was shocked to hear him claim that the Aboriginal Peoples are excluded from the displays in the Canada Hall. It is clear from that he did not understand the meaning nor the mutual obligations of that display to the Aboriginal fishing communities of the West Coast. His pressure to remove that exhibit flies directly in the face of what he claims the new legislation will achieve.

[Translation]

What is your reaction to that type of comment?

[English]

**Hon. James Moore:** That's bizarre. I've never pressured a museum to change an exhibit, so I don't know what that's referring to. It's true that, as you go through the Canada Hall, you get to the end of it and realize that apart from the fashions and the architecture it ends in 1980. It doesn't continue through the nineties and into the modern era.

This is a request for funding to upgrade the museum that I know existed before the current management was present at the Museum of Civilization. I know the NDP is not opposed to our investing this money in the museum—you just don't like to change the mandate. You yourself have acknowledged that this museum could use some updating. The Canada Hall is proof of that.

It's not just that one angle. There's also another one. Over time, inadequacies in the Canada Hall were pointed out to me when I did a

tour there not long ago. Acadian Canadians have a plaque on a wall, and that's it. It's just a plaque. The story of the Acadians, the trauma they went through, which is all part of Canada's history, is not treated with real seriousness or any kind of due care. There are all kinds of examples. I've spoken to members of the board of the museum, and I can tell you that very often people put stuff in the suggestion boxes saying that this story isn't adequately told.

Having a refresh is something that is habitual, by the way, in every other museum in the country. They do this stuff all the time to make sure they're up to date, and they understand the nuances of teaching and disseminating information about history.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** You talked about consultations and suggestion boxes. I would like to remind you that the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage has conducted an in-depth study of the potential festivities and the organization of the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Canada. To our great surprise, you have told us since May 2011, when you were elected, that you already had an idea of how to make those changes. Basically, we have learned that historians' associations, archeologists and anthropologists were only consulted in the spring of 2013.

Who have you consulted in almost two years? I remember that my team and I went to a consultation in January. I have here one of the consultation methods used by the representatives of the museum. That consultation was held in the basement of a shopping centre in west Montreal. They wanted to know what Canadians were expecting to see in their museum. We had to put little stickers in boxes to indicate whether our first choice was Maurice Richard's hockey sweater, for example.

What types of consultations have you conducted in those two years?

**Hon. James Moore:** That consultation was organized by the museums.

Listen, on the one hand, you are saying that I should not get involved in museums...

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Are you happy with the consultations held by the museums?

**Hon. James Moore:** That is for them to say. I know that Mr. O'Neill could tell you how they hold their consultations. You must also understand that we are constantly holding consultations to understand the wishes and needs of taxpayers. We want to know what they want to see in every museum and gallery.

I have talked to my provincial colleagues and other people. I fully understand the situation. In my response, I thanked your committee for its work on our country's 150<sup>th</sup> birthday and on what it wanted to include in the celebrations. I agree with most of what you said, but my mandate does not come from your committee. My mandate comes from Canadians and my obligations are to find and work with you on a number of ideas for the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary. That is why, before I introduced the bill in the House of Commons, I presented it to each of you and to each of the parties of the House of Commons. I told you about this bill in person.

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** That is because I want us to talk about it.

**Hon. James Moore:** You have never told me not to go ahead with it. You told me to submit the bill to study its content and see how it was drafted. We are here today to talk about it.

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Exactly, and that is why I wanted to ask you...

**Hon. James Moore:** If you have ideas, I would be very happy to hear about them.

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Let's talk about them then.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Nantel, and thank you, Minister.

Next we have Mr. Simms.

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

Minister, just quickly off the top, who brands a museum? Is that you, or a curator with total independence?

**Hon. James Moore:** Who brands? The naming of the museum is found in the Museums Act. Branding of specific exhibits is up to the museum.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** But in this particular case, certainly there's a great deal of scepticism even in some of the language that's out here. It's a lot smaller than it used to be. In the new language there is "knowledge and understanding" as opposed to what was there before, which was "knowledge and critical understanding". Some people may look at that as just a small item, but these are words that carry a lot of weight. A critical understanding in and of itself carries a certain degree of independence. I would like to see a three-year review about our museums, about the independence, and about whether this independence is maintained.

I'm sorry if I sound alarmist, but, number one, the committee in a report recommended—all of us recommended—that for the celebrations of 2017 we would set up an arm's-length organization to do this. Already we are now into this exercise, which is also branded as a celebration of 2017, to rename the museum and to produce the artifacts across the country or share them, which I'm fine with. But the branding that you're doing is..... Your department has done it before to an excessive degree. We did an order paper question just a short time ago, and you rebranded what was always the "Government of Canada" so that now most of the releases contain the words "Harper Government" as a rebranding exercise. From June 28, 2011 to March 2, 2013 government departments put out a total of 2,600 releases containing the term "Harper Government". The number one department was yours by far, by 600 releases. That's a quarter of the total. So, that's your branding exercise. I hope this is not what we're

seeing here, which would actually infringe upon the curatorial independence of this organization.

• (1610)

**Hon. James Moore:** That's quite a stretch, Scott. You're comparing apples....

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Fine, but illustrate the stretch.

**Hon. James Moore:** You're talking about the Department of Canadian Heritage versus a museum. I don't run the museum, and I don't send out any press releases from the museum. The museum sends out all of its own press releases. You understand the difference, right? The museum is not a part of the Department of Canadian Heritage. The museum is its own independent entity created by the Museums Act and protected by the Museums Act from me or you or anybody telling them what they can or can't say. Tell me you understand the difference between the museum sending out a press release and me sending out a press release.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** But you have the appointees on the board itself. You now decide on the board. You've laid out here, in the terms you have, how you want to see this museum. You are changing the name, yes, but in effect you're also changing the function of this, which really can be dictated by you if you look at the language of this.

**Hon. James Moore:** The only change is the mandate that is spelled out in Bill C-49, and if you want to change one of the words in there because it will provide you greater comfort, then I'm prepared to see that. But you haven't told me. You've talked, but you've never said anything about a specific amendment. If you want to put pen to paper, I'll be glad to look at it, Scott. As I said to you, we want to work together on this.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Well, I'll have to wait until we get to that.

**Hon. James Moore:** That's fine. That's great, and we'll take a look at that. If that will provide you greater comfort, that's fine. On the first thing that you said here about a three-year review of the independence, it's the law. The law is pretty clear. Do you not think the Museums Act is clear about the independence of our museums?

**Mr. Scott Simms:** So what is there to be afraid of?

**Hon. James Moore:** I'm not afraid of anything.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** You did it for the Copyright Act. Why did you do it for Bill C-11, the Copyright Act? You have a review built in....



**Hon. James Moore:** We have a five-year review of the Copyright Act for very different reasons, because technological changes over years and international obligations by the Government of Canada shouldn't stop us from reforming our copyright legislation—so it's about technology and international obligations. There's nothing technologically that changes about the Government of Canada having a wall of independence motivating the museums—

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Well, of course there is. We share the artifacts across the country. You even said yourself earlier that because of technological changes, some of the changes have to be made no matter what. That's certainly true in this particular case and when it comes to the museum.

**Hon. James Moore:** I'm not following you on the technology...

**Mr. Scott Simms:** The fundamental reason for you to have a review is to make sure that your legislation is working. Correct? So, why not do a three-year review of this?

**Hon. James Moore:** You mean on this particular museum or on all museums?

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Sure. If Canadians have a fundamental concern about the independence of this museum and perhaps even about other museums, wouldn't a three-year review alleviate that problem?

**Hon. James Moore:** If you want, but this is a new policy. Let's be very clear. This is the first time that any member of this Parliament has ever raised this issue. But let's look specifically at the law. Section 27 of the Museums Act says:

No directive shall be given to a museum...with respect to cultural activities, including...its activities and programs for the public, including exhibitions, displays and publications...and...research.

It's pretty clear.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** So why would you be against a review?

• (1615)

**Hon. James Moore:** Because it doesn't change, Scott. It's the law. Words don't jump off the page and jump over each other. It's the law.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** But in other cases, you have put a review board in, such as for Bill C-11.

**Hon. James Moore:** Propose it, fine.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Okay, but it sounds to me like you don't want to do this.

**Hon. James Moore:** I don't care. If you want to do it, do it, but it's the law. It doesn't change.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** I'm sure you care

**Hon. James Moore:** But it's the law; it doesn't change.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Let's go back to the first point then, the one I mentioned about the 150th celebration. Do you think there should be an independent agency to look after the celebrations of 150 years, for the sesquicentennial.

**Hon. James Moore:** It's one of the things we're considering. We haven't decided on it because, to be honest, we had differing experiences, for example, when I was minister responsible for the Vancouver 2010 Olympics. We had VANOC, which was an independent organization, and very often when we have independent organizations, what they will often do—and your government will remember this well—is to have all kinds of hype and to dream up all

kinds of great big things and stir up all kinds of excitement about something, and then all they do is then to turn to the government and say, “Now fund it”. I think that's not necessarily the best model to follow.

The idea of having, certainly, independence in making sure that our celebrations are seen to be pan-Canadian and obviously non-partisan, thoughtful, and inclusive of all parts of the country, respectful of our official languages, and all of our diversity in the country, of course, is self-evident.

That would only benefit the program, but the way in which it's structured matters very much because, as I personally experienced in the past, there have been organizations that have been independent, have dialed up expectations, and then turned to the government and said, “Now pay for it”, without any input whatsoever.

There's a way to do it that matters, and that was one of the recommendations of the committee that was looking at it, and we're taking that into account.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Simms.

Mr. Hillyer, for seven minutes.

**Mr. Jim Hillyer (Lethbridge, CPC):** Thank you very much.

Thank you, Minister, for coming to visit us on this subject.

There's a lot of talk about how this name and mandate change has been politically motivated. I have trouble seeing it; I don't understand how it's politically motivated. I wonder if changing the name to the Canadian Museum of History, which also includes not just Canadian history but our place in the world and therefore world history as well, is politically motivated. Would that suggest perhaps that the lack of a Canadian of museum of history up to this point was also politically motivated, perhaps owing to a doctrine that Canadians have to be self-effacing and that it's somehow un-Canadian to be pro-Canadian?

I guess I can't ask you why people think it's politically motivated because you can't think for other people, but what are your thoughts on that notion?

**Hon. James Moore:** If this were in any way partisan or politically motivated, I wouldn't have shared the language of the legislation with the NDP and the Liberals, and the Green Party before we tabled it. If this were partisan, we wouldn't have the broad-based support that we have for it. If this were partisan, former NDP MP and now independent MP Bruce Hyer wouldn't have voted for it. If this were partisan, Elizabeth May wouldn't have voted for it. If this were partisan we wouldn't have the support of former Liberal MP John English. When I spoke to Jean Chrétien about this, he liked the idea. He thought it was a good idea and proposed that we go forward with it.

When I say this is non-partisan, I genuinely mean that, and if colleagues want to see devils where there aren't any, then they'll see them, and that's just the way it is. As I said, maybe this will be a circumstance of believing me later when the results are fully shown, but this is going to be a great project. It's going to be great. It is.

There are institutions lining up to be signatories to the MOUs across the country. I can tell you that the Royal British Columbia Museum; the Manitoba Museum; and The Rooms in St. John's, Newfoundland, all want to sign-on. They're going to be partners in this. We have museums all across the country, large and small, that are thumbs-up enthusiastic. They understand the value of this, the importance of this. Every single member of the current board of the Canadian Museum of Civilization, every single one of them, supports this museum. Past board chairs are supporting this.

This has broad-based support across the country because this is a classical example of Occam's razor. This is exactly what it appears to be, the creation of a national institution that will be of value to every part of the country. It will teach Canada's history as Canadians want to teach it, one to another, in the institutions where they live. That's what this is. Anybody who tries to spin this or torque this into something that it's not is really playing a fool's game.

**Mr. Jim Hillyer:** You wouldn't say there was political motivation to avoid it up to this point?

**Hon. James Moore:** The Canadian Museum of Civilization, I think, has a great track record. They've had great successes. Certainly the staff at the museum is great.

Keep in mind, by the way, about one-third of the Museum of Civilization's budget right now goes to research. That will continue to be the case because there is great research that is done there, and it will continue to move forward.

They've built a great legacy there that we're building upon.

If we were in any way disrespecting the Canadian Museum of Civilization, Douglas Cardinal would not be supporting this. He was one of the great visionaries who helped build this institution. If we were in any way diminishing the value of this institution, the mayors of Gatineau and Ottawa wouldn't be supporting this project, but they are, because they see this as an important step forward in enlarging the value of this museum and what it means for the national capital and the country.

I don't know what to say to the opponents of this. There are not many of them and, frankly, those who are have very, very weak arguments. I'd have to be blunt.

• (1620)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jim Hillyer:** Where I come from, all the cities are young. The province of Alberta itself was created in 1905. We think that Canada started in 1867. I personally had never heard of Saint Jean de Brébeuf before I took French literature courses in university.

Could you tell us about the importance of understanding history, even before 1867?

**Hon. James Moore:** Yes, that is something very important. In the House of Commons, I did not have the chance to say enough about that. So let me make it clear.

[*English*]

You notice the name of this museum. Again, I mentioned how we reached out to opposition parties and showed them the language of the bill before we tabled it. We spoke to people before we did this. It is a demonstration, by the way, of the effort that we've made to try to be as inclusive as possible with this museum. Some people have asked why it will be called the Canadian Museum of History. The reason is that we don't want to limit it singularly and only to Canada's history. And equally, it's the Canadian Museum of History because not all Canadians trace back their lineage back to 1867. Of course, aboriginal Canadians have a different view of when their history and their lineage began on this continent and what that means to them.

I think my deputy minister will agree with me that we had very painstaking conversations and e-mails back and forth, working things around and making the name work in both official languages in a way that was inclusive for Canadians themselves and institutions across the country, so that they will be able to talk about history and Canadian history in a context that makes the most sense to them. So we came up with the title, the most appropriate one, the one that works best—the Canadian Museum of History—to be inclusive of Canada's first people and to be inclusive of all the different stories and narratives that have led us to where we are today.

**Mr. Jim Hillyer:** One of the things that excites me about this notion is the pan-Canadian network that you talked about. You said in your comments at the beginning that "It's time for this country to think big". Now, to be fair, and I'm sure you aren't insinuating this, this is not the first time this country has ever thought big. We have a nature of thinking big.

There's the notion in the past that we could only think big or do big if it were being propped up by the federal government. You've talked about how the regional museums can profit from this central museum. But what about the other way around? How can the central museum or one region benefit from another region by their being able to share their local histories with the rest of Canada?

**Hon. James Moore:** Yes, it's an important point. This is one thing we envision as well, that not just will local museums be able to draw down items from the national museum and host them locally; local museums can also take some of their collections and move them to other parts of the country, or to the national museum as well.

So the idea of a partnership isn't just stuff moving from the national museum to locally, but stuff locally moving up nationally, or moving to other parts of the country.

I've had the privilege—it's been an incredible privilege, I can tell you—to visit all kinds of museums across this country. We have thousands of museums across the country, I can tell you. I've gone through them in painstaking detail—sometimes with lots of boredom on the face of my wife as I go through some of these things—and aggravating some of the people who are with me by how much time I like to spend in museums. But the truth is that when you go to museums around the country, you realize there are some incredible gems out there. There are some incredible things and stories that should be told.

I think I told this committee this story about one of the catalysts that drew me to this idea of networking all of our museums together. It was when I visited the museum in Midway, British Columbia.

If you haven't been to Midway, it's a very small town. And it is where it sounds like: midway across the border between Alberta and the Pacific Ocean, on the southern border of British Columbia. It's a small little town, with a population of I think 2,500 persons. They have a small little museum there, and I went in. Against the back wall they had this display by the Japanese Canadians of Midway, British Columbia. It's a small association. This was a display of people of Japanese descent who still live in the south Okanagan, who decided, after having been displaced and put in internment camps in the Second World War, to stay in the south Okanagan and make lives for themselves.

There are all kinds of items there that talk about the hardships they faced, the racism they went through, the difficulties in establishing themselves, the pride they now feel in having gone through all that, and the successful lives they've made for themselves and their families.

It's not a big display, but it's very impactful. I looked at it and I thought, "This is really quite something." I left the museum, and when I signed the guest book I was saddened to see that I was about the sixtieth person to visit that museum in the last two months. I thought, "What a waste. This is a great story to tell." As I went on with the rest of my road trip, I thought to myself that there had to be some way....

I know that the Canadian Museums Association advocates for local museums, but they don't really have the capacity to do these things. I thought about it: what can we do so that people in other parts of the country can see this display and understand its impact, and maybe host something in an exchange? Maybe a national museum should see this display. Japanese internment is spoken about in the Canadian War Museum, but it's not talked about in that kind of personal way, with individual stories of people who talk about what they went through, how they came out the other end, and

how they ended up being very successful and proud Canadians in spite of the suffering they went through. It's a great story.

So I started thinking about it, and where we arrived at is where we are today. I'm very proud of that. From those early moments of thinking about how we can tie these institutions together, here we are. We're now at—hopefully soon—report stage of Bill C-49 to create the Canadian Museum of History.

That little museum in Midway, British Columbia, can be a partner now. That little collection I saw those couple of years ago can now be hosted at the national museum, and those Japanese Canadians who are telling their story in the south Okanagan might now have the opportunity to share that story with other Canadians.

That's what we're doing.

•(1625)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Hillyer.

Mr. Cash.

**Mr. Andrew Cash (Davenport, NDP):** Thank you.

Thank you, Minister, for being here.

I'm going to have to be fairly quick here.

First of all, has the Mayor of Gatineau made a public statement of support for this museum?

**Hon. James Moore:** I believe as a public statement.... He said it to me in private, and he said—

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Well, has he signed a declaration? Has he made a public statement that he is in support of this?

**Hon. James Moore:** I asked him personally and he said, yes, absolutely, and if you want me to send something—

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** This is part of the problem we have. So much of the issue here with this museum is that it's a personal endeavour between you and other personal relationships that you have.

I mean, you're announcing here that the Mayor of Gatineau supports the changes when the people of Gatineau haven't heard that officially from the mayor himself.

Is this the official announcement of his support?

**Hon. James Moore:** I've said so from the.... I spoke to him in my office. I talked to him before we tabled the legislation. I talked to Mr. Bureau and as well as Jim Watson. I told them what we were—

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** You say that the government doesn't interfere, and that agencies are very independent, but we know that Bill C-60 will give powers to cabinet—

**Hon. James Moore:** Hold on. With respect, Andrew, to just roll through this—

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Excuse me. Can I just ask the question first?

**Hon. James Moore:** Yes, but just to call Mr. Bureau a liar.... Like, come on.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Pardon me?

**Hon. James Moore:** Let's not call people liars.

I mean, Mr. Bureau told me directly, and my office—

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** I didn't call.... I asked if there was a public statement of support from the mayor.

I didn't call you anything, Minister, with the greatest respect. I asked a simple question: was there a public statement? That's all.

**Hon. James Moore:** Ask his office about that. He told me.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** We already know that Bill C-60 will give powers to cabinet to set terms of employment for all staff at the museum—

**The Chair:** Mr. Cash, we're on Bill C-49.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** I know. I'm going to get to it.

**The Chair:** You have the last question, and you have a few minutes, so bring it on to—

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** It's because this is related to independence. We know that many experts are saying that the independence of crown corporations will be compromised by this.

So when you said “we” had the idea to make changes to the museum, who is “we”, first of all?

**Hon. James Moore:** Well, I did. I talked to a bunch of colleagues. I talked to the president of the museum at the time, to members of the board, to historians. I talked to one of my old history professors from back in university; I said, what do you think of this idea? I talk to people in museums across the country all the time, and I say, what do you think of this idea?

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** How often do you speak to Mr. O'Neill?

**Hon. James Moore:** I don't know. Where is Mark?

I talked to him just before this meeting.

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

•(1630)

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Do you and he frequently converse?

**Hon. James Moore:** Through the course of this legislation, not any more often than I've spoken with presidents of other museums.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** And how about e-mails and visits and meetings?

**Hon. James Moore:** I don't have his e-mail address.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** So what sort of things do you speak about with him?

**Hon. James Moore:** His favourite colour, what he likes in his hot dog. Important things like that....

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

**Hon. James Moore:** Come on. We talk about public....

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Well, this is just it. Are there notes and records of these meetings?

**An hon. member:** You're not a prosecutor.

**Hon. James Moore:** Come on. He's a conspiracy theorist.

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Oak Ridges—Markham, CPC):** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, we have the minister for a short period of time. We're talking about Bill C-49, not Mr. O'Neill's e-mail address.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** I wasn't asking for Mr. O'Neill's e-mail address—

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Could we bring it back to reality?

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Come on, you're going to run out the clock. This is a classic tactic.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Maybe offline they can ask Mr. O'Neill and Mr. Moore what movies they like and what they like on their hot dogs. But if we could talk about Bill C-49, that would be a real change.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cash.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** The issue here is that there's no transparency in this decision. You've made an announcement assuming that there was some public announcement of the support of the mayor of Gatineau. Your decision about this museum was made, it seems, arbitrarily, or with some friends in private.

We had a long study of Canada's 150th birthday. This was never brought up once. The decision was made after the fact. The announcement of the money to spend was made, and then a consultation began for which essentially the decision had already been made. So it's valid to ask you how often and for how long have you been working on this in secret without the public's knowledge of this, and what's the connection? I mean, you seem to be very close to Mr. O'Neill. How often do you meet? We've been trying to ask this question for many months in various forms. So I have you here, and I think it's germane to the conversation.

**Hon. James Moore:** I probably speak to any of our museum presidents, including Mr. O'Neill, every month. Maybe once a month. There's no difference between Mr. O'Neill and the heads of any other of our organizations.

Second, on this issue of secrecy, this is such a secret plan that I shared it with my heritage critic from the NDP. This is such a secret plan that I shared it with the leader of the Green Party. It's such a secret plan that I told Scott. It's such a secret plan, I told Jean Chrétien. My God, it's such a secret plan, I shared it with the former board chairs. It's such a secret plan, I was very proud of it and talked about it across this country over the past nine months since we announced this plan. With regard to Mr. Bureau, I had the same conversation—

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Are there records—

**Hon. James Moore:** Let me finish. I had the same conversation—

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Are there records of your meetings with Mr. O'Neill? Is there a log of the appointments, how often you two have discussed this? When did you start discussing this, and for how long? And what was the nature of those discussions? It's just a simple question. Is there a log of that stuff?

**Hon. James Moore:** I don't think so. I mean, he's not a lobbyist; he's the president of a museum.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Sure. And you decided to spend \$26 million of taxpayers' money on a museum, which—you've already described the Canadian Museum of Civilization aptly and perfectly today as a great museum. You've already described....

**The Chair:** The minister is—

**Hon. James Moore:** Yes, but it could be made better and improved upon. And look, the fact—

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** There was no consultation with the public on this.

**The Chair:** Okay, Mr. Cash—

**Hon. James Moore:** Andrew, I didn't interrupt you at any point. Just let me answer—

**The Chair:** —allow the minister to give a quick response to this.

**Hon. James Moore:**—some of the nonsense here. Look, I met with Mr. Watson in my office, and I asked him if he supported this idea, and he said yes. He said he thinks it's great. I believe he issued a public statement. And I asked him, “Can I publicly say that you support the museum?” He said, “Yes. Absolutely”.

I had the exact same conversation with Mr. Bureau. I said, “Here's what we plan to do. Can I say publicly that you support this institution?” He said, “Yes. I think it's a great idea”. So I've said so.

And you're right—

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Did he say that it was a great idea? Or did he say you could say publicly that he supports it?

**Hon. James Moore:** Yes. Both.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Which?

**Hon. James Moore:** Both. Look, even just—

**The Chair:** We're out of time, as interesting as this is.

Minister, thank you for your time with us.

We're going to suspend for one minute, and let our next panel of witnesses come to the table.

•(1630)

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

•(1635)

**The Chair:** We'll get started again. From now until 5:30, we will have with us Mr. Mark O'Neill, president and chief executive officer of the Canadian Museum of Civilization, as well as David Morrison, director of research and content, special project 2017, exhibitions and programs.

Welcome, gentlemen. I believe the clerk has told you that you have some time for opening remarks before we move into questions and answers.

With that, Mr. O'Neill, the floor is yours.

•(1640)

**Mr. Mark O'Neill (President and Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Museum of Civilization Corporation):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Good afternoon, committee members. I greatly appreciate this opportunity to discuss Bill C-49 and the proposed establishment of the Canadian Museum of History.

[*Translation*]

I believe the proposed changes will strengthen our institution and greatly enhance its contribution to the public life of this country in some very significant and constructive ways.

At the outset, however, I would like to talk about some of the things that won't change, and that have been the subject of some debate and discussion in the media and elsewhere.

[*English*]

First, the proposed Canadian Museum of History would continue to present outstanding temporary exhibitions that illuminate world history and cultures. They will remain part of our mandate and an important part of our programming.

In fact, we are currently working with our colleagues in Greece on the production of a major exhibition about that country's ancient history. This exhibition, “From Agamemnon to Alexander the Great”, will feature over 500 exceptional artifacts and will be launched at the Royal Ontario Museum, our partner next year, and will travel to Ottawa, Chicago, and then Washington.

Second, we will maintain the ever popular Canadian Children's Museum.

Third, our First Peoples Hall and Grand Hall will continue to explore the historical achievements and contemporary contributions of Canada's aboriginal peoples. They are the finest exhibitions of their kind in Canada and so they shall remain as integral parts of the new museum should the legislation be passed into law.

Finally, we will continue building our national collection, and undertaking scholarly and other types of research, despite claims from some to the contrary. In fact, our national collection fund now totals \$9 million and in consultation with academics across the country, the corporation has developed a research strategy, the first in the museum's history. This strategy will guide the work of the museum in its research activities over the next 10 years.

[*Translation*]

I would like to turn now to the engagement process we used to solicit public input.

It began last October. We engaged with Canadians across the country and invited them to think about their history and how it should be told in their Canadian Museum of History.

We set up an interactive website and designed an online survey. We organized roundtable discussions in nine cities from St. John's to Vancouver. We set up an interactive kiosk in public places across the country. We held meetings with school students and other groups. And we had questions placed on an independent opinion survey. Over 24,000 people became directly engaged in the project, either in person or online.

[English]

The results are detailed in a report that will be released shortly, but I am very happy to share with you, the members of this committee, some of what we have heard from Canadians.

Canadians told us that visiting museums and historic sites, and encountering real artifacts are by far their favourite ways of connecting with history. Many stress the unique role that museums play in educating children and youth, and in providing shared learning opportunities for family and friends.

Canadians have said that they trust museums more than any other source of historical information and that they value museums for the way they allow them to interact with each other and their common history.

Yet, Mr. Chair, we've never had a museum that tells the pan-Canadian story from earliest time to present day. The Museum of Civilization has indeed been trying to fill that void and has been doing so despite a very different legislative mandate. Its central purpose, as described in the Museums Act, is to enhance understanding of cultural achievements and human behaviour—not Canadian history and identity.

Nevertheless, since at least 2005 and on the heels of the overwhelming success of our sister institution, the Canadian War Museum, the museum has been working to broaden and deepen its focus on Canadian history. It has been trying to do a better job of telling the story of this country and its people from the pan-Canadian perspective. It has been working to share that story with as many Canadians as possible.

Currently, the museum is a key centre for historical research and scholarship through its artifacts, exhibitions, and its other programming. The museum explores many aspects of our country's past and disseminates the results of that research in many forms across the country, such as print publications and other forms of research. All of this will continue under the new mandate.

[Translation]

The museum's work and achievements are impressive. But it has serious shortcomings, which are most evident in our largest permanent gallery, the Canada Hall.

[English]

The Canada Hall was not designed to be a narrative history exhibition. Inspired to some extent by the success of the streetscape of the Epcot Center in Florida, the museum staff designed the hall to offer a vision of Canada's social and economic history that moved

temporally and geographically from 1000 A.D. in the Atlantic provinces to the present day in British Columbia and the Northwest Territories.

• (1645)

While that approach makes for an interesting and informative visit, it can't help but produce a disjointed and narrow picture of our country's dynamic past. In the Canada Hall, the regions of the country presented are frozen in time and exist entirely independently. Whole categories of endeavour—politics, sport, culture, our contributions to the world—are poorly covered or not covered at all. Women's history is at best peripheral. The journey through time ends in the 1970s, so almost half a century of our history is left unexplored.

As a result of this, while walking through Canada Hall you will learn about life in New France, but you'll find no mention of the Quiet Revolution or anything else about Quebec. You'll learn about the early whaling industry in Newfoundland, but nothing about why, how, or when the colony joined Confederation. You'll see recreations of grain elevators and oil rigs, but you won't learn about the phenomenon called western alienation.

Although modules on the rebellions in Upper and Lower Canada have been added very recently, Confederation itself is reduced to a multimedia timeline. You'll find no mention in Canada Hall of the flag debate or the Constitution, no mention of Paul Henderson's goal in Moscow, or the wartime internment of Ukrainian or Japanese Canadians. You'll find no reference to residential schools or peacekeeping, or Terry Fox and his Marathon of Hope. There is no meaningful reference to the Great Depression, the conscription crisis, or even a hint as to where Canada might be headed. But perhaps the most egregious flaw in the Canada Hall is its starting point. If you've been there, you will know that its telling of our national story begins not with the arrival of the First Peoples but with the arrival of Europeans in the eleventh century. Colonization as a term or concept is not mentioned in Canada Hall.

[Translation]

This is something we intend to correct. Canadians made it very clear to us during the public engagement process that the voices and the experiences of First Peoples must have a place in any narrative of Canadian history. We want to focus more of our attention on the telling of Canada's story in all its richness and complexity. And we believe the task is best accomplished under a new mandate and a new name—a name that better reflects what we aspire to become.

[English]

Here is the vision we have for the new Canadian Museum of History.

It will feature the largest and most comprehensive exhibition on Canadian history ever developed. The new permanent gallery will replace both the Canada Hall and the Canadian Personalities Hall. It will be a place where Canadians can go to retrace their national journey and encounter their national treasures. It's where they can go to learn about the people, events, and themes that shaped our country's development and defined the Canadian experience. It will underpin our national identity. It will include seminal events and episodes from our past, and some of the greatest Canadian stories never told.

We are also establishing a network of history museums across the country. Members of this network will have a permanent gallery devoted to the presentation of their exhibitions. Those exhibitions will complement and enhance our national narrative by adding regional content and perspectives. The new gallery will also broaden the reach and the profile of the contributing institutions, and members of this network will have better access to the national collection to enhance their own work.

During the public engagement process, Canadians told us what they expect of those exhibitions and the museum in general, especially the new Canadian history hall. Here are some highlights.

Canadians want us to be comprehensive, frank, and fair in our presentation of their history. They want us to examine both the good and the bad from our past. We were urged to foster a sense of national pride without ignoring our failings, mistakes, and controversies. Canadians want us to present various viewpoints and voices, recognizing that people and events can be interpreted in different ways when seen through different eyes. They want us to connect with them on a personal level. They want to see themselves and their neighbours reflected in the museum—whatever their heritage, whenever they joined the Canadian family, and wherever in this country they live. They have told us quite clearly not to ignore the world beyond our borders.

Those comments, suggestions, and pleadings will inform our every decision going forward. The content for this new exhibition is being developed by a multidisciplinary team of experts at the museum, led by Dr. David Morrison. This team is made up of researchers, curators, and museologists working in close collaboration with advisory committees composed of historians and experts from across Canada.

•(1650)

Creating a new gallery is going to be a major challenge. Our experts will first have to develop a comprehensive and cohesive storyline, which they have begun to do. They will have to identify the themes, events, and artifacts that merit inclusion in the gallery. They'll have to make some difficult choices and grapple with some very contentious issues, and they'll have to do it all in full knowledge that their every decision will be scrutinized by scholars, lay people, advocacy groups, the media, and politicians from coast to coast. But our professional staff are the best in the country at what they do, and they're certainly up to the challenge.

Mr. Chair, the call for a national history museum is hardly recent. Over 60 years ago, the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences stated in its final report, "On the necessity for an historical museum, we can hardly speak too strongly." In 2003, the Government of Canada announced a \$50-million plan to convert the Government Conference Centre in Ottawa into the Canadian History Centre.

Mr. Chair, should Bill C-49 be passed into law, the corporation will create a museum worthy of Canadians' support and deserving of their pride.

Thank you. I look forward to your questions.

[Translation]

I would be happy to answer them.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. O'Neill.

We'll move now to our questions and answers, beginning with Mr. Richards for seven minutes.

**Mr. Blake Richards (Wild Rose, CPC):** Thank you very much for being here.

Mr. O'Neill, there seem to be some misconceptions about this bill, certainly on the other side of the table at least. I want to take a moment to clarify a few points with you. Certainly, when we had the Minister here earlier, he was very clear that many of the decisions about the museum and its contents and its curatorial decisions would obviously remain in your hands at the museum. But the opposition seems to be inferring that there will be some interference with the independence of the museum. That's certainly what their inference is.

I wonder if you can tell us a little bit about Bill C-49 and if it will still allow the Canadian Museum of History, as it will be called, to maintain its curatorial independence, and if you could indicate if that would be the same independence currently enjoyed by the Canadian Museum of Civilization, as it's currently called. Also, perhaps you could even point to the sections or parts of the bill that explain that particular point.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Mr. Chair, I thank the member for the question.

I'd like to begin my answer by saying that I fully understand the concerns of Canadians when changes are made to their memory institutions. I've been around a long time, having worked in cultural and social policy for the Government of Canada since 1986. I've been in this museum corporation for 12 years. I was in the corporation when another government created a museum, when a government built the Canadian War Museum, and I saw that project from the ground up. Many of the same concerns and discussions were certainly central to that whole period as well.

I think those concerns are understandable. What works, and as the Minister of Canadian Heritage explained, simply by its statutory nature the museum is a crown corporation existing at arm's length from the Government of Canada. Ministers and governments make their views known in very broad ways, as the former government did about the need for a military history museum, as this government has about its desire to introduce a bill to Parliament, and here you are at second reading.

The arm's length and the protection flows from the governance structure of the corporation, and that is the role of the board of trustees in setting the strategic direction and, as I think many of the members of this committee know, that is a cornerstone of crown corporation governance. It appears in our corporate plan each year. It is my task as the CEO of the corporation to respond to that strategic direction and demonstrate to the board, operating on behalf of the minister of the government, that we are indeed implementing it.

My experience in the corporation is that the members of this committee as well as Canadians can be encouraged and assured that the museum will operate independently from the Government of Canada, and that the content of this new museum will be created by the content experts who work for us: the museologists, curators, researchers, and historians.

• (1655)

**Mr. Blake Richards:** That's obviously a pretty clear statement you have made. There've also been some concerns expressed about the new mandate and how it might not allow the museum to conduct research or participate in international knowledge sharing. Can you tell us if that's the case?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** The members of the committee studying this bill know—and I don't think I need to direct you—that clause 9, I believe it is, immediately following the mandate statement, discusses research and collecting, and the powers and authority of the museum at length. I understand there is some concern that the words “research” and “collecting” aren't in the mandate statement. That's certainly beyond my purview, in terms of your work.

However, I can tell you that the museum is engaged in collection and research as we speak. I mentioned in my remarks that we have a national collection fund of \$9 million. At the end of the last month, we literally finalized a research strategy that will garner activities. I see absolutely nothing in this bill, if that's your question, that would in any way prevent the museum from undertaking the research and collecting that it currently does. In fact, it's explicitly set out in clause 9.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Excellent.

What about the ability to host international exhibitions? There's been some concern expressed there as well that under the new mandate this could not be undertaken .

Is that true?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Again, world cultures in history are specifically mentioned, I believe, in the mandate statement proposed in the act. This has dogged us a little bit since day one. There was an earlier media report that said the museum would no longer undertake international exhibitions and partnerships. At the actual press conference in which the government made the announcement, we

talked about the fact that we had begun discussing the Greek exhibition that I just highlighted for you, and the museum will continue to host international exhibitions and develop international partnerships. They're critically important, and I believe that was explicitly referenced in the proposed mandate statement, which I think is in proposed section 8 of the act.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** While we're on the topic of international exhibitions, in Budget 2012 the government actually increased the travelling exhibitions indemnification program to help attract new exhibitions to Canada.

I wonder if you could just tell the committee a little bit about how that will help the museum to bring in those international exhibitions.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** I can also talk, Mr. Chair, as someone who used to manage that program. I worked in the Department of Canadian Heritage in that area for some five or six years and managed that along with several other programs.

The indemnification program was, is, and as long as it is there will be, critically important to museums across the country, particularly those that wish to partner to host large international exhibitions. That's really the fundamental purpose of the indemnification program, and it's an extremely important program.

For example, we would apply for indemnification along with the ROM in Toronto for the Greek exhibition that I mentioned. The indemnification program is absolutely critical to successful partnerships, particularly in hosting and attracting large-scale international exhibitions.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** There also seems to be some confusion in some of the members of the opposite side who seem to be making the claim that Canadians were not consulted on this new museum. I know you mentioned briefly in your opening remarks some of the consultations that the museum undertook in the consultation phase. I wonder if you could elaborate and expand on that a bit, and tell us a bit more about some of the consultations that the museum undertook regarding the creation of the new Canadian museum of history.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Yes, I'd be happy to do that.

I certainly can tell you that the museum went across the country for a period of about four months, from St. John's to Vancouver, in nine centres, and met with groups of Canadians in those centres. We mounted kiosks in urban centres. We had an online survey, and as I mentioned in my speech, we also had an independent question and opinion survey.



Altogether we've had about 24,000 Canadians participate in various ways in that consultation. We took the consultation very seriously. The consultation that I referred to earlier, the meeting earlier in Montreal, was in fact one of the most dynamic consultations with a very good panel discussion, a very diverse panel discussion of young Quebecers, anglophones and francophones, talking about the history museum. It was very helpful to us.

The information has already been given to Dr. Morrison and his team, and they're working that into the interpretive scenario, as we call it, or the storyline that we've begun to develop for the new museum, and we've taken the content and themes very seriously.

I would simply add that in a parallel way we also consulted with academics and scholars—we felt that was critically important—right across the country, and they have helped us develop this new research strategy, which will also help inform the new exhibition hall.

I would finally mention that I'm pleased to tell you that as of recently, we have members of the Canadian Historical Association—and we're very pleased about this—who have accepted an invitation to work with us on our advisory committees in developing the content for the new Canadian history hall.

• (1700)

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

Next, we have Madam Boutin-Sweet, for seven minutes.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. O'Neill, as you know, I am an archeologist and this bill worries me a great deal. We heard a lot about consultations, but my understanding is that they were all held once the decision was made to change the museum and its mission.

Have Canadians and museum experts, including archeologists, been consulted to see what they think about changing the museum's mission?

[*English*]

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Thank you very much for the question.

Mr. Chair, we did not ask Canadians if they thought that the mandate should be changed. Our view was that the government had introduced a bill in the House, that there is the likelihood of the bill becoming the law of the land. We felt that it was important to talk to Canadians about the kinds of things that they would like to see in their new history museum. We wanted to learn more about how Canadians might engage in the museum, and the kinds of things that they thought might be important.

In the public consultations there were a number of Canadians who participated. There certainly were museologists and content experts.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet:** That is not what I was asking.

I am well aware of who you consulted with afterwards. My understanding is that the decision came from the minister. Once the decision was made, no one else could say that it was not a good idea

to change the museum's mission. The public was consulted on what will be displayed in the new museum.

I would like you to quickly answer my question by yes or no. Does the museum have a code of ethics for the acquisition of collections?

[*English*]

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** You're asking about a code of ethics for the acquisition of material.

I would say our collecting is guided by a number of policies that are common to museums across Canada and around the world. That would be an accurate answer, but as for a specific code of ethics, the answer would be no.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet:** In the fall of 2012, the museum agreed to buy artifacts from the *Empress of Ireland*. The archeologists of the museum were strongly against that purchase because it was the result of pillage.

First, did you take the advice of the archeologists from the museum? Second, were there any disciplinary notices after that? Third, how much did the collection cost?

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, he's here to speak about the bill that's before us. I don't think he was advised to do his research and homework on other topics. He's here specifically on Bill C-49—

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet:** It is directly related to interference. Other members asked questions about interference.

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** —so I'm wondering if you might make sure that if—

**The Chair:** Mr. Calandra has the floor.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I wonder if you could get the member opposite under control.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

If we could try to be specific on Bill C-49 that would be helpful.

I know the last time the president was here members had an opportunity to talk about all kinds of different things, but the opposition decided to use up his time by trying to pass motions. Right now we have an opportunity on Bill C-49. Let's do that. If we want to have the president back on other things later, we can do that as well.

**The Chair:** Mr. Calandra has made a point of order. When we invite witnesses we generally do want to focus on the subject matter on which we invited them. We allow a bit of latitude, but if you could bring it back to Bill C-49—

[Translation]

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet:** Absolutely.

[English]

**The Chair:** —the point of order doesn't come out of your time. So you're all set.

[Translation]

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet:** It is directly related to interference. I would like to know if there was any interference. Who made the decision? Did archeologists have a say in it? That is a direct link.

[English]

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Mr. Chair, the first part of the member's question concerned the acquisition of the *Empress of Ireland* itself.

First, I would suggest that Mr. Philippe Beaudry, the diver, is considered to be the legal owner of the objects from the wreck according to the Receiver of Wreck in Canada. As I think you know, the site of the *Empress of Ireland* was not designated by the Quebec Cultural Property Act until 1999, long after Mr. Beaudry finished collecting his objects. The Government of Canada, through the Cultural Property Export Review Board decided in 2001 that the objects were too important to the national cultural heritage of the country to be exported from Canada. The problem was that they would either be sold into private collections in Canada, or some institution that had a mandate or a capacity to acquire the collection and preserve it would have to do so. Incidentally, after many years of negotiation involving and beginning with my predecessor, we were able to successfully acquire the objects for future generations.

I would also add that although it is true that the acquisition of these kinds of artifacts can be controversial, as you well know, many Canadians are extremely pleased that we've acquired this collection, including a group of Canadians in western Canada who formed the *Empress of Ireland* artifacts committee.

• (1705)

[Translation]

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet:** If I understood correctly, the artifacts were bought against the advice of the archeologists working at the museum. I think disciplinary measures were taken and there was a high price to pay.

On that note, I will share the rest of my time with Mr. Cash.

[English]

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Okay, thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cash, you have 30 seconds.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Thirty seconds.

How frequently and how often have you met with the minister over the last few years?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** I was thinking about that when you were talking to the minister. With respect to this particular project, I've met with the minister twice.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** I'm just saying in general how often. Thanks.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** I don't meet with the minister. I've met with the minister twice on this. I see the minister at events; I see him at exhibition openings.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** He said he meets you once a month.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** I don't think he said he met me once a month

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** A point of order.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** —I think he said he talks to me once a month, which is probably true.

**The Chair:** Mr. Calandra has a point of order.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** I'm sorry.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I'm sorry, Mr. O'Neill.

We didn't ask him to bring his datebook with him. The line of questioning is almost ridiculous. Obviously we are here on Bill C-49, and if they want to bring him back to talk to about his datebook, they can do that at a different time. Our time is limited, so let's ask him about Bill C-49, Mr. Chair. It's truly unfair to ask him what his datebook has included over the last five years that Minister Moore has been the minister.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cash, as I said before we do want to try to stay on Bill C-49. You have actually two minutes left.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Okay. I'm trying to understand the sequence of events that led to the decision being made.

I think it's appropriate to understand how often the minister is in touch with you. How often is he in touch with you on the phone, in person, or otherwise, through e-mail? How often do you two converse?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Mr. Chair, I see the minister at events in town, usually at exhibition openings or citizenship court hearings at the Museum of Civilization and the War Museum. I think the last time I saw the minister would have been at the opening of the Star Wars Identities exhibition at the Aviation Museum. I go to all of these events.

I do not have regular meetings with the Minister of Canadian Heritage. I met with him twice on this particular project. I do not regularly speak to the minister or meet with the minister. I certainly see him a lot because, as you know, he's a very active minister: he has his films and other nights here in Ottawa. I see him around town frequently and he's often at the national museums and other cultural institutions in Ottawa.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** I am a little confused then. When he said about once a month, what was he referring to?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Mr. Chair, you would have to recheck with the minister.

I thought I heard him say, and perhaps I'm mistaken, Mr. Cash, that he thinks he speaks to me about once a month.

I certainly don't meet with the Minister of Canadian Heritage once a month.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** I'm talking about speaking. I said speaking on the phone, e-mail, or face-to-face.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cash, you've got to bring it back to Bill C-49.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I have a point of order.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** I would bring it on to Bill C-49—

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** On a point of order, Mr. O'Neill was quite clear that he sees the minister at events that we're all at. Go figure: they might actually talk to each other at an event where they come across each other.

Mr. O'Neill is not here to discuss his datebook. Could we bring it back to Bill C-49 just for 30 seconds. If they have no more question for Mr. O'Neill with respect to Bill C-49 then let's move on. We have a lot of questions for the president and we could get some value out of this.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cash, you have 33 seconds.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** This is about how the decisions were made. It's about transparency. It's about the independence of the museum. I think they are appropriate questions to ask.

I'm still unclear about what the answer is. You speak with him on the phone. You exchange e-mails sometimes. Sometimes you meet formally. In aggregate, how often is that?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** I would not be able to tell you that, Mr. Cash. The most I see the minister is socially at exhibition openings and cultural events.

• (1710)

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** I heard you say that already. But you do speak on the phone with him often?

**The Chair:** Mr. Cash—

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** No, I don't speak on the phone often to Minister Moore.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Cash.

Next we have Mr. Simms for seven minutes.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Thank you, Chair.

There's quite a list of events here that you'd like to illustrate as part of the Canadian story. It seems like we are brimming over with all kinds of events that we could put out there. I'm not saying you are being nefarious in any way, shape, or form; I'm just saying it's quite a bit.

When you and the minister spoke were these some of the ideas that you fleshed out of what you wanted to display, or was there something else?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** I've never had any discussion with the minister about the content of the exhibition. What we've talked to the minister about are some of the broad themes that are not present in the Canada Hall, as I've discussed in front of the committee today, and the sorts of themes we think should be there in a broad Canadian historical exhibition.

We've yet to develop the storyline for that exhibit. That's up to Dr. Morrison and his staff. I've never had any discussion about any of the specific content that would be in the new Canadian history hall. We've certainly talked about some of the broad kinds of historical

themes that are missing, the kinds of things I laid out for you today, yes.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** One of the things the minister spoke about was the need to update current exhibitions. Would you feel that the exhibition regarding first nations needs updating? Does that involve expanding its presence within the museum?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Thank you very much for the question.

Mr. Chair, I would say, just to be clear, that there are two permanent exhibitions dealing with first nations. The first is the Grand Hall, the large room with the totem poles. The second is the First Peoples Hall behind it. And in fact there is a third: there are small houses behind the Grand Hall.

We have just finished completing the upgrading of the houses behind the Grand Hall as part of standard museum work that is in no way related to this project. At some point in the future, we would like to be able to update and bring in additional aspects of first nations history into the First Peoples Hall as part of regular museology/museum updates that we would like to do over the next several years. But these are not related to this project. This would be part of the regular maintenance, and research, and exhibitry updates that the museum would be expected to do.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** You lay out a lot of examples here, and I want to deal first with the legislation. Something has been omitted here—a word. I know the minister said it's just a word, but for some reason I'm stuck on it, because it is different. In the original wording of the Museums Act, it says “interest in, knowledge and critical understanding”. In the new version, it says “to enhance Canadians' knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of events”. The word “critical” is not in there. Is there a difference?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** I don't know why the word “critical” is not there. I'm not sure why that word is not in the mandate statement.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** That means something, right? If you have a critical understanding, it's a part of the critique. It's like an academic function. Is that correct to say?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** I'm not sure. I think that would be up to interpretation. If you're asking whether the jettisoning of the word “critical” somehow dilutes the importance of “understanding” and “knowledge”, I'm not sure that it does.

I can tell you that in my opinion the impact of this bill on the museum would not in any way change the nature of the scholarly research and the dissemination of knowledge that the museum undertakes. I don't see that at all in this bill.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** It can work outside the legislation itself, this sharing of the artifacts with the rest of the country. Now, I like that idea; I think it's fantastic. The minister mentioned The Rooms in Newfoundland and Labrador. Great. He also mentioned museums on the west coast. But this seems brand new. How is it going to function?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** I want to applaud and pay tribute to one of our sister institutions, the Canadian Museum of Nature. The Museum of Nature perfected an alliance of natural history museums. They've done it very well. It has existed for about a decade or a decade and a half. We've looked at that.

In our situation, most of our partnerships have been one-offs. It will be a travelling exhibition, artifact loans, those kinds of things. We're very excited, as are some of the museums that have already signed on to this whole notion of developing some kind of a cooperative approach to sharing history.

Let me give you one example. I'm going to talk about a small museum, the Timmins Museum: National Exhibition Centre in northern Ontario. We have a very small exhibition there right now. The Timmins Museum is a very small museum. They would like to become a part of this network. What will be enough for the Timmins Museum would be to borrow two or three artifacts or put on a very small exhibition. They will be able to contribute some of their material to our work.

• (1715)

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Who pays for that? What's the financial burden on a very small museum? Are they able to punch above their weight?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** We have no misconceptions about that. We know that the majority of museums in this country are not going to be able to contribute a great deal of financial capacity to this project. We're aware of that. We are right now mounting a fundraising campaign to try to raise some money to help us do this.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** So that's not part of the \$25 million?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** The \$25 million is going right to the renovations and the redevelopment of the two halls that we spoke about. We've also committed to raising an extra \$5 million.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** So you're going to raise money to allow these smaller museums access to that money, to get artifacts from your institution.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** We are going to reallocate some of our resources to help do that, and we think that this network will lend itself very well to sponsorship. So we're looking at a variety of ways in which to—

**Mr. Scott Simms:** For whom?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** We're looking at sponsorship to allow the network to function—private sponsorship. That's right.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** I got that, but what about Timmins? How does that work?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** We're hoping that if we raise some funds, we'll be able to assist the smaller museums as they participate in this network.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** But none of that money, the \$25 million, is going to help these people get some of those artifacts that you have on display in your museum.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** The \$25 million is slated for the renovation and the redevelopment of those two halls.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** I would love for the small museums to find themselves on an even keel with the larger ones in the larger centres. It seems to me that if you're in a larger centre, then you would have

an advantage in getting this material. But you want to help these smaller museums out?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Yes, and they're eager to be part of this network.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** But you plan to do this through private means.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** If we can secure private sponsorship, that would be extremely helpful to us in offsetting costs. We do not intend to place any financial burden on the smaller institutions. They're eager to participate. At the beginning of this project, we're going to have to work out the ways in which we will be able to finance this. We believe that we will be able to do it through a reallocation of some of our resources and through some private sponsorship activities.

**The Chair:** Next, we will move to Mr. Calandra.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you very much, sir. I appreciate your coming here and I appreciate all the information you shared with us today.

The minister talked earlier about the support of the Mayor of Ottawa, as well as the Mayor of Gatineau. In fact, the Mayor of Gatineau said,

[*Translation*]

...this decision is a step in the right direction... I think there is no cause for concern.

[*English*]

So it must be very helpful when two of the most important and relevant partners to drawing people to this brand new museum are so favourable to it and excited about it. It's actually part of building a consensus, which is on top of the extraordinary outreach you've done.

I wonder if you'd just talk about that, the need to continue to consult with Canadians as we move forward.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Thank you very much again for the question.

We believe that the museum's history network will allow us an opportunity to reach Canadians where they live in a more concerted way than we have ever done before.

I just want to give you a sample of some of the institutions that immediately signed on and didn't hesitate to become part of this cooperative form of network: The Royal British Columbia Museum in Victoria, several months ago; The Rooms in Newfoundland, which also agreed to sign on; the Museum of Man in Winnipeg, which became part of this partnership just last week; and many smaller museums across the country. I have a list of about a dozen or so other museums that are hoping to participate—the McCord Museum in Montreal, for example—and many others.

What this will allow us to do is to collaborate on museological projects over the long term, which has not happened before for our museum corporation. Things like research projects, joint public programming, all of which do not have to be in the National Capital Region, we will be able to do with new partners across the country in ways that we haven't been able to do before.

We're also looking at partnering with institutions that are not necessarily museums—centres of excellence in one region, and perhaps community federations in another. We're attempting to build all of these relationships.

We want to expand the national footprint of our museums—the War Museum and the Museum of Civilization—so they really are national as opposed to federal in scope. We have a lot of work to do in that regard and we think that the network is a strategic opportunity for us to do this by building ongoing, long-term relationships that are reciprocal and do not exist now.

• (1720)

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I will give the remainder of my time to Mr. Boughen, please.

**The Chair:** Mr. Boughen.

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

Let me add my voice of welcome to our two guests. We're pleased that you're able to share part of your afternoon with us, because it's good to hear how the project is coming along from your firsthand.

We'll leave the datebook and the English lesson and distribution of displays for another day, and maybe get back to concentrating on the museum. It seems to me that the museum has been in the planning stages for a number of years now. The bill will update a museum that is at least 20 years old and this will indeed be a great opportunity for the museum to have a fresh start.

Could you share a little of what the plans are for that, first of all?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Just to make sure I understand the question, it's about our planning forward and what the new exhibition itself look like?

**Mr. Ray Boughen:** Yes, are you looking at 10-year cycles with history tied in? People say that museums are a visual history of a country. Or are we looking at a broader timeframe?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** I wonder, Mr. Chair, if I might ask Dr. Morrison to answer that question? Would that be allowable?

David, would you like to—

**Mr. David Morrison (Director, Research and Content, Special Project 2017, Exhibitions and Programs, Canadian Museum of Civilization Corporation):** Sure, if understood the question correctly, we do have a temporary exhibition program right now that goes to 2018-19, where we're filling in the slots of what kind of shows—either produced within our museum or borrowed and worked on in collaboration with other museums—we're going to bring in.

We have, of course, this big history hall initiative that's scheduled to open on July 1, 2017 for the 150th anniversary of Confederation.

After that, we have been tasked, when planning out this hall, to make it reprogrammable and changeable so that it's the kind of hall that we can update as things move along and historicity changes, but also to integrate new events so that the hall doesn't immediately become out of date.

The current plan is to bring the storyline of Canada right up to the year of opening—and as nothing ages faster than current events, we have to program this sort of thing into the hall. At the same time, we

are under no illusions that a hall like this might not also, by the act of some future Parliament 10, 20, or hopefully 100 years from now... Nothing lasts forever, even permanent exhibition galleries.

**Mr. Ray Boughen:** Right.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** I could add briefly to that, if the member wouldn't mind.

**Mr. Ray Boughen:** Sure.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Part of your earlier question was about when all of this starts and how long these kinds of visions take place.

Here, I would note that John English's name was mentioned earlier. When I joined the corporation as corporate secretary in 2001, Dr. English, former Liberal member of Parliament for Kitchener, was the chair of the board of trustees, and he was until 2005. Dr. English, in fact, began talking about the need to bring more broad historical themes into the Canadian Museum of Civilization, even back then. It's one of the reasons that today he has agreed to be one of our advisers and on one of our advisory groups for this project.

The evolution of the museum into a national history museum really had its antecedence, well over a decade ago, in the museum corporation.

**Mr. Ray Boughen:** In the planning, will aboriginal people be represented? Will the display represent them in historical concept, as other folks are represented?

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Again, thank you for the question.

First, we have aboriginal historians actively involved in the project now. As I mentioned earlier in my remarks, aboriginal history will be a part of the national narrative in the museum, fully and completely within the new national narrative that we've developed to tell the complete history of Canada.

**Mr. Ray Boughen:** As a matter of curiosity, what will you do with the number of displays you've had in place for a while? They're going to be replaced. As you've said, David, nothing lasts forever.

What will become of those artifacts?

**Mr. David Morrison:** One of the things we're doing now is deciding which parts of Canada Hall we want to keep, that we can reprogram and fit into the new mandate, the new vision, for the space. I can tell you right now that we have more or less decided—it's not cast in stone yet—on the St. Onuphrius church, the Ukrainian church. It is the largest artifact we own, a real consecrated church. We've decided it's going to stay in the hall, for instance. We have also decided that the “Nishga Girl”, a west coast fishing trawler, is not going to make its way through the new iteration. It left the building last week for a new home with a national historic site in British Columbia. So we found a good home for it.

But that's very much the issue. What do we want to keep? And what can we reprogram? There are wonderful architectural spaces in there that we'd like to keep, like the Ontario streetscape or the New France square. But can we tell a different and more coherent story by keeping that architecture in place?

• (1725)

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** I'll just quickly add to that—

**The Chair:** Mr. O'Neill, we're out of time for that round. We might be able to pick it up before the end.

Madam Turmel, welcome to our committee. The rest of the time is yours.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Nycole Turmel (Hull—Aylmer, NDP):** I will be sharing my time with my colleague Mr. Nantel.

Mr. O'Neill, you talked about refocusing and rebranding the museum. Could you tell me how the temporary exhibits on other world civilizations will be affected. I am talking about the space intended for those exhibits and the funding invested to attract major exhibitions.

[*English*]

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** Thank you for the question, Madame Turmel.

By rotating, do you mean the international exhibitions?

**Ms. Nycole Turmel:** Yes.

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** As I mentioned in my remarks earlier, we intend to continue to have international exhibitions. Those partnerships are extremely important to us.

We're planning several years out now. We have the Greek exhibition coming next year. In two years', time we'll have a Vikings exhibition coming from the Swedish History Museum, for example.

We will continue to have those international exhibitions.

I'm sorry, the second part of your question was...?

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Nycole Turmel:** Will there be an impact on the amount invested in either of those areas?

[*English*]

**Mr. Mark O'Neill:** No. We do not perceive any sort of detrimental impact on the funds we set aside for hosting international exhibitions.

Each international exhibition has a wide variety of cost factors attached to it. Some are based on the complexity of the artifacts for travel. Some are even based on, frankly speaking, the value of the rental of the exhibition. There are many factors. It can be very difficult to predict, but we have no intention, in any way, of diminishing our budget for hosting international exhibitions.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Nycole Turmel:** Thank you.

I will ask my colleague to continue.

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Thank you, Ms. Turmel.

Mr. O'Neill and Mr. Morrison, thank you for being here today.

As you can see, here with us we have some eminent individuals. These people are very interested in the issue. As a result, I feel that receiving five witnesses after your presentation and that of the minister, is not enough. I would therefore like to introduce the following motion:

That the current study be extended by two meetings to allow the Committee to hear from more witnesses.

This basically means adding two meetings to the study of Bill C-49 in order to hear from more witnesses. I would like us to make a decision as soon as possible.

I have a question for you about what you said with respect to the museum's ability to expand...

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Monsieur Nantel has moved a motion. Do you want to repeat what you said?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Of course. Basically, I wanted the committee to extend the study of Bill C-49 by two meetings in order to hear from more witnesses.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Monsieur Nantel has moved a motion that we extend our study of Bill C-49 by holding two more, two-hour meetings.

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Any discussion on the motion?

Mr. Calandra.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Just to confirm, is the motion actually in order? This is a difficult one because the discussions were obviously held in camera.

• (1730)

**The Chair:** Yes, it's in order.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Without betraying any confidences discussed in camera, Mr. Chair, if it is in order, we gave the opposition a great deal of opportunity to present witnesses and to discuss the length of time of these presentations in these hearings. Based on those conversations, both in public and in private, we will obviously not be supporting this motion.

**The Chair:** If there are more speakers on this motion, I am going to dismiss our current panel because it was scheduled to wrap up at 5:30. Once we finish this bit of committee business, we will start with the next panel.

Mr. O'Neill and Mr. Morrison, thank you to both of you.

Mr. Cash.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Well, Mr. Chair, I'm not sure what my colleague is talking about in terms of the opportunity to discuss this in public. This is the first opportunity we've had to discuss this in public. As for the other discussions, we're not party to talk about them.

That said, clearly, there are a lot of questions to be answered here. We have been given one day to question witnesses. That's not enough. Canadians deserve a more thorough going over of this bill, especially considering the fact that it was never discussed in our committee study. We were relegated to one day of witnesses.

Surely, we owe the Canadian people a more thorough discussion and witness testimony on this issue. It's been an issue that Canadians right across the country have been engaged in. We're stuffing it all in one session, which doesn't seem to be the way we should be proceeding on this bill, in fact, on any bill really. On a bill concerning the key Canadian Museum of Civilization, the most popular museum in the capital region and the jewel in the crown of our museum system, we are giving one session to witnesses.

**The Chair:** Well, we're chewing into that witness time now, so unless there's further discussion, we'll move to a vote on the motion.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I don't know if this is in order, but I'm sure you'll tell me if it's not.

With unanimous consent, I would be more than pleased to make public the discussions that happened in camera with respect to the time given for this testimony. If the opposition would agree with that, and if that's even allowed, I think that would help explain to the Canadian people why we are having this set of meetings today. I would have no problem with that.

**The Chair:** Well, we have a motion by Mr. Cash, so we'll move to a vote on it, unless there's further discussion.

Mr. Calandra.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I have a friendly amendment, then, that we also then, if allowable—and I'll wait for the clerk's interpretation of that—make public the content of what was decided on and that led to these hearings today.

**The Chair:** Mr. Nantel.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

As a general rule, we would much rather have all the in camera discussions in public.

Many people in the room would have been very happy to share their views on the issue. This is all over the place. The rules certainly do not allow it, but if we were to ask them whether they want to express their views, they would want to. It is important to let stakeholders have a say in this bill. I hope that...

• (1735)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** The reason the stakeholders aren't at the table is that Mr. Cash has moved a motion, which we're debating now.

The sooner we can get to a vote on that, the sooner we can call our witnesses.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** [*Technical difficulty—Editor*]...specifically on that motion while we wait for an interpretation.

**The Chair:** So on the motion by Mr. Cash, that—

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** I think it was Mr. Nantel.

**The Chair:** Those in favour of the motion by Mr. Nantel that we extend the study of this bill by two sittings?

(Motion negatived)

**The Chair:** At this—

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** On a point of order, then, can the clerk tell us if we can make public what took place in camera with respect to this, and what the procedure would be for that?

**The Chair:** Mr. Calandra, things that are done in camera are kept private and in camera.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I appreciate that, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** With the unanimous consent of the committee we could make it public—

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** That's my question.

**The Chair:** —if every member of the committee consented to it.

Are you asking for unanimous consent?

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I would ask, then, for the unanimous consent of the committee to make public—

**The Chair:** No, I think you should....

Are you asking for the—

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I am asking to make public the discussions and the voting with respect to the length of time for the meetings and the witnesses who were suggested.

**The Chair:** It has to be the entire meeting, Mr. Calandra.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I'm okay with that.

**The Chair:** Mr. Calandra is asking for unanimous consent that we make public the minutes of the previous meeting that was held in camera.

We need unanimous consent.

Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Cash.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** First of all, I would like to get clarification about this. Then I would like to have a pause while I discuss this with my colleagues.

But first, are we in order here?

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** If you want to suspend for a moment, Mr. Chair, we'd be okay with that.

**The Chair:** I'm just clarifying that with unanimous consent we can make what was said at the in camera meeting public.

Is there unanimous consent?

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Before we move to that, I'd like to have a small pause with my team.

**The Chair:** Well, at this point, we will suspend for a few minutes.

We will reconvene in five minutes.

• (1735)

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

• (1750)

**The Chair:** Okay, we will resume our meeting.

Mr. Cash.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Well, first, I'd like to say that we have been arguing to limit the use of in camera sessions since we got here in 2011. This is great news; finally, the government has listened to us in regard to transparency. That's fantastic. We have no problem with being open in all of these meetings in the future, and retroactively. So I'd like to move a friendly amendment that we release all of the transcripts for all the meetings that we've had in camera in this committee in the past, and that we in the future keep all of our meetings in public.

That's my friendly amendment to the motion.

**The Chair:** I don't consider that a friendly amendment at this point.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Mr. Chair, I have to challenge—

**The Chair:** We can deal with that. That's no problem, but Mr. Calandra's motion is—

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** This is a friendly amendment. I have to challenge you on this, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cash, it's not a friendly amendment; it's not in order. It's a separate motion that you are free to make.

Are you done?

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Well, maybe with your advice, Mr. Chair, because if this isn't deemed a friendly amendment, we have seen motions come before this committee, and members have introduced friendly amendments to them. With your advice and counsel, how does one extend the period of the release of the in camera transcripts? That's what I would like to do. I would like to say, yes, we agree with the spirit of this, and that we'd like to extend this spirit to all of the meetings we've had, and to the meetings we will have in the future.

**The Chair:** That's very easily done. All you would need to do is to move a motion to that effect. What I'm saying is that you can't attach that to Mr. Calandra's motion. You could have your own motion. Right now we're dealing with Mr. Calandra's motion.

Mr. Calandra.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Just to be clear, because I might have had the date wrong, it's the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, May 29.

**The Chair:** That's Wednesday of last week.

Number one, I'm going to ask for the indulgence of our panel here. We're not going to keep you over time. We do have a bit of committee business that has come up.

Let's try to get to our panel as quickly as possible. Members of the committee, Mr. Calandra has asked for unanimous consent that the minutes of the in camera meeting of May 29 be made public. I will remind members that when we're discussing the motion we cannot discuss the contents of the meeting—and we all know that because it was in camera.

That's his motion.

Mr. Cash, on the motion.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to attempt a friendly amendment. I believe we had two meetings specific to this study, so I would like to move a friendly amendment that we include both the meetings in this motion.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** I'm not clear on the date.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cash is moving a friendly amendment that would add the minutes of Monday, June 3.

Is there any discussion on the amendment?

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I know he needs unanimous consent to amend my motion. I'm not going to give unanimous consent to do that. I think the minutes of Wednesday, May 29, will speak for themselves, Mr. Chair, and I'm prepared to vote on that and release them to the public.

Sorry, I guess I'm not allowed to say, but the minutes will speak for themselves.

• (1755)

**The Chair:** Mr. Nantel.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Yes, we are not allowed to talk about what was discussed in those meetings. It is somewhat unfortunate. I don't understand why we really want to make public the minutes of one meeting but not of another that deals with the same topic. It is quite surprising for anyone listening. Why?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Nantel, we can do both. We can do as many as we want, but we're dealing now with the motion of Mr. Calandra that we release publicly the minutes of the in camera meeting of May 29.

Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Cash.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Again, forgive me, Mr. Chair, for my lack of total understanding of the procedure, but could we have a vote on my friendly amendment, please?

**The Chair:** We could have a vote, but it would still need unanimous consent. We could have a vote to add—

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Could we, just to add the second day? Thank you.

**The Chair:** We would need unanimous consent for the motion.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Could we have a recorded vote on that, then?

**The Chair:** Because of the nature of this, and since this isn't something we often deal with, if you want to move a separate motion we can do that, but for now we are just going to deal with the motion of Mr. Calandra. He's seeking unanimous consent that the minutes of the May 29 meeting be released. Is there unanimous consent of the committee members to release the minutes from our in camera meeting of May 29?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])



**The Chair:** There you go. That was easy.

Mr. Cash.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** So, just before we restart, Mr. Cash, the clerk will endeavour to see how we do this, but we will make the minutes available publicly for the in camera meeting of May 29. That would basically be the transcript.

Mr. Cash.

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** I'd first like to move a motion that we release the transcript of the other meeting. It makes sense that if we're going to actually...

**The Chair:** You mean the meeting of June 3?

**Mr. Andrew Cash:** I mean the second meeting that we had around...yes.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cash is asking for unanimous consent that we make public the transcript of our in camera meeting of June 3. Is there unanimous consent for that motion?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Chair:** There is no consent.

Now we will move on to our witnesses.

Thank you for your indulgence, witnesses. Thank you for appearing before us.

From the Canadian Museums Association we have John McAvity, executive director, and Kirstin Evenden, vice-president. Welcome.

From the Canadian Association of University Teachers, we have James L. Turk, executive director. Welcome.

Here as an individual is Victor Rabinovitch, fellow and adjunct professor, School of Policy Studies, Queens University. Welcome to you, sir.

From the Canadian Anthropology Society, we have Lorne Holyoak, president-elect.

From the Historica-Dominion Institute, we have Anthony Wilson-Smith, president.

Welcome to all of you. We will begin our rounds of opening statements in the order you appear on the list.

We'll start with the Canadian Museums Association. You have 10 minutes.

**Mr. John McAvity (Executive Director, Canadian Museums Association):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

That was quite an enjoyable lesson in parliamentary procedure.

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. John McAvity:** The Canadian Museums Association or CMA is delighted to be here to provide our advice and commentary on Bill C-49. We are the national not-for-profit association for museums, art galleries, and related institutions across Canada. We

have almost 2,000 members located in every province and territory of this country, all of which are dedicated to preserving Canada's cultural heritage and presenting it to the public. Together, these museums welcome close to 60 million visitors per year. They range from large metropolitan art galleries to small community volunteer-run centres.

CMA strongly supports Bill C-49, an act to amend the Museums Act. The mandate and roles expressed in this legislation are consistent with the roles of museums in society.

● (1800)

[*Translation*]

I would like to introduce Kirstin Evenden, who comes from Calgary. She is the former director of the Glenbow Museum and is now the vice-president of the Canadian Museums Association.

**Ms. Kirstin Evenden (Vice-President, Canadian Museums Association):** Good afternoon.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to Bill C-49 today.

[*English*]

Many countries have national museums devoted to their history and heritage. There are numerous examples we could cite today. I will mention a couple of them. There is the fascinating Te Papa museum in Wellington, New Zealand, which features first nations history and culture, as well as the heritage of that country. There is the Smithsonian in Washington, another well-known example, which embraces a broad approach to presenting United States history, from grand achievements all the way through to everyday Americans.

We're confident at the Canadian Museums Association that the new Canadian Museum of History will paint a similarly broad picture of this diverse and complex country.

Canadian history is many things. It's major events, it's sometimes war, and it's sometimes major and significant historical figures, such as prime ministers and monarchs, but it is also about those things that relate to the everyday, the small-h history that we all know and live ourselves.

In this history of the everyday and the extraordinary, the new Canadian Museum of History will really a place where Canadians could explore all of these diverse aspects of who we are and what we want to become, starting initially by exploring first nations issues, from both contemporary and historical perspectives, and indeed, contemporary events that relate to historical circumstances. Sometimes these events are important but challenging, such as, for example, an internment camp in Minto, New Brunswick, the FLQ crisis, or the Winnipeg riots.

These are all aspects of who we are and where we've come from, and knowing history contributes to the quality of life in this country and supports the rich creative and scientific achievements of our nation. Our history is therefore multi-dimensional, whether expressed and preserved through artifacts, art, documents, or science, and it's vital that this rich heritage be properly presented in this museum. It's a place where we will all connect with each other through these stories.

We note clause 9 in particular, which gives clarity to the powers and capacity of the new Canadian Museum of History and details its mandate in terms of collections, research, and preservation. We note paragraph 9(1)(i), which outlines the creation of opportunities to work with other partner museums across Canada.

Again, as someone who has lived in three Canadian provinces in this country and has worked in all three, I certainly think that the national museum will really be an encouraging partner with all of these regions to again further historical research across the country. These regional stories that can become a part of this network will certainly contribute to talking about who we are and where we want to go.

Over and above the legislation, we're very pleased with the proposals within this section and the intentions of the new museum to move forward. The creation of a network between museums across the country is indeed timely and was outlined by the president and CEO of the museum just last week before 250 museum colleagues from across the country at our annual meeting of the CMA in Whitehorse, Yukon.

In a time of budget restraints, sharing resources is more important than ever. This is a terrific opportunity to more easily exhibit our country's history, not only in museums across Canada through partnerships, which will be extremely beneficial to the entire country, but also here in Ottawa as a national showpiece. It will provide a platform to easily distribute the large amounts of often unseen artifacts of importance that are currently in storage.

In addition, the partnership role to be assumed by the Canadian Museum of History will provide positive guidance to other institutions across Canada.

Finally, the plans call for a special gallery to be created at the new museum, where other museums can provide exhibits from their local communities representing where history really happened, providing a national platform for telling our regional stories. Over 2,800 museums across Canada tell our country's collective story. Connecting them through a major national institution will greatly benefit museums and the Canadians who they serve and who visit them. This may well be a role model for other national museums, which cannot work in isolation from other aspects of the cultural fabric of our country.

• (1805)

We wish to thank the members of the committee for their time and consideration on this matter.

Merci beaucoup.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Is that it for your opening? Great.

Now we will move to Mr. Turk.

**Mr. James L. Turk (Executive Director, Canadian Association of University Teachers):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm pleased to be here on behalf of the Canadian Association of University Teachers. We represent 68,000 academic staff at 124 universities and colleges across the country.

We're deeply troubled by Bill C-49. The Canadian Museum of Civilization is a great museum, the most popular in the country and arguably the best. It's certainly one I'm proud to take every visitor who comes to Ottawa to see. The proposed Canadian Museum of History will be something less. Not only does Bill C-49 ensure a lesser institution, the process of consultation has been disappointing at best.

The CAUT, our organization, raised some concerns initially and was very pleased that the CEO, Mark O'Neill; the vice-president of research and exhibitions, Jean-Marc Blais; and the director of archeology and research, Dr. David Morrison, willingly agreed to meet with us. They did spend more than an hour talking with us and indicated that there would be an opportunity for consultation; this was back in October. In February Monsieur Blais was in touch again to say that there would be a process of consultation involving us, and we've never heard a thing since.

The Canadian Historical Association, the Canadian Archaeological Association, and the Canadian Anthropology Society wrote a letter on the same matter to Mr. O'Neill on May 6, 2013, and I'd be happy to give the clerk a copy:

On behalf of our respective associations, we write to express our serious concern regarding the lack of extensive or systematic engagement of the professional community of historians, anthropologists, and archaeologists in the CMC's planning for the proposed Canadian Museum of History. Unless redressed through significant and meaningful consultation with the professional heritage community, we fear this lack of engagement will critically compromise both the quality and credibility of the new museum.

I mention the concern about consultation because there are serious flaws in the bill, and I'd like to just address a few of those. I'd be happy to expand in the question period that follows.

The first is the change in the purpose of the museum. The current mandate, since 1990, of the Canadian Museum of Civilization is quite clear and quite impressive. I'll just quote a relevant section:

to increase, throughout Canada and internationally, interest in, knowledge and critical understanding of and appreciation and respect for human cultural achievements and human behaviour by establishing, maintaining and developing for research and posterity a collection of objects of historical or cultural interest, with special but not exclusive reference to Canada, and by demonstrating those achievements and behaviour, the knowledge derived from them and the understanding they represent.

That has been replaced by a much shorter mandate that may superficially sound similar but is fundamentally different. The relevant section of the proposed mandate in Bill C-49 says:

to enhance Canadians' knowledge, understanding and appreciation of events, experiences, people and objects that reflect and have shaped Canada's history and identity, and also to enhance their awareness of world history and cultures.

Unlike the proposed change, the CMC mandate makes clear that it is a knowledge-generating organization, like all great museums. The proposed mandate for the Canadian museum of history eliminates all reference, for example, to maintaining a collection for research and posterity.

It removes paragraph 9(1)(f) from the act that established the Canadian Museum of Civilization, which is particularly troubling. The part that has been removed reads:

undertake and sponsor any research, including fundamental or basic research and theoretical and applied research, related to its purpose and to museology, and communicate the results of that research.

To our mind, these changes clearly indicate that the research and knowledge advancement function of the museum is under threat. The removal of “critical understanding” and replacing it with “understanding” is one concern. Promoting critical understanding of history is an essential goal of any great museum. Providing visitors with critical understanding of history means offering them an opportunity to consider different points of view, the opportunity to critically analyze the past, and to re-examine traditional viewpoints, rather than simply venerating national heroes.

Another indication that the research and knowledge-generating role of the museum is being replaced with it becoming a display site is the elimination of the position of vice-president of research and it being combined into the job of vice-president, exhibitions.

● (1810)

A second concern of ours is the limited perspective of history. The new act will replace the museum's emphasis on human cultural achievements and human behaviour with “...events, experiences, people and objects that reflect and have shaped Canada's history and identity...”.

It's a troubling emphasis on dates, heroes, and objects, an approach that historians have moved well beyond. The great man/great woman version of history risks leaving out the experience of the vast majority of Canadians. The stories and experiences of ordinary people and events that don't fit into the political biography model will be marginalized, just as they currently have been celebrated in the Canadian Museum of Civilization.

Other concerns are the elimination or marginalization of the history and culture of first nations people, and of issues of colonization, industrialization, gender relations, migration, environmental transformation, and so forth.

This refocusing and rebranding will involve the gutting of the Canada Hall, a remarkable permanent exhibition of Canadian social history. What's curious is that the Canada Hall cost over \$50 million to create, and yet the total budget for the transformation of the new museum is only \$25 million. So how they are going to recreate the vast social history that's currently reflected in the museum, as well as doing other things, is totally beyond us, especially when that \$25 million is not just for that, but lots of other things as well.

Minister Moore, for example, recently indicated that the \$25 million was also going to include the cost of agreements to establish a nationwide museum artifact lending network, which he described as having more than three million items in its collection, 90% of which are in vaults. I'm quoting: “We need to get these items out of storage.... We need to get them moving around the country.” But this betrays a fundamental ignorance of the museum materials. The vast majority of these artifacts are things like bone fragments and are not exhibit-worthy; they are research materials. Collectively, they are extremely important to our understanding of Canada's past, but not for their value as exhibition pieces.

Our third concern, and the final one I'll mention in my opening remarks, is about whether this is going to result in a partisan representation of history. All of what's happening in regard to the transformation of the Museum of Civilization into a Canadian museum of history is in the context of the broader undercutting of

the role of Canadian heritage institutions. Here I speak of Library and Archives Canada, which we've spoken about on many occasions, which has a national campaign called Canada's Past Matters; the cuts to archeology and heritage sites as a result of the cuts to Parks Canada; the closure of federal departmental libraries; the reduction of public access to libraries; the elimination of the inter-library loan system at our National Library; and the elimination of granting programs for local and regional archives. All of these are part of a context that gives us concern about what's happening

The decision to transform the Canadian Museum of Civilization seems part of a pattern that suggests the government's interest in using history to serve its own political agenda. In our view, we'd speak out as strongly to any government appearing to do this.

The celebration of the War of 1812 was the transformation of a rather tawdry series of skirmishes into some defining characteristic of Canada's history. The rewriting of the study guide for people who want to become new citizens, which was done by this government a few years ago—this is what it looks like now—is a celebration of heroes, warriors, with pictures of warrior events, and there is even a picture, on the aboriginal page, of a former Governor General of Canada who portrayed himself as an Indian. It's the sudden interest in the Franklin exhibition, and the diversion of resources to an already decimated Parks Canada archeology budget to focus on finding this wreckage. It's the glorification of the monarchy and the War of...

The context for all of this gives us grave concern.

The Canadian Museum of Civilization has been a remarkable contribution to the history and people of this country, and internationally as well, and for it to be transformed into something that will not retain its fundamental research and knowledge-generating function and that will not have the resources to maintain the broader social history of our country is something we lament.

We urge you to revise the mandate for this institution, as reflected in Bill C-49, into something that continues the tradition of the Canadian Museum of Civilization.

Thank you.

● (1815)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Turk.

I don't know if you practised that but you landed on 10 minutes exactly.

Mr. Rabinovitch.

**Dr. Victor Rabinovitch (Fellow and Adjunct Professor, School of Policy Studies, Queens University, As an Individual):** Thank you, Mr. Chair, for the opportunity to be here today.

By way of personal introduction, I was the president and CEO of the Canadian Museum of Civilization from 2000 to 2011. During my tenure, the Canadian War Museum was built and the CMC vastly expanded its collections and presentations on Canadian history and on international themes. Prior to this I had been an assistant deputy minister, in the Department of Canadian Heritage and other departments. I've always had great pleasure in having the authority from my minister to speak to members of the opposition or any MP, and at that time at least, as a public servant, to take information and report information fairly back to ministers.

Currently I'm not here representing any organization. I am an adjunct professor of cultural policy at Queen's University. I'm also the volunteer chair of Opera Lyra, Ottawa's professional opera company. I publish considerably in various Canadian and international publications. All of that is by way of background to say that I bring a certain amount of knowledge to the table, which I hope is helpful to the members of the committee.

As you know, Bill C-49 is part of an initiative that was announced by Minister Moore. An important part of that initiative has been alluded to by the other presentations so far, and includes funding to enable the Museum of Civilization to develop networks for purposes of better historical exchange. That type of announcement is really part of a much longer debate that has gone on for years regarding the proper role of "the nationals"—the national museums. The general view, certainly amongst museum people, is that the nationals are uniquely positioned to promote linkages and networks, to share materials, to share research and information. And in this respect the announcement by the minister certainly fits beautifully into what could be an important development for the Canadian museum world. The type of initiative that the minister announced could always be administered through the Department of Heritage, it could be administered by individual museums. In any event, I would certainly hope that it's not the last of such announcements.

Allow me to turn now to the substance of the discussion this evening, which is Bill C-49. I confess to finding the substance of Bill C-49 to be deeply confusing. It proposes in clause 2 to abandon the most successful brand name in Canada's museum sector. It's a brand that is known and respected throughout the professional world. The Museum of Civilization is a pathfinder in what is now called internationally "museums of society". One example of its eminence is that a conference was recently convened at the University of Barcelona to feature the experiences of the CMC as a model for the work that the university was doing on behalf of the Catalonian region of Spain. And several other museums of society, notably Quebec City's Musée de la civilisation and Amsterdam's Tropenmuseum, joined with the CMC to present information on how museums can present people, society, and development in a way that is an example of what can be popular, credible, and informative, and contribute to national understanding.

The Museum of Civilization is described throughout the global tourism industry as one of Canada's must-see landmarks. It actually receives a three-star billing from the *Guide Vert Michelin*; Parliament Hill receives only two stars. Clearly, the people from *Guide Vert Michelin* weren't here an hour ago; they would change their mind. The same applies to Frommer's guides, Lonely Planet...and on it goes. They are just three examples.

Visitor recognition of the name and style and content of the CMC is enviable. It's one of this country's bright spots in showing itself. Foreign diplomats make this point repeatedly, and they use the museum as a key orientation point for new staff who arrive, and also for visiting dignitaries.

• (1820)

If the Museum of Civilization stands out as such a great product, why would anyone want to change its brand? Think like a business person. General Motors, even in its worst days, did not abandon the brand of Cadillac and Chevrolet.

The challenge from a marketing standpoint is to extend a brand. New products can be added, an old brand can be relied upon to win attention and trust. If the government believes that the area of history should be given more attention in titling, then why not simply retitle the museum as the Canadian Museum of History and Civilization.

CMHC, it has a ring—

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

**Dr. Victor Rabinovitch:** —especially if you're a young homeowner.

The simplicity of the change is almost breathtaking. It simply links together history and civilization.

Beyond the proposed change in name, however, lies another shift that's deeply worrying. The core of that—I believe that Mr. Turk was talking about this momentarily when he spoke about the revision of the purpose of the museum—is the new mandate, which I would term narrow and parochial.

The current mandate of the Museum of Civilization is set out in section 7 of the 1990 Museums Act. It's not drafted elegantly, but its intention is perfectly clear. Its first focus is on Canada, and it empowers the museum staff to create knowledge, to expand collections that will inform future generations, and to share knowledge through public activities. The museum is also empowered in a secondary focus, which is to conduct external research, make collections, and share knowledge publicly.

The Museums Act of 1990 refers to a full range of human activity. It calls on the museum to increase knowledge and critical understanding for human cultural achievements and human behaviour. This range of knowledge is not limited to history.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, I have a Ph.D. in history, and I speak to you with great modesty about my area of training and professional knowledge.

Other fields of expertise are essential to understanding society and essential to operating good museums. The CMC staff in areas such as archeology, aboriginal studies, music and popular cultures, design and craft have made huge contributions to understanding this country in its fullest sense. History has been part of the work; history is not everything.

The success of the Museum of Civilization has rested on its balance. The balance on Canadian priority has been balanced by presentations on international themes. The priority for domestic activities has been balanced by Canadian exhibitions and venues abroad. Research from the past has been balanced by research on the ancient past. History has been balanced by contemporary studies on aboriginal arts, nursing, communities, winter sports, and childhood experiences. It's all part of a balance and the knowledge from this balance has been shared.

I won't go into detail talking about the success of the Museum of Civilization. It is by far the most visited museum in the country. In a typical year, its attendance is double the attendance of a full season NHL team. That's a lot of people.

What's the meaning of the proposed new mandate? In essence, it aims to restrict and reduce the activities of a renamed museum of history. The wording is subtle, but the meaning, it seems to me, is clear. Number one, the scope of interest will now be on events and experiences "that have shaped Canada's history and identity". It's a backward-looking focus, purely on the past. Contemporary issues, contemporary activities, community issues, and cultural expressions have no place in this except peripherally as outcomes of the past.

- (1825)

Secondly, the role of research is very reduced. Mr. Turk has spoken about this. Perhaps research will be intended as something ancillary to enhance Canadian knowledge. Perhaps research will simply be a form of enhanced journalism that's aimed at popularization.

Thirdly, while there is mention of "world history and culture" the focus is only on what can be shown here in Canada. The museum of history is not intended to be mandated to take part in research activity abroad, nor to be part of exchanges that would send Canadian museum knowledge to international venues

These proposed changes to the mandate will have the overall effect of reducing the museum's scope of activity and creating an inward focus that turns away from the world and eliminates concern with the here and the now.

Today, as a standing committee, you have the mandate to look at the changes with long-term implications. The changes will be cumulative. The decisions that will be made by the museum will have great impact on the hiring of staff, on eliminating people who are not historians, on selecting topics for future projects, and on downgrading hard tasks of creating substance. The celebrations of 2017 will be long past when the impacts of the reduced mandate will be felt.

Mr. Chairman, with all of this in mind I have prepared two recommendations that I hope the members of the committee will wish to consider, and I will provide you with some copies of the paper I have written.

The first recommendation I would make is that you consider changing the name of the proposed Canadian Museum of History to the Canadian Museum of History and Civilization.

The second recommendation I would make is that the purpose of the Canadian Museum of History and Civilization be written so as to

increase, throughout Canada and internationally, knowledge, critical understanding and appreciation of cultures, events, experiences and peoples that have shaped history, identity, and contemporary society with special, but not exclusive, reference to Canada, and to do this by expanding, studying, and preserving for posterity a collection of objects of historical or cultural significance, with special, but not exclusive, reference to Canada.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I have some copies of what I have presented to you. I sincerely hope that despite my drafting, this is a basis for good, impartial discussion amongst the members of the standing committee and that a bill of importance can be made better through your work.

Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Rabinovitch.

Next, we'll go to Mr. Holyoak.

**Dr. Lorne Holyoak (President, Canadian Anthropology Society):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman and the members of the committee, for the opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the Canadian Anthropology Society, an organization that represents professional and academic anthropologists throughout Canada.

I do have prepared remarks, but on the walk over here today I was thinking about the bill and an image popped into my mind, a picture of my uncle back in the thirties on the farm in Saskatchewan with a sedan he had converted into a pickup truck so that we could haul boulders out of the fields. I thought that is what Bill C-49 is. Unfortunately, it's more than that. You're taking a Rolls-Royce and you're chopping the roof and tearing out the back seats so that you can turn it into a pickup truck. Canadians deserve an excellent Canadian history museum, and the Canadian Anthropology Society supports the creation of a museum of Canadian history, but we do not support the gutting of, as has already been said, the crown jewel in our collection of museums. It would be a terrible mistake with long-term consequences.

I'd like to start my remarks by noting that we are also concerned about the consultation process as it has gone forward to this point. We feel there was a lack of extensive or systematic engagement of the professional community of historians, anthropologists, and archeologists in the CMC's planning for the proposed Canadian Museum of History.

The meetings on the new museum that have been convened to date do not meet the definition of true consultation, a formal discussion between groups of people before a decision is made. The public meetings held last fall were brainstorming or awareness sessions, but not actual consultations. The museum's representatives did not undertake to provide participants with a synthesis of comments, a formal response to their concerns, or any specific indication as to how the museum would seek to integrate the received feedback in the research or implementation of the new exhibits. Only a minority of professional practitioners of the historical disciplines was invited to participate in these meetings.

I'm pretty confident that everyone in this room has had the privilege of appreciating the Canadian Museum of Civilization, this national monument to the cultural heritage and living present of all who have peopled these lands, most notably the first nations, Inuit, and Métis, as curated, researched, and shared publicly by a cadre of expert and dedicated scholars for more than a century. This history can be traced to the founding of the anthropology division of the Geological Survey of Canada in 1910. In those early years, and later as the National Museum of Canada and then the National Museum of Man, the focus and collections remained predominantly focused on Canadian aboriginal peoples. As established in 1990, and still in effect today, the vision of the then-renamed Canadian Museum of Civilization was expressed in the mandate of the Museums Act:

to increase, throughout Canada and internationally, interest in, knowledge and critical understanding of and appreciation and respect for human cultural achievements and human behaviour by establishing, maintaining and developing for research and posterity a collection of objects of historical or cultural interest, with special but not exclusive reference to Canada.

In this process, the museum was empowered to undertake and sponsor any research, including fundamental or basic research and theoretical and applied research related to its purpose and to museology, and communicate the results of that research.

On this basis the Canadian Museum of Civilization has been dedicated to publicly supported scholarship on core issues in the Canadian and the human experience, and is internationally renowned for its work. Upon a substantive research basis, public exhibitions, both permanent and temporary, have been rigorously created to be offered, critiqued, and constantly renewed as a trust to the Canadian people. This work has been largely, but not exclusively, anthropological in character and has depended on the sustained and sometimes lifelong work of specialist curators in ethnology, cultural studies, archeology, and history.

However, in May 2012 the Canadian Museum of Civilization's administrative structure was readjusted to no longer include a vice-president for Research and Collections. Research and Collections is now placed under the former vice-president, who is now a director general of Exhibitions and Programs. Furthermore, the current executive of the museum includes no member with research or collections expertise. It is unclear what the future of research will be at the museum, despite the substantive need for research both in itself and as the basis for exhibitions and programs of quality.

● (1830)

Bill C-49 provides a new and significantly reduced purpose: "to enhance Canadians' knowledge, understanding and appreciation of events, experiences, people and objects that reflect and have shaped Canada's history and identity, and also to enhance their awareness of world history and cultures". It also has a narrower empowerment to "undertake or sponsor any research related to its purpose or to museology". This language renders even research within the reduced mandate optional. It would be possible under this language for there to be no research undertaken within the museum itself, and it appears planned that research may become an adjunct to exhibitions, once they are decided upon, rather than the informed and critical basis from which they arise.

Some of the consequences are immediately clear. The First Peoples Hall, a signature creation of the Canadian Museum of

Civilization, is 10 years old. It cannot maintain or renew itself, and it requires continuing research and collaboration to ensure that it is current with contemporary aboriginal life and engages with emerging issues regarding the past and present of Canada's first peoples.

This anticipated new Museum of Canadian History will, according to Dr. Mark O'Neill, include "aspects of the aboriginal experience" but shift toward other still-unspecified Canadian historical themes. Here a very considerable amount of research and enhancements of collections will be required, as this has not been hitherto a focus of the museum. The museum's collections are currently, depending on definition, 70% to 80% aboriginal, as has been the established curatorial expertise of the museum. Elements of material culture cannot simply be borrowed from other collections and placed on display. There are major issues of cost, access, time, research, and vision.

Apparently, there will be a one-time-only provision of \$25 million for the transformation of the museum, but this will not be new money. These funds are designated for a renovation of half of the museum's 100,000 square feet and other costs. Given current costs to meet curatorial standards at this level of roughly \$1,000 per square foot, this generates an underfunding of at least 50%.

The plan for the museum is due to culminate at the time of the 150th anniversary of Confederation and presents a view of Canadian history as "settler history". In the words of Mark O'Neill, "Canada's history from the fur trade to the Northwest Rebellion to Confederation, through two world wars and the quiet revolution to Canada in the world will come to life".

So Canada's history started with the fur trade. The frame has clearly and decisively shifted. The frame now is the imported imaginings of the modern European nation state and its transplantation to a new territory. This history enshrines a much-diminished vision, compared with the collaborative one that recognizes our shared occupancy of these lands and the fundamental character of all Canadians as treaty people.

Canada's history truly began long before there was any thought of Canada, and we all benefit from the living legacy of the first nations, Inuit, and Métis fashioning vibrant societies and cultures, and maintaining relationships with their neighbours. Those who arrived later, the French and British as well as successive waves of newer arrivals from all corners of the world, have brought with them an abundance of linkages with larger and new global realities. Canadians are outward-looking and cosmopolitan by their very definition. Canadians deserve a museum that reflects that. The Canadian experience has never been limited in time and space and is intrinsically part of the larger human experience.

We are concerned that the government's decision to transform the CMC into the CMH fits into a pattern of a politically charged heritage policy that has been emerging in the past few years. Alongside the substantial public funds that were directed into the celebration of the bicentennial of the War of 1812, this initiative appears to reflect a new use of history to support the government's political agenda, that is, the highlighting of particular features of our past favoured by leading ministers of the current government.

If so, this would be a highly inappropriate use of our national cultural institutions, which should stand apart from any particular government agenda and should instead be run according to sound professional standards and principles of non-partisanship.

• (1835)

Once again, I applaud the government's initiative to establish a Canadian museum of history. I deplore the government's decision to convert the Canadian Museum of Civilization into a pickup truck.

Thank you.

• (1840)

**The Chair:** Thank you, sir.

Finally, we will have Mr. Anthony Wilson-Smith, president of the Historica-Dominion Institute.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Anthony Wilson-Smith (President, Historica-Dominion Institute):** Mr. Chair, members of the committee, I want to thank you for this invitation to appear before you today.

The Historica-Dominion Institute is Canada's largest organization dedicated to making history and citizenship issues more well known.

[*English*]

Our board of directors includes some of the country's most respected representatives of the business, philanthropic, and arts communities, and a number of them are members of the Order of Canada.

Our programs range from our well-known *Heritage Minutes* to the Memory Project, which arranges visits by veterans to schools and videotapes the recollections of their war experiences. Passages to Canada brings Canadians from other countries and of different ethnicities and cultures to our schools and other public institutions to speak about their experiences. The Canadian Encyclopedia, which is in the process of being enhanced, is a definitive digital record of things Canadian, and Encounters with Canada each year for over 30 weeks hosts more than one thousand students from coast to coast for a week of learning here in Ottawa.

We are non-partisan. With that in mind, we very much support this legislation.

Canadians can be divided into a variety of categories, but let's take two: those born here and those who come from elsewhere. Those Canadians born here are automatically citizens and are actually not required to know much about our country. Paradoxically, those who come here often know more about their chosen country because they have chosen it and because they have to in order to pass their citizenship test.

But they need and want more, and too often our schools are not the answer. As we know, only four of the thirteen provinces and territories make it mandatory to pass history in order to get out of high school.

[*Translation*]

History teaches us about what we have achieved as a nation and how, thus providing us with a road map for the future. We do not always agree on history's lessons, and that is not only acceptable, but even desirable. A good debate creates more clarity, introduces us to different points of view, prompts deeper reflection and thereby produces better results.

[*English*]

A national museum of history helps to kick-start that process. Of course, \$25 million is a lot of money, and yet in some ways it's not. It's somewhere around 70¢ per Canadian to create a better debate and to discuss our national narrative. No institution is a more appropriate place to do so than one belonging to the federal government, as decided upon by the House of Commons, through which every Canadian has a voice.

At our institute we're proud of the work we do, but we don't presume or pretend to cover the sweep and scope of history. Our *Heritage Minutes*, more than 60 of them, offer snapshots of key moments in history. I'll make the point that this includes events involving so-called ordinary Canadians as well as bad news and sad and unfortunate chapters in our history. We presume those minutes educate and also engage the people who watch them—and those have been in the millions, of course, for more than 20 years now. We hope they create an appetite to learn more, and if they do, then Canadians need a place to satisfy that appetite.

History belongs to everyone.

[*Translation*]

Our national narrative should allow everyone to claim their right to see their own reflection in it. We know that a number of elements of the Canadian society do not seem to be sufficiently represented in our history books.

[*English*]

We expect those voices to be heard in this process and to be reflected back within a history museum.

My own background is largely in journalism, not history, and many of you might think journalism is the less well-behaved sibling of history. Journalism is sometimes described as the first, rough draft of history.

These days, with the great democratization of the information process created by the digital world, we hear many voices interpreting events in many different ways. Smart people understand that it's a good idea to read many different interpretations in order to get a better sense of an event's context and its ramifications, including the building and continuing development and evolution of the nation.

To get that process going, there has to be a leader, a gathering place, a trigger, to get the discussion under way.

Perfection, we often say, is the enemy of the good. Sometimes the reverse can be true: good can be an obstacle to perfection. Good can get to be very good; very good aims at perfection. So we shouldn't stop, saying that because something is very good right now, it can't possibly get better. In 2017, as we mark 150 years of being together in recognized form as Canadians, a federally run Canadian museum of history would serve our country appropriately and superbly.

Thank you. Merci beaucoup.

• (1845)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Now we'll move to our rounds of questions and answers. This is our seven-minute round. I think we're starting with Mr. Young.

**Mr. Terence Young:** I do want to say that I'm a little saddened to hear that anyone thinks the museum of Canadian history will be a pick-up truck, because I think Canadian history is fascinating. It's romantic, it's dynamic, it's amazing.

Growing up in the fifties, I had four brothers and we used to watch television. We lived in Toronto, so we got the Buffalo TV station WBEN. We got American news and stuff, including Walt Disney. We saw some really good cartoons and shows about Paul Bunyan, with songs that were very catchy, and Davy Crockett, Abraham Lincoln, and George Washington. We didn't learn our own history. And this generation is not getting it in high school. We have to talk about our history more.

I'm thinking about our history and people like Sir John A. MacDonald, a man who basically assembled this country—with the second largest country in the world—with the force of his personality. Or Sir John Graves Simcoe, who banned slavery 60 years before the American Civil War, without a shot being fired.

I want to ask Mr. Rabinovitch a question. As you may know sir, Michael Bliss, a Canadian historian and an award-winning author states that it's very exciting that Canada's major museum will now be explicitly—not exclusively, but explicitly—focused on Canadian history.

In addition, John English, former Liberal MP and Trudeau biographer, says, “Congratulations on the Canadian Museum of History. This is a great boost to the museum.”

Do you agree with these comments, and if not, is there some common ground?

**Dr. Victor Rabinovitch:** Mr. Chairman, thank you for the question by the member.

I certainly agree with the way you have put the problem. I also grew up in the 1950s. I can still see Davy Crockett and I had a coon

skin cap. And I certainly know that the Americans won the War of 1812 because of what took place in 1815 outside a certain battle of New Orleans, and can sing that song as well.

But those problems of mass media representation are not going to be overcome by simply renaming a museum. Mass media representation, the type of popularized telling of stories, telling of tales as done through Hollywood, is something that can only be competed against through having significant cultural activities and cultural industries: Canadian filmmaking, British filmmaking, other filmmaking.

Where does the Museum of Civilization and proposed museum of history fit into this? As it now stands, the Museum of Civilization does a very, very extensive job of portraying Canadian history. My calculation is that 75%, some three quarters, of all of the public exhibition areas are given to Canadian history. There are exhibitions on Sir John A. Macdonald, on D'Arcy McGee. There is nothing to say that these cannot be improved and I think it is laudable that they be improved, and the installations dating back to 1989 and 1990 can be improved. But fundamentally, does Bill C-49 improve it? My advice to you would be that it does not. The bill as currently constructed takes away from that broader mandate of understanding the world and being engaged with the world.

One of the proudest things I was involved in was opening an exhibition in the centre of Beijing at the time of the international Olympics, followed shortly thereafter with the opening of four exhibitions in Brazil showing aspects of Canadian life, Canadian artifacts, what we were accomplishing in Canada. That is a central part of the mandate of the Museum of Civilization.

So I don't know how the circle should get squared. I do believe as currently constructed, the legislation reduces and eliminates rather than enhances the ability of museums to contribute to solving the problem that you and I grew up with.

• (1850)

**Mr. Terence Young:** I just disagree with your interpretation of the act itself, and I think time will prove me right. But I appreciate your answer.

Mr. Holyoak, we deal with the members who are stating that there is a lack of support from this government for the arts and culture sector. Nevertheless, our government has increased funding for the Canada Council for the Arts by 20%. That's the largest increase in decades for the Canada Council for the Arts. We've also created two new national museums, and we're showing leadership in supporting arts and culture across the board. So I would proudly compare our record to that of previous governments.

Does your organization support the measures I just mentioned?

**Dr. Lorne Holyoak:** Do we support increased funding for arts and culture?

**Mr. Terence Young:** I mean for the Canada Council for the Arts and the two new national museums.



**Dr. Lorne Holyoak:** Most anthropologists are funded by either the Canadian Institutes of Health Research or the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, so I'd be better positioned, I think, to speak to that. However, as I said in my opening remarks, we support the creation of museums that will enhance Canadians' understanding of a variety of topics including a Canadian museum of history. We just don't want to see that done at the expense of what is a world-class institution.

**Mr. Terence Young:** Mr. McAvity, as you know, a number of key stakeholders support the creation of a Canadian museum of history. Could you tell me if you agree with such respected experts as Yves Fortier, a member of the Historica-Dominion Institute's board of directors, and Marie Lalonde, executive director of the Ontario Museum Association in support of the museum?

**Mr. John McAvity:** Sir, we are completely supportive of Bill C-49, and we are certainly aware of the comments of a number of other people who have been supportive of the legislation as well.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Young.

Mr. Nantel, go ahead for seven minutes.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

While I was listening to Mr. Rabinovitch describe his vision of this museum, I could not help reminiscing about the images that used to accompany the Canadian national anthem during CBC/Radio-Canada broadcasts. I remember that very well, and my colleagues will probably remember it too, since we are all in the same age group—with a few exceptions.

When I visited the Canada Hall at the Canadian Museum of Civilization last September, that's exactly what I felt—that pride in our Canadian identity, that diversity, that culture mosaic that has marked our modern image.

I really liked the dimension Mr. Rabinovitch provided. Couldn't we use what he told us by adding a "history" dimension to the museum's mandate without, however, removing the "civilization" dimension?

I want to ask all of you here today questions, but I would like to have Mr. Rabinovitch's opinion on an issue I'm somewhat concerned about.

Don't you think the museum's current success could potentially fade away if its mission becomes more economic? Given your level of involvement in the cultural sector, don't you see that as a key issue? Aren't you worried by a period of uncertainty at that museum?

**Dr. Victor Rabinovitch:** I want to thank the member for his question.

Of course, I will answer in French.

I'm convinced that proper adjustment is possible, as the building is huge. My former colleagues probably have some plans and ideas on how to make different use of the available space. That's expensive. A great deal of effort and investment is required to create interesting exhibits, such as those you have visited in the past. To achieve that, both money and time are needed. I have no doubt that the

"civilization" mandate can be added and even expanded upon by presenting historical topics in a better way.

Let's come back to the bill. Do you understand that some of this bill's wording really reduces the museum's mandate going forward?

• (1855)

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Absolutely. We will come back to this, as the removal of the words "critical understanding" is clearly a major issue.

I have a question for Mr. McAvity or Ms. Evenden.

Ms. Evenden, you referred to subclause 9(1)(i) of Bill C-49, which reads as follows: "establish and foster liaison with other organizations that have a purpose similar [...]". That's extremely important to you.

I'm once again wondering about the following. I understand that anyone with an interest in history, civilization, museums and that duty to remember will be happy about this point. But this was already included in the Museums Act. Right?

[*English*]

**Ms. Kirstin Evenden:** Thank you very much, Monsieur Nantel.

[*Translation*]

I will answer in English.

[*English*]

It's my understanding that the network that will come out of the revised act is a new initiative for the Canadian Museum of Civilization and, therefore, history. The memoranda of understanding that President Mark O'Neill referred to earlier this afternoon with the Royal BC Museum, and now with the Manitoba Museum, are all new initiatives that, once this new museum is established, will provide the regions with opportunities to exhibit regional histories in the national institution, the larger national story. That's my understanding.

Do you have anything to add to that, John?

**Mr. John McAvity:** I would like to comment that I've worked in the museum profession for about 40 years, in New Brunswick, Ontario, and now in Ottawa.

When I look at the capacity and powers outlined in this legislation, they are consistent with what a museum does.

With respect to questions such as the international role, I draw your attention to paragraph 9(1)(e), which clearly provides for the role of the museum internationally, as well as within Canada.

The other thing is that most of these functions are really consistent with professional ethical guidelines. For example, the disposition, or what we call the deaccessioning of artifacts, cannot be deaccessioned willy-nilly, and the revenue that would come from any sale of artifacts must go back into the collection.

All of the functions of a modern-day museum are really adequately cared for here, and I don't see many of the limitations that others have been concerned about.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Thank you, Mr. McAvity.

I will not ask you to tell me what you are the most pleased about. Is it this commitment to Canada-wide dissemination or the destruction of what is already in place to make improvements? I am not asking you to respond to the question, as I already have my answer.

It's clear that the museum community is excited about this idea, and its members have said so many times in the House. People are very happy about that potential roll-out and project variation. I see that as a positive aspect. As Mr. Rabinovitch said, there was no need to break something to add another dimension that deserves full development—or at least an addition and not a replacement.

I really liked the metaphor Mr. Holyoak used. We should not be against the use of the term pickup, as that's really a nice image. This is really a wonderful thing people use and visit. It is well made, it is moving and can perfectly represent the Canadian reality, as it has not changed that much. And if it has changed, we can modernize the metaphor. So your analogy is excellent. In addition, you referred to something very true in your life, and also very Canadian. So it was perfectly relevant to point that out.

Given your area of expertise, do you think it is a shame the term “critical understanding” is being removed from the legislation?

• (1900)

[*English*]

These words have actually been taken out. To me, this removal is so important, considering all the doubts that we have about the approach of the government toward scientists and other questioning units in our society.

**Dr. Lorne Holyoak:** Thank you for the question.

Speaking on behalf of the Canadian Anthropology Society, I think that is a critical concern for us. The possibility that history will be presented from one viewpoint, as if there are no debates about history or that there is only one standpoint on history, is profoundly disturbing. Furthermore, I think it will impoverish Canadians.

I agree with the other members who have spoken and have said how important it is that Canadians are engaged with their history. I grew up in the 1960s. I can remember that when I was 10 years old my dad gave me a book about the War of 1812. I had no idea, and then, for the next 10 years of my life, Lundy's Lane was something I thought about all the time.

I'm excited about Canadian history just as much as Mr. Young, for example, but when I was 10 years old, my understanding of Canadian history was not the same as it was when I was 22 years old and studying history in university. At that time, I realized that there was more than one story to be told. There was more than one story to be told about the War of 1812. I realized that John Graves Simcoe's actions were a part of a larger world system and that he wasn't acting independently as some sort of hero. He was important, but all the other people who we don't talk about by name in history were also important

I'm sorry. I'm going on too long, but I feel that what I'm trying to say is that there are so many stories to be told, and there are so many ways to engage Canadians. Canadians want to be engaged in a challenging way, not in a simplistic way. Canadians, as I said earlier, are sophisticated and worldly people. They don't want to be spoon-fed their history. They want to be challenged.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Nantel.

Mr. Simms, for seven minutes.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank the guests for being here today. This has been very entertaining, and also very informative, more than anything else.

Mr. Rabinovitch, I understand what you're saying about the name change. I'll deal with that later, but first of all, you made the comment that the research will be only an “ancillary” device, more than anything else, given what's coming from the legislation. I want to touch on that a bit more, because I did ask Mr. O'Neill about this idea and about how the word “critical” was taken from the particular passage. Formerly, it was “knowledge and critical understanding of and appreciation”, whereas now it just says “understanding”.

I got the feeling from Mr. O'Neill that there wasn't much of a difference, but I get the feeling from both you and Mr. Turk that there is a difference. What is that going to translate into? Because you also talked about a reduction in capacity to do research, the capacity for the museum to be something organic and something better than what it is now and to lend itself to the world. Could you comment on that?

**Dr. Victor Rabinovitch:** I should explain, Mr. Chairman, that changes don't happen simply overnight. They evolve in the operation of an institution over a period of time. Why a mandate, and a mandate expression in law, is so important is that it acts as the direct guideline to the administrators of the institution as to what they're supposed to do.

I wish I could count on multiple fingers the number of times that I and my colleagues over 11 years would go back to read the mandate paragraph in the 1990 bill, and how many times we would cite it to each other as we decided on the internal allocation of money for positions in one area or positions in another area.

This is a long way of saying that the wording of Bill C-49 will have a very direct impact on how the senior managers see their authority, their priorities, and their role. It's important that it's not just words, but that it is the law stating what you're supposed to do.

Unlike my colleague, Mr. McAvity, having worked in these large institutions and having had to justify every penny to the Auditor General when they come through for their special investigations every five years, you have to be able to point to the law to explain what you're doing and why. As well, the Treasury Board reviews your plans, and the Department of Heritage reviews your plans each year. You have to be able to justify: where does the law say that this is your mandate, that this is your objective?

So the way these words are chosen—and this is for all members of the committee—is really important. It's not window dressing. "Critical understanding" is an academic expression meaning the ability to criticize, the ability to engage with knowledge and challenge it.

• (1905)

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Do you feel that's lost here in this language?

**Dr. Victor Rabinovitch:** It is lost. "Understanding", in an academic sense, certainly as I would teach it, is simply instruction.

You have on the one hand the ability to engage, to debate, to argue, and on the other hand, the ability to distribute information, to educate.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Dr. Rabinovitch—and I'll get comments from Mr. Turk too in just a moment—it sounds to me like you want to set up something different. You're okay with the idea because, really, what they're trying to illustrate is a museum of Canadian history. I think that's probably what's going to happen here.

In Mr. Young's case, he says he'll be proven right tomorrow. I think he'll be proven wrong today because what you have here is something that is parochial.

Mr. Turk, would you like to comment on the critical aspect of it and the language of the bill?

**Mr. James L. Turk:** I'm a bit perplexed by the discussion, to be honest—

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Welcome to Ottawa.

**Mr. James L. Turk:** —in the sense that if we take everyone in this room at their word, we're all in favour of a stronger museum that helps us better understand, appreciate, and be critically aware of our history. If that is in fact what everyone in this committee believes, you have a unique opportunity because Bill C-49 adds zero to the current Canadian Museum of Civilization, but takes a lot away from it.

It can be fixed easily by changing the mandate provision in the bill, because it takes away the brand, as Mr. Rabinovitch said, and it takes away the money. The cost of the vast amounts of reconstruction is going to be far more than \$25 million.

In terms of the sharing, which I assume is why some of our colleagues from the museum community are supportive of the bill, there is literally nothing in the current Museums Act that would preclude precisely what is being promised under the new bill.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Mr. Turk, I'm sorry, I don't mean to cut you off there, but I want to switch ends because I don't have a lot of time. I only have five minutes.

To Mr. McAvity and Ms. Evenden, just on that point alone. Something that has come to light is that the \$25 million is not going toward the sharing of these objects across the country. The former witness talked about how he envisions private enterprise being involved in sponsorship and fundraising.

That really has to be a disadvantage to a small museum, for example, from Timmins, or from some smaller community such as Bishop's Falls, where I'm from. It's an advantage for those who can afford it, as opposed to those who deserve it. At least that's my

interpretation because there is no money involved for these smaller places; they just have to have big enough resources.

**Mr. John McAvity:** We've been completely supportive of developing private sector philanthropy to help museums. Currently in Canada the museum community is receiving about 9% of its total revenue by way of donations. I don't mean donations of artifacts, I mean donations of money. That is much lower, for example, than in the United States and other countries. We need to develop a culture of greater support for our museums. We've made proposals to the federal government and the finance committee to set up a special program of matching donations as a short-term incentive. It's not in this bill.

I'm speaking to the larger issue regarding the difficulty of raising money. What I heard Mr. O'Neill say is that it was his role to undertake that national campaign.

I agree with you, in Timmins or Corner Brook, it will be more difficult to raise that kind of funding. I believe there are probably some other steps that can and will be looked at by the Department of Canadian Heritage.

• (1910)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Simms.

Mr. Calandra, for seven minutes.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Turk, you represent university professors?

**Mr. James L. Turk:** That's correct.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Do your professors teach the same lesson plan year after year, after year, after year?

**Mr. James L. Turk:** Certainly not.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** They modify and update it?

**Mr. James L. Turk:** Yes.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Why do they do that?

**Mr. James L. Turk:** Because knowledge and information changes.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Mr. Rabinovitch, I appreciate your passion on this. You came to the museum in 2000 or 2001?

**Dr. Victor Rabinovitch:** It was 2000.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** From what department did you come from?

**Dr. Victor Rabinovitch:** Human Resources Development.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Had you run a large museum before that?

**Dr. Victor Rabinovitch:** For three years I had been the assistant deputy minister responsible for museums, as well as broadcasting and similar activities in the Department of Canadian Heritage. I also sat on private cultural organizations as a volunteer.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Thank you.

Mr. McAvity, during Mr. Turk's opening statement he mentioned that he wanted to share the collections. He talked about bone fragments and that a lot of it is for research. It strikes me that you have the longer experience—you said you have 40 years' experience in museums—

**Mr. John McAvity:** Yes.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** —just to confirm?

You have 40 years of experience in museums.

**Mr. John McAvity:** Yes, 40 years.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** In my riding there is a massive discovery of a Wendat village, a massive, massive discovery. There's a film, a documentary, about it called *Curse of the Axe*. Hundreds of bone fragments were found, among other things. The Museum of Civilization is currently custodian of all of those artifacts, but our local museum also wants to have an opportunity to display those, as does the Stouffville museum, as does the Markham museum.

In your estimation, do you agree with Mr. Turk that these local museums don't have the ability, that the local curators, the local people who will handle these collections, aren't sophisticated enough, to deal with these collections?

**Mr. James L. Turk:** That's not what I said.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Mr. McAvity.

**Mr. John McAvity:** I would not agree with that. There's the willingness and the desire to do it. What there may be is a problem with environmental controls at some of those very small museums, and that would be a legitimate reason, because we have to be very concerned about temperature, light, humidity control and so on. The Museum of Civilization would have legitimate concerns that they would have to meet standards.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** The museum, presumably, would put in place standards. But as far as your understanding, there are a number of local museums, local officials, local curators, who could handle such collections.

**Mr. John McAvity:** Yes.

The other point I'd like to make is that today we're spending a lot of time talking about history, but I think a lot of people are coming at it from the point of view of putting a capital-H on "History", and local museums, as you've mentioned, are using small-h history, with much more emphasis on social history and a broad definition of what history means. I do not believe we are talking at the new museum about a museum with a capital-H, restricted, academic approach toward history. From everything I've heard, I think we are looking at a much broader approach to history, from before day one to late last week.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** We also heard this from Mr. O'Neill:

The content for this new exhibition is being developed by a multidisciplinary team of experts at the museum, led by Dr. David Morrison. This team is made up of researchers, curators, and museologists working in close collaboration with advisory committees composed of historians and experts from across Canada.

I believe that Dr. David Morrison has Ph.D. in archeology from the University of Toronto and is the author of many books, with some 20 years of experience in the field.

So yes or no, Mr. Turk, do you know Dr. Morrison?

**Mr. James L. Turk:** I do.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Is he a good man, somebody who's capable of putting this together? Or is there something I need to know about education at U of T that I need to be concerned about?

**Mr. James L. Turk:** All I said was that virtually all of the academic organizations that specialize in this are indicating they have not been properly consulted at all.

• (1915)

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** But you would agree that that is something.... Clearly, we haven't passed the bill yet, and the museum hasn't changed, so obviously—

**Mr. James L. Turk:** Well, the museum purports to be undertaking consultation, and you were indicating—

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Well, I think Mr. O'Neill mentioned the massive consultation that has gone on across the country. But obviously, as we go forward with the collections, you would agree that the right approach to take would be to have somebody like Dr. David Morrison, and that it would be important to include "researchers, curators and museologists working in close collaboration with advisory committees composed of historians and experts", thus a broad cross-section of people who can—

**Mr. James L. Turk:** But the very mandate of the bill ties the hands of Dr. Morrison—

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Specific to that question, are they the types of people—

**Mr. James L. Turk:** —because he can't do research. That's not the focus.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** —we should have in place?

**Mr. James L. Turk:** It doesn't matter who you have in place if research isn't part of the mandate.

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Mr. Chair, on a point of order, may I ask my honourable colleague to be a little more respectful of people coming in to witness—

**Mr. Terence Young:** He's just talking to Mr. Turk.

**Mr. Pierre Nantel:** Yes. It's not the same at all, and you know it, Mr. Young.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Nantel.

Mr. Calandra, you have a minute-and-a-half left.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Mr. Smith, let me ask you this: places like the Wendat village in my riding—

**Dr. Victor Rabinovitch:** Mr. Chairman, there was a comment made about the Huron-Wendat collection—

**The Chair:** Sorry, Dr. Rabinovitch, the person asking the question has control at the moment, because of the limited time. Maybe you will get another opportunity, but Mr. Calandra is directing his question to someone else now.

Mr. Calandra.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Your organization has done a spectacular job in connecting people with their history. In my hometown, I see things like this Wendat village, and I realize how important it is to our local community that we do a better job of connecting Canadians with their history, especially in light of the things that your group is doing.

**Mr. Anthony Wilson-Smith:** Fundamentally, we as Canadians don't know our history. We don't know enough about Sir John A. We have polled repeatedly on this over the last 10 years, and we've not shown any significant improvement. People don't know that Sir John A. was the leading Father of Confederation. Some of them don't even know what he looks like, even though he's on the dollar bill that a lot of people see in large numbers every day. They can't identify who D'Arcy McGee was. They don't know Canada's contribution in World War II, which is something that came up earlier. On virtually every mark they fail, and that's probably because they don't learn.

In terms of our history and our heritage, the system is failing us, so something has to change within. When you talk about local museums, I go back to Tip O'Neill's observation that all politics is local. So is history to a large degree. It's about communities, whether we define them geographically, through ethnicity, or through culture. It happens through reaching out and touching each other. We have to get better. It has to change fundamentally. To get somewhere, you have to leave somewhere behind.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Calandra.

Madame Boutin-Sweet.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet:** Thank you, everyone.

I don't think anyone here is opposed to the promotion of Canadian history. What we are opposed to is the fact that Bill C-49 is limiting the museum's mandate to a large extent. Seeing as how two former museum directors have substantial concerns about this bill, I think we need to give the issue some thought. I also think that we need more than two hours to discuss this.

I would like to talk about research. Currently, the museum archeologists decide what their research will focus on, but things will be reorganized. I am a bit concerned about the future of research at this museum. Will it be based strictly on the needs of upcoming exhibits, or will the archeologists—and I am talking about archeologists because I am one myself—still be able to conduct basic research?

I would also like to point out that three ethnologist positions are still vacant at the museum and that the person currently in charge of ethnological collections is a war historian.

I see here a similarity with what happened at Library and Archives Canada, where many people have lost their job and where it is now difficult for employees to do research on site. In the first place, they have to contend with a staff shortage and, in the second place, their personnel is made up of people who are not specialists, but rather generalists. I note an underlying problem in the area of research, especially seeing as how the new mission set out under Bill C-49 does not include the word “research”.

Mr. Turk, do you agree with me?

[*English*]

**Mr. James L. Turk:** In fact, reference to research has been removed from the mandate. That's why it doesn't matter what qualifications Dr. Morrison has, or others have. As Dr. Rabinovitch had indicated, when the museum has to account for how it's spending money and has to make tough decisions in this difficult

financial environment, you can't point any longer to a provision in its mandate that specifies research as one of its priorities. So that's part of our concern.

I remain perplexed. We're all in favour of the advancement of Canadian history, and we can fix the problem. This committee can make proposals that easily fix the problem. Dr. Rabinovitch gave you two of them. They're not diminishing anything. They're preserving the brand. They're preserving the focus on research and knowledge and critical understanding. They're preserving the diversity, and they allow all of the kinds of sharing that our museum colleagues are so keen about. The current Museum of Civilization has more than 200 MOUs with other museums across the country. There's nothing in the current act that prevents this. So I'm just perplexed. I don't know why we're diminishing what we currently have when we have the opportunity to preserve it, expand it, and support it.

• (1920)

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet:** Thank you.

Mr. McAvity, earlier, funding allocated to culture was discussed. Yet we are about to spend \$25 million on a significant change. As I already said, many small museums need money.

Don't you think those funds could have rather been used directly to help smaller museums? We have to wonder about that, especially if we compare Canadian museums' budgets for 2013-14.

The budgets for that period total \$57.4 million. However, prior to the recession, that amount was \$62.4 million. Some budgets have increased since, but in the case of museums, the budgets are tighter than they were before the recession.

Don't you think that money could have been spent more intelligently?

**Mr. John McAvity:** Thank you for your question, Ms. Boutin-Sweet.

[*English*]

It's very good coming from you, because you worked in a museum, in Pointe-à-Callière in Montreal, so you know our field.

In terms of the funding question and the \$25 million, it certainly would be nice, but I would point out to you that it is a one-time contribution, so it will not be repeated. We would really be looking for ongoing, continuing support.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet:** Of course, I feel the same way.

Mr. Turk, you raised an interesting point earlier. You talked about the Franklin expedition, which you linked to the cuts to Parks Canada. As we know, Parks Canada has undergone some major cuts. However, a very significant and expensive search is ongoing. They are trying to find Franklin's lost vessels. The same expedition is being used to chart the shoreline. That will help Canada better establish its footprint on the Northwest Passage.

I am wondering about that search. Let's say that archeological research is not the only reason behind it.

Mr. Rabinovitch, Mr. Turk, I think both of you would like to say something.

[English]

**The Chair:** You're over time, but we'll allow a quick response to that.

**Mr. James L. Turk:** I have a quick response. My point was that with a severely diminished budget for archeological work, having what is a political priority, basically, drive how that money gets expended is our concern.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Turk.

Mr. Calandra, go ahead for five minutes.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Rabinovitch, I do appreciate everything you've said, but I want to point out that you said you thought the new mandate was a bit restrictive. The *Winnipeg Free Press* said:

The previous title was vague, as was the museum's mission, which seemed to include multiple trajectories and themes, everything from postal history to natural science and exhibits on butterflies.

Obviously, there's always going to be a lot of disagreement on what mandate is the right mandate and what mandate is the wrong mandate. I guess that's always open to interpretation.

Mr. McAvity, I'm going to ask you this, because you seem to have the most experience of anyone on the panel when it comes to museums. Paragraph 9(1)(f) of the bill says:

undertake or sponsor any research related to its purpose or to museology, and communicate the results of that research.

That sounds to me as though research will obviously continue.

Paragraph 9(1)(e) says:

organize, sponsor, arrange for or participate in travelling exhibitions, in Canada and internationally, of museum material in its collection and from other sources.

You have the most experience of anybody on the panel. In your opinion, is the mandate too reduced? Do you think we won't be able to continue with our international desire to promote Canada and to learn more about other cultures? Is the mandate too narrow? Are we eliminating research with this new act?

• (1925)

**Mr. John McAvity:** I'm not sure what the mandate is. I see what the purpose is, but I don't see a paragraph here that specifically says "mandate", so the terminology being used is.... I assume we're talking about the clause that says "purpose", because then that is reinforced in the paragraphs under clause 9.

If we can be clear on that, I think what is outlined in clause 9 is adequate. It meets the needs and it defines pretty well all of the potential issues that would come up.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Thank you.

Mr. Wilson-Smith, I really want to hear from you.

What opportunities do you see not only for small museums but also for organizations such as yours? Other organizations also have a

desire to promote Canadian history and to learn more about international history and cultures.

What opportunities do you see in this that don't currently exist? Why is your organization so in favour of this new bill?

**Mr. Anthony Wilson-Smith:** It's about the creation of a conversation, which is a phrase similar to something Dr. Rabinovitch used in a different context recently. You have to get people talking about something, for ideas and exchanges to flow.

I'll give you an example. In the last *Heritage Minute* we released, which was on 1812 and quite separate from the federal initiatives, we showcased a former slave who had formed an all-black regiment of former slaves to fight for the British in the Battle of 1812. The size of the Afro Canadian or Black Canadian contingent at that time, the efforts that they took, the feelings among them...that was an aspect that spoke to an element of society we hadn't seen before.

Similarly, we have another minute coming up for release in a couple of weeks, which is also about 1812, and highlights the first nations' effort there. Now, I don't know history as well as most here, but I know it better than most Canadians. I had no idea that about 10% of the fighting forces on the British or pro-Canadian side in 1812 were first nations warriors.

Through those conversations, you have outflows that create awareness of other cultures and their contributions. When you talk about World War II, it's not only about the heroism of the fighting force at the front, but it's also about the efforts of women and other people at home who helped modernize Canada's economy and workforce, through the building of factories. You create a whole rollout. Through discussions like these, you say what your priorities about history are and what issues matter. What is the relationship between civilization and history as such, and you help to define that.

It's not only through the discussions, it's also through the debates and the disagreements you get there. But first you have to pay attention.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Do I have any more time, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** You have 40 seconds.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Mr. Brown had a question.

**Mr. Gordon Brown (Leeds—Grenville, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I could use a lot more than 40 seconds.

**The Chair:** Try to make it quick.

**Mr. Gordon Brown:** Before I was a member of Parliament, I was the chair of the Ontario government agency that operated Upper Canada Village and Fort Henry, two wonderful living museums that depict Canadian history.

I would argue, with all due respect to our professors on the panel, that history is not the exclusive purview of university professors and that we should be doing everything we can to teach Canadians history. Last year's commemoration of the War of 1812, in my area, was a wonderful opportunity to teach young people the history. When I hear some of the comments today about our not having an opportunity to get that out there, I think this is a wonderful way to do it. I support this bill completely, and I don't believe there's anything in it that precludes research.

I have one quick question.

What do all of you think about the opportunity to get our history out there, across the country, using the new Canadian Museum of History as the base?

**The Chair:** Sorry, Mr. Brown. That'll have to be a closing comment because it's 7:30 and we're out of time.

I want to thank each and every one of our witnesses. Thank you for appearing and contributing to our study of Bill C-49. Thank you to all of you for sitting through our previous testimony as well. It's been a long night for you, so thanks for your input.

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>