



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans

FOPO • NUMBER 062 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, June 19, 2007

—
Chair

Mr. Gerald Keddy

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:

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

Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans

Tuesday, June 19, 2007

• (1100)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's, CPC)): I call the meeting to order. We are meeting pursuant to the order of reference on June 13, 2007, for Bill S-220, an act to protect heritage lighthouses.

We'd like to thank our witnesses for coming in today. From the Department of Fisheries and Oceans we have Cal Hegge, assistant deputy minister, human resources and corporate services, and David Burden, director for real property divestiture. From Parks Canada we have Patricia Kell, director for policy and government relations, national historic sites—now, there's a long title—and Doug Tapley, manager for cabinet affairs.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for coming in. We ask for your presentation.

Ms. Patricia Kell (Manager, Policy and Government Relations Branch, National Historic Sites Directorate, Parks Canada Agency): Thank you. I'd like to thank the standing committee for the opportunity to participate in the discussion of Bill S-220.

During the last 30 years, Canada has lost over 20% of its historic buildings, and recent estimates suggest that another 14% are at risk of being lost. These are significant amounts for a country such as Canada, which has a comparatively small number of historic buildings.

Canada remains the only G-8 country without statutory protection for its federally owned heritage buildings. The purpose of the Heritage Lighthouse Protection Act is to preserve and protect heritage lighthouses by providing for their designation, preventing inappropriate alteration or disposal, and requiring that they be maintained.

The Auditor General of Canada, in her report on cultural heritage in 2003 and her follow-up report on built heritage released this year, recommended that the federal government strengthen its conservation regime for built heritage. However, the Auditor General also cautioned that the government should make strategic and reasoned choices consistent with the means available to maintain designated historic places. She questioned the designation of many examples of the same building type, citing lighthouses specifically.

An approach like that taken by Bill S-220, through which a single type of building will receive its own designation and protection program, risks jeopardizing the protection of other heritage buildings such as the Parliament Buildings, which still have no legal

protection. Such an approach is also expensive, in that it requires its own administrative processes and systems.

Bill S-220 recognizes that many Canadians have a strong attachment to lighthouses and that lighthouses are icons of our maritime heritage. Owing to this important role, 14 lighthouses are already designated as national historic sites, and 126 are designated as federal heritage buildings under the Treasury Board policy on management of real property.

Bill S-220 would provide statutory protection to lighthouses with significant heritage value, a principle that is deserving of support.

Given these considerations, the challenge moving forward will be to ensure that Bill S-220 is as cost-efficient as possible and that it supports other related policy objectives. With this in mind, there are three areas of concern: reducing the costs of the bill's implementation, rationalizing the requirement for public meetings, and facilitating the divestiture of lighthouses that are surplus to operational requirements.

I will address issues associated with reducing costs and rationalizing public meetings, and my colleague from Fisheries and Oceans Canada will speak to the divestiture issue.

The obligation to maintain heritage lighthouses represents the bill's most significant financial consideration, and associated costs will largely depend on how many structures are designated. Currently the bill includes the power to designate not only lighthouses but also related built structures. The reason is to ensure that beyond the light tower itself, other structures that have a function in a lighthouse's operation are conserved. This would include buildings that contribute to the heritage character of the lighthouse, such as lighthouse keepers' residences, gas houses, and fog alarm buildings. However, it would also include other kinds of infrastructure that are related to lighthouse operations but contribute little to heritage character, such as helipads, walkways, wharves, equipment sheds, and even outhouses. Some of these are very expensive to maintain.

Parks Canada therefore suggests that only related buildings be eligible to form part of the heritage lighthouse designation. This would result in fewer structures being designated, reduced costs for maintenance, and a greater focus on the lighthouses themselves.

Coastal communities are intensely interested in the future of their lighthouses. A belief that decisions were made about conservation work and sales and demolition of lighthouses without communities being informed has been translated into the bill as obligations for public notices and public meetings.

As currently drafted, the bill takes an inconsistent approach to public notices and meetings. It requires public meetings for alterations; such public meetings are unnecessary, as the bill requires that alterations be done in such a way as to protect heritage values to a high standard. At the other end of the spectrum, the bill does not require a public meeting if a heritage lighthouse is to be demolished, an action that has irrevocable consequences. Furthermore, public notices and meetings are required if a heritage lighthouse is sold, even to a community group that is intent on providing for its continued public use.

• (1105)

Public notices and meetings should be offered when public interest would be highest and could have the greatest impact on the future of a heritage lighthouse.

This would suggest that no public meetings be required before alterations are made and no public meetings or notices be required when heritage lighthouses are sold to groups that will continue their public use, but that public meetings be mandatory when the demolition of a heritage lighthouse is proposed.

I believe that my colleague from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans would also like to address the committee.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Cal Hegge (Assistant Deputy Minister, Human Resources and Corporate Services, Department of Fisheries and Oceans): Thank you.

Good morning.

Like my colleagues from Parks Canada, we are very pleased to be here today to assist in the SCFO review of Bill S-220.

Canadian lighthouses, which date back to the 18th century, were built to ensure marine navigational safety. Many of Canada's lighthouse towers still serve their original purpose as aids to navigation, which is evidence of a continued, thriving maritime trading system.

Canadian lighthouses also remain a point of pride for this department—both the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard. To be sure, lighthouses are just as important to the DFO and CCG staff who manage and maintain them for operational purposes as they are to Canadians who live near them or visitors who come to see them.

The principles of Bill S-220 are laudable, but the department does not have the financial resources to cover the implementation costs. However, we recognize the historic and cultural value of heritage lighthouses.

Nobody wants to see lighthouses that could go to local communities destroyed. For the last several years, DFO has been working to foster relationships with groups who want to adopt

lighthouses, and we are doing everything possible to live up to our heritage obligations within the financial realities we face.

Our priority is to meet community requests for continued public purposes wherever possible. No sales on the open market have happened in recent years, and I do not foresee open market sales unless there has not been an expression of community interest.

Our view is that many of our surplus lighthouses could be transferred, at nominal value, to communities and not-for-profit groups with tourism and heritage interest mandates that are better equipped than our department to assume responsibility for their protection and conservation.

We do have concerns regarding the potential implementation costs and impacts on our lighthouse divestiture strategy. Our concern focuses around the maintenance requirements within the bill and concern that prospective groups might no longer follow through on the divestiture initiatives if DFO were required to maintain them to heritage standards.

While it is technically not a money bill, it is our contention that funds would be required to ensure lighthouses were brought up to an acceptable level to meet the obligations specified within the bill.

Due to the marine aids modernization initiative, AToN 21, the traditional role of lighthouses has been reduced. Consequently, during the past 20 or so years, DFO has recapitalized only those assets that are required for operational purposes. The majority of these funds have been invested at staffed sites in British Columbia and Newfoundland and Labrador only to deal with the most urgent health and safety concerns.

Current policy requires the divestiture of surplus properties and precludes significant investments in properties that are no longer required for program purposes. For some time now, DFO has worked with community groups and non-profit organizations to transfer lighthouses of local interest for a nominal sum.

Currently, the annual departmental operating deficit for core real property assets is about \$30 million—in that figure I'm talking about real property, not just restricted to lighthouses—which would be reasonably invested to maintain all assets required to support ongoing program service delivery. If the bill is passed without the necessary funding, the resources to support heritage could only be funded by diverting core program funds, which would be inappropriate in the context of our mandate and could compromise our ability to deliver program services.

As the ADM responsible for small craft harbours, I know I don't have to dwell on the unfunded nature of that particular program. It's been in front of this committee several times. It's an example of another program that we do not have any flexibility to move funds from and that we would have to look at—not just small craft harbours but throughout our capital budget—if we were going to try to come up with funds for this program.

As custodian, with new responsibilities under the bill, DFO can no longer defer structural repairs required to ensure that many of these heritage light stations remain standing. In fact, we will require access to some funds immediately, as repair work cannot be delayed further if many of these heritage lighthouses are to be protected as proposed in the bill.

For the bill as written, it is estimated that our department would require \$461 million of a total estimated cost of \$481 million over the first 10 years for recapitalization costs and \$24 million of a total estimated cost of \$26 million annually thereafter for maintenance costs, in order to respect their statutory obligations for those lighthouses under our custodial control, if 450 sites were to be designated. The estimate is based on the assumption of a 60% designation rate, as per the Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act, on a maximum of 750 DFO lighthouses.

• (1110)

At the other end of the spectrum, if only those lighthouses that are part of national historic sites and our highest FHBRO, Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office, designated lighthouses were afforded the statutory protections proposed in the bill, the estimated financial impact for DFO would be \$105 million of a total estimated \$118 million for recapitalization. There would be an additional \$5 million out of a total estimated \$6 million annually thereafter, for maintenance and addressing the administrative barriers required for effective implementation. Even at this level, the department would need to seek additional new funding.

Mr. Chair, that concludes my opening remarks. We'd be pleased to do our best to answer any questions the committee might have.

The Chair: I thank our witnesses for appearing.

For the benefit of our committee, you've outlined some of the issues that we've been struggling with on this particular piece of private member's business and some of the challenges that are obviously going to have to be met before we can make this work in any responsible way.

Mr. Simms, I know you have some words of wisdom.

• (1115)

Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-sor, Lib.): Good Lord, I'm looking for another Mr. Simms in the House.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

First, I would like to say thank you for introducing this in the House and bringing it forward. It was an initiative from the Senate, and a long one at that. I'm sure this will be a pretty productive period, nonetheless.

As you know, we support this bill and look forward to amendments to make sure this works out. So congratulations to you, sir.

Ms. Kell, what I have noticed in my three years in this job is that in instances where we have an incredible amount of heritage wrapped up in a lighthouse that in many cases was the centrepiece of the community 100 years ago—it wasn't just a safety thing, but there was a community aspect with the lighthouse and related buildings—

any investment to help these places survive has come either from DFO or our local economic development agency, ACOA.

I find that—I would say Heritage Canada, but I understand it's really Environment Canada, as you've now found a new home—Parks Canada has been glaringly absent from the support aspect of this.

I appreciate where Mr. Hegge is coming from. He talked about a \$105 million recapitalization, and he notes there isn't enough money available, if I can paraphrase you correctly, to sustain most of these historic places.

Do you feel you've been absent in your part?

A voice: Just be direct.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Patricia Kell: Parks Canada administers two heritage designation programs that affect lighthouses. On behalf of the Treasury Board, it administers the Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office and the national historic sites program.

Under the Treasury Board program, departments are responsible for caring for heritage buildings in their portfolios on their own. FHBRO provides advice, but it does not provide financial support.

Mr. Scott Simms: I apologize at the beginning. I realize I may have put blame on you, and I don't do that. I think Heritage funds have been absent for quite some time, even beyond a year or so.

So I would have to say that when it comes to the designation of a certain place—I was involved in one near Twillingate, Newfoundland—there are no funds surrounding that to help them get started as a heritage site.

Ms. Patricia Kell: That's correct.

Mr. Scott Simms: It seems to me that what they're doing now is struggling with a local economic development agency to find funds to do this as a tourist attraction.

If I'm not mistaken, places around the world provide money for heritage sites simply to be, as opposed to what you are to become as a tourist attraction. I mean, they can sell so many trinkets.

In the past, were funds available when you received that distinction?

Ms. Patricia Kell: There has never been a program that automatically provided funds on designation. Canada's national historic sites program has always been a program where some sites are owned by the federal government and some sites are owned by other bodies—provincial governments, municipal governments, private individuals, and corporations.

There has been a cost-sharing program for probably the last 20 years where sites not owned by government could apply to do specific conservation projects and have the government make a contribution.

That program still exists in theory, but it is not well funded.

Mr. Scott Simms: What is that program?

Ms. Patricia Kell: It's called the national historic sites cost-sharing program.

Mr. Scott Simms: Obviously, there is no core funding available for these places from either department.

• (1120)

Ms. Patricia Kell: That's correct.

Mr. Scott Simms: All right.

But I think the demand has been...and I know several provincial governments have said the same thing: "Along with the designation, you've given us a plaque. Thank you very much." They are appreciative; nonetheless, at the same time it would be a welcome boost to kickstart their way into a long-term program.

I guess I'm getting into the issue of divestiture, which probably goes back to Mr. Hegge. But I just wanted for the record to say that I honestly believe that when it comes to heritage money—Parks Canada, or even Heritage Canada, for that matter—we've been glaringly absent on that. I don't know if you agree or not.

Mr. Hegge, I want to talk about divestiture for just a moment. You touched on the \$105 million recapitalization, which caught my ear. The department has no financial capacity for that. Is that correct?

Mr. Cal Hegge: That's correct, yes.

Mr. Scott Simms: And you do not foresee anything coming as a means by which these lighthouses can receive a lump sum payment to get started?

Mr. Cal Hegge: What I'm saying, Mr. Simms, is that if the bill is passed, in whatever form it's passed, we would have to seek additional funding in order to meet our obligations.

Mr. Scott Simms: I see.

To do this in this particular bill, what would you suggest as an amendment? I'm putting you on the spot here. I shouldn't be, but it's to help us make sure this bill passes correctly and doesn't place an extra burden on your department.

Mr. Cal Hegge: I would prefer to stay away from any questions on amendments per se. I don't know if my colleagues from Parks Canada want to address anything on it, but I'm not really in a position to comment on amendments. I think it's in the hands of the politicians to decide what they want to do with this at the moment.

From my perspective as the senior finance officer for the department, all I can say is that if the bill gets passed—and again, we're not sure in what form it would be passed—there would be a considerable financial hit on our department. I've given you basically two scenarios in my opening remarks, from the lower end of the scale to, arguably, the upper end of the scale.

Mr. Scott Simms: Are we getting into the \$105 million figure now?

Mr. Cal Hegge: Again, based on our knowledge of what's been proposed, that would probably be the lower end of the scale.

Mr. Scott Simms: Yes.

Do I have time left?

The Chair: You have a couple of minutes.

Mr. Scott Simms: Would my colleague like to jump in?

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Thank you very much.

I certainly appreciate the fact that both departments don't see the possibility of getting into this thing unless there is a new envelope of money developed. I believe that with the additional pressures that have been put on both of your departments over the last number of years, there has been a continued case of underfunding going back a number of years.

We have the Fortress of Louisbourg in my riding. With the new fire codes and safety codes, the work that had to be undertaken without compromising the integrity of the site has been very expensive. So I would think this is going to have to be new money, whatever we pursue with this.

Just sort of generally speaking, do you see a significant role in this, through Parks Canada, in helping with interpretation and presentation and those aspects, or assisting community groups? I don't think we should be protecting any of these sites unless there is a significant initiative on the ground from those communities that want to protect them. Those are the groups that have to score high to protect and show willingness.

Do you see a role for Parks Canada to help with the interpretation and presentation?

Ms. Patricia Kell: The bill doesn't discuss interpretation or presentation, so it doesn't create any obligations on current or future owners with respect to that. So to be honest, your question isn't something we have contemplated.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner: Okay. We may look at that. As you know, a lighthouse is a focal point that we're drawn to, to experience the coastline and the crashing surf. But if we're going to look at interpretation, it has to be of a high standard, and I would think that maybe Parks Canada might be able to help us, because you do a tremendous job with the presentation.

A community group would not be able to secure funding from a regional economic development agency if they're still under the ownership, the direction, of Parks Canada. You can't move money from one federal pocket to another. Would it have to be divested before regional development moneys would be allocated?

• (1125)

Mr. Doug Tapley (Manager, Cabinet Affairs, Parks Canada Agency): Regional development organizations provide contributions to organizations outside of government to do various things. Because we are inside of the federal government, we do not qualify to receive any of their contributions.

The Chair: I'm sorry, Mr. Cuzner. You're over a minute now, and you only had a second, so you'll have to catch him on the next round.

Monsieur Asselin, s'il vous plaît.

[Translation]

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Manicouagan, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The way in which Bill S-220 was drafted led a number of parliamentarians to vote in favour of it at second reading. That is exactly what the Conservatives and the New Democrats did, as well as the Liberals who overwhelmingly voted in favour of the bill. The Bloc, however, was reticent about doing so, even at second reading. Personally, I decided to vote in favour of the bill at second reading so that I would be able to hear from witnesses. Had it been defeated at second reading, we obviously would not have been here talking about it today.

This bill has already been tabled a number of times in the House of Commons in various guises and it either died on the *Order Paper* or was outright defeated. I hope that the Conservatives, the Liberals and the New Democrats will realize that it is simply a waste of time to enact legislation that makes no mention of funding; I presume that they will realize that it is not worth continuing to discuss such a bill. That being said, I believe that it is important to shed some light on this bill, a bill that was prepared by the Senate, although sponsored by our chairman.

To my mind, it is utterly nonsensical to speak of protecting heritage buildings without providing financial resources to do so. I also disagree with the idea of asking the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to use funds that have been earmarked for small craft harbours, as our small craft harbours have been suffering from underfunding for a number of years. Their upkeep has been inadequate and they need a helping hand so that fishermen can enjoy a safe and functional place to berth. Whichever way you look at it, much more money is needed.

Lighthouses are a navigational aid that belong to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. They are not used as often as they once were. The bill provides for the creation of an advisory committee that will be mandated to produce an inventory of lighthouses and to decide which ones will remain heritage lighthouses, which ones will be transferred and which ones will be sold to private sector buyers. In some instances, lighthouses may even be demolished.

I believe that the inventory will have to be prepared thoroughly. The advisory committee would be responsible and would have to consult with stakeholders. However, we must bear in mind that nothing will be done without political will and the support of the department. Where will the money come from? Canadian Heritage, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans or Parks Canada? The Mingan Islands, in my riding, are on land that belongs to Parks Canada. A lot of tourists come to visit the lighthouses on the island. A business plan for restoring and developing the lighthouses was even developed, but nothing is happening.

I would like to know where the money will come from and why we should continue studying Bill S-220. I know for certain that these lighthouses are falling apart at the seams, or to put it more bluntly, totally antiquated and dangerous.

Over the time that these bills have been tabled in the House, a number of studies have shown that several of these lighthouses are highly polluted. This is not something that can be overlooked. An in-depth environmental evaluation would have to be given priority, because these lighthouses harbour mercury and diesel fuel contaminants. Given that the surrounding land is also polluted, both building and land would need to be decontaminated, as departments

well know. Nobody would want to buy these lighthouses in their current state. They are virtually moribund and there is little chance of their making a recovery.

I would like the representatives from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans or from Parks Canada to tell me whether they really believe in the idea of setting up an advisory committee and implementing lighthouse disposal and development programs. I would also like them to tell us if they know where the money to fund all of this will come from.

If, at the end of the day, neither DFO nor Canadian Heritage is prepared to invest a cent in this project, and if Parks Canada has no money to restore and develop these lighthouses, surely you would agree with me that the idea of setting up a commission, carrying out studies and evaluations, and spending more money is simply pointless. And if such is the case, why bother continuing with Bill S-220?

• (1130)

Mr. Cal Hegge: I am not quite sure how to answer your question, Mr. Asselin. As I stated earlier, our department will support the objective of the bill. The problem is simply that we do not have enough resources to implement the measures that this legislation will require.

If Parliament adopts the bill, we will have no choice but to ask for additional funding to implement it.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: You said that you would request additional funding. Why would you request additional funding? Would it be for restoration, renovation and upkeep? Would you require the funding immediately? Have you prepared an inventory? How much money would be required straightaway? How many hundreds of thousands of dollars would the government have to invest? Are hundreds of thousands of dollars needed to make these lighthouses viable?

Mr. Cal Hegge: I am unable to give you an answer at the moment because we do not yet know exactly what the enacted legislation would entail. I provided two examples of the type of funding we would require, but it will depend on the exact content of the final version, as if I am not mistaken, Parliament and this committee are currently considering a number of amendments to the bill.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: Did you know that some of your land, buildings and lighthouses were contaminated?

Mr. Cal Hegge: If we have contaminated lighthouses, we will be eligible to benefit from the Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan. It provides funding to address matters such as, for example, contaminated lighthouses. I do not know exactly how many lighthouses are affected.

Mr. David Burden (Director, Real Property, Safety and Security, Divestiture, Department of Fisheries and Oceans): The majority of our lighthouses are affected to some degree, but the Department of Fisheries and Oceans has a program to assess the environmental status of all of our properties.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: Could you send us a list of the contaminated lighthouses so that it can be tabled with the committee?

Mr. Cal Hegge: Yes, that would be no problem.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: Please note that carefully, Madam Clerk, because promised documents seem to have a habit of getting lost in the mail.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Asselin. Your time is up.

Mr. Lunney.

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, CPC): Thank you for coming. It's an interesting subject that we're talking about here. It seems as though for some time there have been attempts to bring a bill forward to address this issue, and we've never been successful in finding a solution.

I am a little confused by the number of sites that we've referred to here. I hear reference to some 750 sites. Another place I see 450 sites. Can somebody give me an idea of how many actual sites we have out there that potentially might be affected by this bill? How many lighthouses is DFO responsible for now?

Mr. Cal Hegge: As you have alluded to, it's a bit of a challenge in terms of definition, but we use the figure generally of about 750 lighthouse-like structures, and within that there are about 250—give or take—that are what we would call major lights, and then another 500 or so smaller structures, which many in the public lexicon, for example, would refer to as lighthouses. That's where we get the number.

As you saw in one of our scenarios, we talked about using the same approach that the Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act uses, under which about 60% of the available railways are actually designated. That is not to say the same process would be followed here, but if it were, 60% of our 750 would be roughly 450, and that was the premise that allowed us to come up with a higher estimate. Our figure for DFO is roughly 750, and then there is another discussion around what is actually going to be included as a lighthouse in the context of this bill. My colleague from Parks spoke to the additional equipment or buildings that—depending upon how the bill is interpreted—could be included as light stations or lighthouses.

• (1135)

Mr. James Lunney: Do you have a rough idea of the breakdown of the locations? On the west coast, I heard, there are about 50 structures under this consideration. Is it possible that there would be that few on the west coast compared to the numbers for the east coast?

Mr. Cal Hegge: We can provide that breakdown by province or region of the country, if you like. I don't think we have the information readily available right at this time. I don't know whether 50 sounds right for Pacific or not.

Mr. David Burden: Actually, we have something here, and 50 sounds about right for the Pacific. There are 27 staffed. Then there is probably about an equal number on the other end of the scale. The challenge we have is that there is no definition of a lighthouse in law. In Canadian law it doesn't exist. We've gone out to the other G-8 countries. We have gone to the International Association of Lighthouse Authorities, of which Canada is a member, and many of the proponents of this legislation would not be satisfied with the definitions that are out there because their community lighthouse

would probably be excluded. Getting a number is a bit more of an art than a science.

We have some numbers that we use within DFO, broken out by our regions, and we could provide those to the committee.

Mr. James Lunney: As I understand it, a lot of the lighthouses or structures on the east coast are on the mainland, or what we would call mainland, and perhaps close to settlements or communities. On the west coast, many of them that are very substantial structures are on remote islands, with no substantial population base nearby, which creates a little bit of a challenge for a local group taking them over.

But when you talk about other structures, some of the bigger ones, I don't want to underestimate, but I know there are at least two on the west coast trail in my riding—Pachena Point and Cape Beale, adjacent to the trail. They're very substantial structures. They're on Vancouver Island, but there are a number of them that are just offshore on islands that are only accessible by boat or by helipad.

So when you talk about maintaining structures for access, it would be great to have a building maintained out there, but if you don't have a dock or structures to access it, or a helipad or some way to get there safely, it's not going to last long.

I think the inclusion of the other structures is something that does need to be considered for those remote areas. But I brought this up before, and I wonder, has anybody talked about the possibility of these things becoming revenue generating in terms of having somebody there to maintain a light, but run them as a B and B or something to generate some income?

Ms. Patricia Kell: Can I speak to your first question about why it would make sense not to designate the wharves?

If you treat the wharf as a heritage structure, then under the bill you're placing constraints on the kinds of changes you could make to that. You're creating obligations to treat it as if the wharf structure itself has heritage value and deserves to be protected, whereas you're talking about having a wharf there because it serves a functional requirement of the light station. So I agree that you would still need to have a wharf, but you don't need to have a heritage wharf.

Mr. James Lunney: Thank you for making that distinction.

When we talk about divestiture, you talk about local community groups taking them over, but within Parks Canada or...it's sort of stretching DFO's mandate, I think, to consider running an organization or some kind of a facility. But we have manned lighthouses. Many of them, because they're so remote, have facilities—houses, for example, that have been maintained. I'm sure there are lots of Europeans and others, Americans perhaps, who would pay good money to come and spend a little time there. So why not turn them into revenue-generating things that can maintain the integrity of the structures themselves and make them available?

•(1140)

Mr. Cal Hegge: In fact, we have some examples we could give you where that's exactly what's happening, where we have divested into community interests. They in fact are doing some of this as a revenue-generating way, I guess, of being able to maintain the property for other purposes. So there's nothing to preclude that.

If you're suggesting by your question that our department, for example, could get into that business, that would complicate our lives considerably. So we don't have the mandate to do that.

Mr. James Lunney: What about Parks Canada? They run campgrounds.

Ms. Patricia Kell: We do run campgrounds, and we have a number of national historic sites that are leased to private operators who run them as back-country hostels and that kind of thing. So it is a model. But I would caution that Parks Canada's interest as a property holder has, until now, at least, been restricted to national historic sites, and we do indeed own five lighthouses that are national historic sites already.

The level of Parks Canada's interest would depend on the historic value of the lighthouse in question.

Mr. James Lunney: I want to ask about the functional ones. It isn't the vision of DFO to eliminate all of them, or is it, as far as the manned ones are concerned? They still serve a functional purpose out there in terms of navigation, fog.

Mr. Cal Hegge: We have roughly 50 or 51 manned light stations. I think it's 27 in the Pacific, 23 in Newfoundland and Labrador, and one in New Brunswick, Machias Seal Island. Of those 51, we have no immediate plans to de-staff them and to divest of those.

Mr. James Lunney: I'm a little confused about something that was said earlier about the requirements for public consultation, because it implied—at least I thought I heard it implied—that you'd have to have public consultation to do repairs or renovations but not for demolition. Is that actually in the bill?

Unfortunately, I don't have a copy of the bill in front of me.

Ms. Patricia Kell: That's what the bill currently says, yes.

Mr. James Lunney: It seems like an oversight or something. It is clearly out of order and beyond the intention, I'm sure, of the bill. It seems strange that it would be in there.

In terms of money—like the small craft harbour issue, Mr. Hegge, we've been discussing at committee here—if we're going to deal with these structures, obviously an envelope of money has to be made available to maintain them in proper order, like any other heritage building. I was surprised to hear them in competition with the Parliament Buildings. I think Ms. Kell made that suggestion, that other heritage sites like the Parliament Buildings could be jeopardized.

As a young country, I think we're at that transition stage. We're coming up to 140 years and we're starting to become more aware of our history. Unlike many other more mature or longer-established nations that go back 1,000 years or more, we're suddenly at the point where we're starting to say, "We do have a history here", and probably we're going to have to be a little more serious about making

the investment to maintain it. It's probably going to require some budgetary allocations in order to secure those investments.

I certainly appreciate hearing the suggestion, though, that some decisions will have to be made—I think the Auditor General made that suggestion—as to where to make those investments, which are the highest-value representative of this type of building. I'm sure the public has a big interest in making sure those decisions are made to protect representations of, if not all...and where the highest value is. So maybe we're going to need a blend of solutions, where we maintain some on our own and divest ones that have community groups close by. I don't see those opportunities in some of our remote areas on the coast, that there's any community that would have the resources, unless there's a revenue-generating capacity.

Maybe the government would be missing an opportunity in some of those areas for creating a little local economy and some interest, because there's a lot of interest in tourism on the west coast now, as you know, and the remote areas are becoming less remote all the time, as the property values go up. And in divesting these properties, they may become of extremely high value if somebody with the right perspective comes along and decides to make them into revenue-generating venues because people are looking for coastal experiences.

•(1145)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lunney. We appreciate the final comments that took us 48 seconds over.

Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan, Lib.): Thank you very much. Welcome.

Did I understand Mr. Lunney correctly, that the Auditor General is going to decide or indicate whether one lighthouse should be kept above the other or not? I didn't hear that correctly, did I?

Mr. James Lunney: I think she simply made the guideline that rather than blanket preserving everything, some decisions would have to be made about making some strategic decisions about which ones are the highest value.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Is there any possibility this bill could put us in a situation that the Auditor General is going to decide what could be kept and what will not be kept? I would pray not, because then we're on autopilot for sure.

Mr. Hegge, on concerns about small craft harbours and the funding part of this, or whoever would answer, what requirements or what situation does the lighthouse have to be in, in order to divest it to the private sector? I do know in my area some have been divested, and there are bed and breakfasts and things taking place in them. Is there a requirement and a lot of dollars required before the move takes place?

Mr. Cal Hegge: Well, it's on a case-by-case basis. First of all—

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Sure, but is there a basic requirement? You can't have it falling down, and there are requirements that would be needed, which I would expect would mean that there are dollars needed.

Mr. Cal Hegge: In that regard, we're able to find the resources to address the urgent health and safety issues, because we're not going to allow a light station or part of it to fall down and be a hazard to citizens. We do maintain those that are in poor shape or could be a health and safety hazard. We'll maintain them prior to divestiture. When we have no operational requirement for our light stations, and we have probably about 150 that are in the process of divestiture now, we'll try to divest of them in accordance with the policy on divestiture that looks first to federal–provincial–municipal interests. It's noteworthy that we have as part of our long-term capital plan a fourth priority in there, which is the community interest, and we take advantage of that where we can.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Also, if I heard correctly, you don't have to have a public meeting in order to destroy the building. I agree that you shouldn't have a public meeting to repair it or other things, but if you're going to remove the building totally, do you have to have a public meeting?

Mr. Cal Hegge: No.

Mr. David Burden: I think if we're talking about what the bill prescribes versus what we actually do, it's not exactly the same.

The reality is that we have a divestiture program in DFO. We do not, and have not, demolished any lighthouses in quite some time, with the exception of lighthouses that were going to fall because of mother nature. Coastal erosion, etc., in your area of the country is a critical factor that we have to consider. Despite our best efforts, there are circumstances where it's not possible to protect or save all the properties. We have not had any circumstances where we've destroyed a lighthouse for operational reasons. Our primary approach is to try to move it into the hands of a not-for-profit community group or another level of government.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Again, it comes down to dollars. I agree with Mr. Hegge. We have a number of wharves and small craft harbours that have, or have had, barriers up because we don't have the funding to repair them. That's more or less where we are with the lighthouses, if I'm reading between the lines properly. Some of them are in very poor condition for the lack of funding.

Mr. Cal Hegge: That's correct.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: I'll turn it over to my esteemed colleague, Mr. Cuzner.

The Chair: There's one minute. This is a five-minute round.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner: I'm getting the crumbs.

On some of the agreements in place now, does DFO continue to own the land and then have a lease agreement with a community group? Is that the norm?

• (1150)

Mr. David Burden: Actually, over the course of the last number of years there has been a bit of a hodgepodge.

Almost four years ago the department created the organization I lead to try to establish an integrated national approach. What we're doing now is divesting the property and all its assets to a community group. We're doing that at a nominal value. We are ensuring that the heritage character of the light, if there is a heritage value in it, is protected through the FHBRO standards. We do that through the legal transfer documents. As well, prior to the divestiture of any of our properties, we undertake the appropriate legal due diligence and provide full disclosure of all environmental contaminations or whatever at the site and outline a risk mitigation plan for addressing those.

There are some instances where we do have leases. Predominantly we're using leases now because there's a bit of uncertainty, as a result of this bill and other issues, as to what the downstream liabilities will be for subsequent owners of the properties. We don't want to slow the divestiture process down. We want to get these lighthouses in the hands of community groups who want to make alternate use of them. We have a number of leases that are in play until the environment gets clarified a bit. Then we want to move forward as quickly as possible with a complete divestiture of the entire property.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Burden.

Thank you, Mr. Cuzner.

Monsieur Asselin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Asselin: In the same vein, I would like to ask you a question on divestiture. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans used to have a port divestiture budget and often signed renovation agreements, as well as transfer agreements with businesses and municipalities.

Does the Department of Fisheries and Oceans have a port divestiture program; and, if so, how much of your budget is earmarked for this program?

Mr. David Burden: My team has an annual budget of around a million dollars for port divestiture.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: A million dollars.

Mr. David Burden: Yes, per year.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: You appreciate that a million dollars will not allow you to renovate many lighthouses, given their current state. They have been contaminated by mercury and diesel. A million dollars for port divestiture is so little that it is not even worth talking about it.

My second question is for Parks Canada. The lighthouses on the Mingan archipelago, for example on the île aux Perroquets and Havre-Saint-Pierre, belong to Parks Canada. What responsibility does your agency have for these lighthouses that are on your land?

Ms. Patricia Kell: Some of the lighthouses are on Parks Canada land, but they belong to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. I believe that is the case for the Mingan archipelago. Even though the lighthouses are in the park, they belong to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: Staff at the Parks Canada office in Havre-Saint-Pierre prepared a fairly lengthy management plan, after having consulted with stakeholders. It was devised under the auspices of Parks Canada. Does Parks Canada plan on keeping these lighthouses? I imagine that it does. If Parks Canada plans on keeping these lighthouses, could you tell me how much money it currently has for their upkeep and acquisition?

• (1155)

Ms. Patricia Kell: I am unable to answer your question. For as long as these lighthouses are the property of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, it is responsible for their upkeep. We do not intend to acquire more lighthouses, even though DFO would like to give them to us. I could perhaps elaborate later on.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: As these lighthouses are on Parks Canada land, would you be pleased if DFO were to decide to transfer them to you through its transfer program?

Ms. Patricia Kell: We would only be interested if...

Mr. Gérard Asselin: If you also had the necessary resources.

Ms. Patricia Kell: Funding helps, but we should also strive to acquire lighthouses that are in keeping with our objectives, for example, the ecological integrity of a park or the commemorative integrity of a site.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: Fine. The management plan that was developed in cooperation with the people of Manicouagan, a riding that primarily lies in the Mingan archipelago, was tabled. We were always told that it was on the minister of Canadian Heritage's desk. Sheila Copps was the Minister at that time. We were waiting for funding to be allocated and a deadline to be set for the restoration of the lighthouses. Sadly, the document has probably been used to decorate the office, although it ought to be put to better use than that.

Are Parks Canada and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans aware of this management plan?

Ms. Patricia Kell: Not in any detail, no.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for you. You told me that a senator was willing to appear before the committee on Thursday. Will the Department of Canadian Heritage be appearing before the committee?

[English]

The Chair: It's my understanding that Heritage Canada will be appearing, but I haven't looked at the witness list. We have to figure out if we're sitting on Thursday—I'm expecting we will be, of course.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

[Translation]

Mr. Gérard Asselin: We have been hearing that for three weeks now.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Calkins.

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Wetaskiwin, CPC): Apparently, Chair, you and I have different expectations.

I'd like to thank the witnesses for coming in today. Of course, being from the constituency of Wetaskiwin, lighthouses are of great interest to me.

I have some questions on national historic sites. I believe you answered this earlier, but I just want confirmation of how many lighthouses are designated as historic sites now.

Ms. Patricia Kell: There are 14.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: I heard the number five.

Ms. Patricia Kell: Parks Canada owns five of those.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: So five of 14. That goes back to the two different types of historic sites, one where the Government of Canada owns the property and one where there's a lease or some type of an arrangement whereby Parks Canada runs a historic site but somebody else owns the property. Is that correct?

Ms. Patricia Kell: That's a possibility, but no. There are sites that are owned and operated by Parks Canada. What I was referring to earlier was that in a few cases Parks Canada owns sites but a third party operates them. So we have an agreement with a third party that operates the sites.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: So we've got a contract.

Ms. Patricia Kell: That's right.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: So every national historic site is owned by the people of Canada?

Ms. Patricia Kell: No. There are about 150 of those. About 50 sites are owned by other federal government departments, and then the balance, which are about 700 sites, are owned outside the federal government. These are national historic sites that are owned by provincial or municipal governments, by private individuals, or by corporations.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: And of the lighthouses, nine of those would not be owned by the people of Canada directly.

Ms. Patricia Kell: Five are owned by Parks Canada. All the rest, but one, are owned by Fisheries and Oceans, and that one has been divested to a community group.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: All right. Good.

How many are located in national parks? Are there any lighthouses currently located in any of the national parks?

Ms. Patricia Kell: Yes. Parks Canada owns about 12, so seven in addition to the five. There are about seven that are on Parks Canada lands that are not national historic sites.

•(1200)

Mr. Blaine Calkins: So now we're up to 12. Is Parks Canada or is Fisheries and Oceans responsible for marine parks, marine protected areas? They're designated under the Canada National Parks Act, are they not?

Ms. Patricia Kell: They have their own act, but Parks Canada is responsible.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: How many of these lighthouses would be contained inside those marine protected areas or directly adjacent to those marine protected areas?

Ms. Patricia Kell: There are currently none.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: None. That's very interesting.

I have some concerns with respect to the bill, and maybe I can get a little bit of clarification.

Clause 11 says, "No person shall remove, alter, destroy, sell, assign, transfer". I'm going too fast for the interpreter—before I get a lecture—but we can all read clause 11 if we want to.

My concern with this is if we designate a lighthouse as a heritage site that is owned by the people of Canada, then the people of Canada, ultimately, have a responsibility to maintain it in a state prescribed by the minister should this act come into force.

What happens when we've divested a lighthouse, it's privately owned by someone else, and it starts to become dilapidated or is not maintained appropriate to the letter of this act? An unintended consequence would be that the person who owns the property would be in contravention of this act. My questions to you is, would the Government of Canada, would the people or the taxpayers of Canada, be responsible for restoring it?

I guess we would have the option of declassifying it—and the process is outlined here—as a historic site. I'm wondering, from your interpretation of this and your dealing with some of the federal heritage buildings—I'm sure you've probably gone through similar situations—does this act give the people of Canada, the taxpayers of Canada, adequate room to manoeuvre if something that was classified as a heritage lighthouse is no longer kept in the condition it needs to be kept in, so the taxpayers are not on the hook for somebody else's inability to maintain the building?

Ms. Patricia Kell: The way the bill is written it applies only to federal property, so only as long as a lighthouse is held by the federal government can this act apply to it.

One of the provisions of the act is that should the government want to sell a designated heritage lighthouse, then there must be some kind of protection put on that lighthouse as it goes out of the federal inventory. That could mean that as the government sells it we would seek provincial designation on it or we'd place conditions on the sale, so the new owner would have to look after the heritage character of the building. In some jurisdictions it's possible to get a heritage covenant or an easement on the property that requires the owner to maintain the heritage character.

The way the bill is designed, it's not that the bill applies once something is sold, but that as you sell it the new owner agrees to take on the obligation of looking after the heritage character of that building.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: In the province I'm from, Alberta, there are provincial designations for heritage buildings and heritage sites. Through a divestiture process, would it not be fair and reasonable to assume that these could be handed over as provincial heritage sites where it's appropriate?

I'm sure there are some Albertans who are particularly interested in lighthouses, but on the whole, I think it would be seen as more of a regional or local issue, whether or not the lighthouse was to be protected, much as there are lots of issues in my particular riding that I don't think would be of great concern to taxpayers in coastal communities or other areas of Canada. I don't see any mention of any provincial jurisdiction in there, and I don't suppose it's possible to do so. From your perspective, talking about the federal heritage buildings program with local heritage buildings or provincial heritage buildings, is there any cooperation there? Is there any experience that you could give to this committee as far as downgrading one from a federal to a provincial heritage building?

The Chair: I'll ask you to be fairly brief in your answer, if you could be. You can come back to this if you want.

Ms. Patricia Kell: I'm sure the provinces wouldn't consider it downgrading, but, yes, we do have some experience with that, both in terms of consulting with local and provincial interests when we are considering designating a federal heritage building and then also because a number of federal heritage buildings over the years have been divested and we have sought to do the same thing that's outlined in the bill here, which is to place protections on them as they leave the federal inventory. So getting a provincial or municipal designation is one of the very good tools we have to do that.

•(1205)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Simms? You're okay.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner: Could I get a quick one in?

The Chair: Of course, you could, Mr. Cuzner.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner: The last time you appeared before the committee I brought forward a concern on two derelict ships that were anchored off Arisaig harbour. We've since had action on that, so I want to thank you for anything you might have done for that. I appreciate it.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Cuzner.

That was a very poignant and artful lighthouse question.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner: Things have happened at our office. You just say, "Oh, no problem," no matter how little we might know about it, but anyway we do have action on this.

The Chair: Monsieur Asselin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Asselin: Could somebody from Parks Canada or the Department of Fisheries and Oceans please tell me what the consequences of this Senate bill would be? Has there been discussion with the provinces regarding the transfer of heritage sites? Have you had meetings with provincial governments, including the Quebec government? Is there any political will to do so?

After all, the provincial governments might be the ones that are most interested in buying the lighthouses and developing them as historic tourist attractions. They could turn out to be valuable partners who would contribute to the survival of this heritage.

Mr. Cal Hegge: If I have understood your question, you are referring to the divestiture process for lighthouses, which I have already explained. We offer lighthouses that are no longer of use to us to federal departments, and to provincial and municipal governments. So yes, the provinces may well want to acquire a lighthouse we no longer need.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. Gérard Asselin: In any case, if it has not been done, either Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Parks Canada or even Heritage Canada should initiate a process and get in touch with the provincial governments once the inventory is done and they have decided which installations they want to keep and which ones they want to tear down. I presume that stakeholders will be consulted in some way or other.

As you mentioned, you should perhaps consult the provincial governments, among others, when you decide which lighthouses you want to divest yourselves of. The government may or may not respond, or it may make its choice. It might decide that in some part of the Gaspé Peninsula or of the North Shore, it wants to keep some lighthouses in partnership with a corporation.

Something else is bothering me. A Senate bill is subject to the same rules as a private member's bill. A member can table a bill in the House of Commons, aware of the fact that there will be no problem with the first and second reading. However, when it comes to the third reading, the Speaker may well declare that the bill will not go to third reading because it needs a Royal Recommendation. The same applies to Senate bills, when they involve government expenditures. The Senate cannot table any bill that involves government expenditures that were not provided for in the budget.

Mr. Chairman, you are the sponsor. Will this work be lost because we don't have the money to keep the lighthouses and turn them into historical sites? I presume that fairly soon, as a next step, before going too far with this bill, we should get the Speaker of the House to explain this matter to us. If we almost reach the report stage and the third reading is not allowed because the bill indirectly involves government expenditure, the Speaker will not grant Royal Recommendation.

The Speaker will have to advise us regarding this bill and tell us whether or not it requires a Royal Recommendation. Otherwise, we may end up working on it, hearing witnesses or even travelling, which might create expectations because the people in our respective ridings will think that it is good to see the government taking an

interest in lighthouses. They have been abandoned for nearly 20 years, and now there is a glimmer of hope, because a committee is studying the issue. Nevertheless, there is many a slip between the cup and the lip, and the ribbon-cutting ceremony is still far away.

• (1210)

Ms. Patricia Kell: Let me briefly fill you in on the background. As you know, this bill was already tabled several times in the House. Twice in the past the Royal Recommendation was requested for it and both times, the House Speaker decided to refuse it.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: This is what I am telling you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me repeat, a Senate bill is just like a private member's bill. It has to go through all the stages up to the third reading, but the Speaker will have to tell the House that it cannot go to third reading because it involves expenditure. In each and every case and in every department, if public funds are involved, whether or not they are in the budget, the bill is turned down.

For instance, employment insurance bills never get through, because they involve government expenditure. Precedents have been established with previous bills.

[*English*]

The Chair: Is there anyone else?

Mr. James Lunney: I've got a few questions here, but Mr. Calkins tells me he has a 20-second question, and then I'd like to go on with some questions.

The Chair: And yours will only be 20 seconds as well.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: I just want one more bit of clarification.

On the seven lighthouses that are inside national park boundaries right now, could you give me an idea of what the status is? Are they operated as an attraction in the national park, or are they just sitting there as buildings behind a gate that says "Keep Out"?

Ms. Patricia Kell: I think there's some variety. Most of them are not being operated as attractions, per se. Some of them do house other functions.

Mr. James Lunney: Thanks, Mr. Calkins. That's a good lead-in to where I was going, because the one I forgot to mention was Carmanah Point, I believe, which is also on the west coast. Both of those, Carmanah Point and Pachena Point, are functional lighthouses that are still manned and operational.

It would seem to me that if they're manned, operational, and have public access, like on the west coast trail, those would be considered priorities, I would hope, for having national heritage designations so they can be maintained as such. It would seem to me that it would sort of be....

Is that a logical assumption, or is it not fair to assume anything at this stage? Do you have an opinion on the condition of those lighthouses? I'm looking at Patricia Kell here from Parks.

Ms. Patricia Kell: I have no opinion on those specific lighthouses. From a heritage perspective, the primary consideration in deciding which lighthouses would merit being designated would be their heritage value.

Mr. James Lunney: Okay. Well, this whole question of royal recommendation is an interesting one, I suppose. I would have thought that we wouldn't have gotten to this stage if it hadn't received royal recommendation.

Has there been a ruling by the Speaker, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: As a point of clarification, the Speaker in the Senate has ruled that it is not a money bill. My expectation is that this will not be treated as a money bill in this Parliament, because it won't require new funding from Treasury Board. Even if it did require new funding from Treasury Board, it's my understanding that the language is "as long as it's not a burden on the people of Canada".

You can actually get additional funds and still not classify, I believe.

I'm not the Speaker, and I don't get to decide on the final ruling, but it's my understanding that so far, it has not been classed as a money bill, definitely, by the Senate.

Did you want to have some input here, Ms. Kell?

• (1215)

Ms. Patricia Kell: I could maybe add a little bit of context. On two previous occasions the Speaker ruled that this was not a money bill, and I think that was partly because this bill was modelled on the Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act, which itself was ruled as not being a money bill. It also was a private member's bill.

There are some important differences between the two bills. The Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act applied to railway stations that were owned by railway companies, not by the federal government, and there was no maintenance obligation in that bill. So two of the big drivers of financial impact on the federal government did not exist in that case.

The other observation, with respect to it being a money bill, is that if the government were never to designate a lighthouse under this bill, there would be no or very little cost. So on some level it's within the power of the government to control the financial implications of the bill. That's my understanding.

The Chair: I'm trying to wrap my head around that.

Mr. James Lunney: Mr. Tapley, did you have a comment to make on this?

Mr. Doug Tapley: The only comment I'd make is that if you were to look at the Parks Canada report on plans and priorities and at our departmental performance report, you would not find a heritage lighthouse protection program. I think there's probably a good argument to say that we would need to find some resources somewhere, in particular to administer the designation process. We would need to find a source of funds for people to do historic research on the petitions; to develop criteria for designation, maintenance, and alteration; to support an advisory committee that would help the minister in terms of looking at important matters dealing with the conservation of heritage value; and for public meetings, which are another financial obligation. So there are some important financial considerations there.

Mr. James Lunney: I was going to ask about an advisory committee, because I see that the minister is obliged under the act to create such an advisory committee. He's also obliged to report back

within five years on each one, what has been designated and how he's managed to dispose of it.

I can't imagine that the work can be done without cost. I think most of us would agree that this work can't be done without spending money. We certainly know from the experience of small craft harbours, which we beat to death around the committee table here, that it can't be done without money.

I think perhaps we're going to have to revisit the issue of where that money should come from, obviously, if it's of value to Canadian people. You can't expect departments to provide the service, whether it's Parks Canada or DFO, without adequate funding to deliver the intention.

The Chair: Perhaps if I could just interject here for a second, there are two issues at stake here. One is the bill itself and the other is the implementation of the bill. The issue is not so much whether it's going to cost money; the issue is whether the dollars come from the implementation. The issue in front of us is whether we are going to support this bill to protect heritage lighthouses, not whether or not we're going to question—well, we can all we want—the Speaker's ruling from the Senate that it's not going to cost dollars today. I think that was a different way of saying what Ms. Kell said, that the legislation itself costs nothing. When you start to apply it is when you spend the money.

Mr. James Lunney: Well, I think the discussion we just had with Mr. Tapley here would indicate that even to implement what the bill requires—to evaluate this over five years and create an advisory committee and go through an examination process and establish the historical evidence about heritage value—is going to require expenditure.

The Chair: Some funding.

Mr. James Lunney: Yes, obviously.

The Chair: But not new funding.

Mr. James Lunney: So somewhere along the line we're going to need to find a barrel of money for the departments to deal with the issue.

That may be beyond where we can go. But let me just go to this question. I understand that with the bill as it's written, it's estimated that DFO would require about \$364 million of a total estimated \$384 million over five years for recapitalization. Maybe those figures are a little different from what we heard earlier, but that's another estimate that's come forward. It would cost about \$28.5 million of an estimated cost of \$30 million annually thereafter for maintenance costs. Now, that is, I presume, for the ones that were designated as heritage structures.

Mr. Hegge, are you familiar with those numbers? Can you tell us if that is based on 450, roughly, on the 60% formula?

•(1220)

Mr. Cal Hegge: I think the difference is five years versus ten years. The figures I gave you in my opening remarks, which I could repeat, are predicated on 450 light stations being designated. The estimate was \$461 million out of a total estimated cost of \$481 million for recapitalization. Then there was a lesser amount for the ongoing maintenance.

Mr. James Lunney: Another question is that if there is a divestiture program where a group takes it over, there seems to be some confusion about whether DFO would still have some custodial responsibilities or whether the department would be clear entirely. It's only if they're designated heritage that DFO would have some custodial responsibilities. Could you clarify that?

Mr. Cal Hegge: If we divest of it, basically we are absolving any responsibility from our department. It's now in the hands of the party to which we divest it. Sometimes there are some provisions that go along with that divestiture. They have to maintain the light, for example, in good shape for a period of time or what have you. But basically it becomes their responsibility in accordance with the agreement that supports the divestiture.

Mr. James Lunney: Thank you.

The Chair: If there are no further questions, we do have another item.

Madame DeBellefeuille.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know that it is challenging for an anglophone to pronounce my name.

I have a brief question regarding something that I am curious about. I want to know how Canada compares with the United States and other countries when it comes to managing and maintaining its heritage lighthouses. Is Canada good at maintaining and preserving its lighthouses as compared to the United States? Where are we at?

Mr. Gérard Asselin: We are the worst country in the G8.

Mr. Cal Hegge: We have some figures that we could give the committee if you are interested. These figures come from a study on lighthouses in other countries. There is great variety among the ways in which different countries treat their lighthouses.

In Canada, the figure for designated eligible buildings is about 55 to 60%. However, these figures can vary greatly in other countries. For instance, in Japan, the country with the most lighthouses, this study shows that only 2% of lighthouses are classified as historical sites.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Do you have any figures for the United States?

Mr. Cal Hegge: Yes. In the United States, the rate is 87%.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: In fact, 87% of lighthouses have been designated as heritage sites.

Mr. Cal Hegge: The United States have 460 lighthouses. Eighty seven per cent of them are designated as heritage sites.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Are they better at maintaining them than we are? Are they spending more money for this than we are?

Mr. Cal Hegge: I do not know.

Mr. David Burden: In the United States, any lighthouse older than 50 years is designated as a heritage site. This is the most important criteria.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Do they invest any money? Are the lighthouses dilapidated or contaminated?

Mr. David Burden: I do not know. This only has to do with designation. I have no information on the amount that the United States spends on maintaining its lighthouses.

•(1225)

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: You must know whether the lighthouses in the United States are in poor condition. Do you have this information?

Mr. David Burden: We don't have this information.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Usually, we are able to make good comparisons with the United States regarding many subjects. You are telling me that we have nothing regarding lighthouses. We cannot make a comparison.

Mr. Cal Hegge: I am not sure if I understand your question. This bill applies to Canada. I think that there are no studies—

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: —to make a comparison—

Mr. Cal Hegge: —that would allow us to compare. It would be a good idea, but I do not think that there are any.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Very well.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[*English*]

The Chair: Merci.

I might just put a little light on your question about American lights. I'm not sure of the procedure they go through for divestiture, but I've been in several in New England and they're in excellent condition. Most of them, though, are privately owned. And they're local museums owned by towns and municipalities. Some may be state-owned, but the majority are owned by the local government, of those that I've been in, anyway.

We will recess, and allow our witnesses time to depart. Then we will go in camera to look at our budget requests.

[*Proceedings continue in camera*]

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

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

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

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

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