



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans

FOPO • NUMBER 029 • 1st SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Wednesday, March 14, 2012

Chair

Mr. Rodney Weston

Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans

Wednesday, March 14, 2012

• (1530)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Rodney Weston (Saint John, CPC)): I call this meeting to order.

I'd like to thank the officials for being with us here today.

Ms. Dansereau, I know this is not your first appearance before this committee. I want to take this opportunity before we start to thank you for appearing here today and bringing your associates with you. I'll ask you to introduce the officials.

You're quite familiar with how we proceed, so I'll just turn the floor right over to you, Ms. Dansereau.

Ms. Claire Dansereau (Deputy Minister, Department of Fisheries and Oceans): Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for the invitation to be here with you today.

As you know, we're here to discuss our main estimates. Our minister will be joining us shortly. In the meantime, we thought our chief financial officer would take a few minutes to walk you through the main estimates.

[Translation]

I have asked our Chief Financial Officer to present our main estimates and to explain key changes from last year. He will also describe how our spending estimates reflect our priorities.

Also with us are Associate Deputy Minister David Bevan, Deputy Commissioner Jody Thomas from the Canadian Coast Guard, David Balfour, Senior Assistant Deputy Minister, Ecosystems and Fisheries Management, Siddika Mithani, Assistant Deputy Minister, Ecosystems and Oceans Science, and Kevin Stringer, Assistant Deputy Minister, Program Policy. Finally, our Chief Financial Officer Roch Huppé is also joining us.

[English]

Mr. Chair, our departmental focus is always on three strategic outcomes: economically prosperous maritime sectors and fisheries, sustainable aquatic ecosystems, and safe and secure waters. Our targeted spending on key programs will continue to support these strategic outcomes and ensure that we create the conditions for our fishing and other maritime industries to generate value for Canadians. In times of restraint we strive to achieve these objectives by streamlining and increasing our efficiency in all areas.

[Translation]

The department, including the Coast Guard, is implementing modernization initiatives as defined in last year's strategic review.

Our department has made important contributions to Canadians from coast to coast to coast. We will continue to build on achievements of the past as we look to the future.

[English]

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not going to take any more time with opening remarks. The minister will have some opening remarks, and I've asked our chief financial officer to walk through the estimates and the changes from last year, if that's agreeable to you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Please proceed, Mr. Huppé.

[Translation]

Mr. Roch Huppé (Chief Financial Officer, Department of Fisheries and Oceans): Thank you, Mr. Chair, for giving us the opportunity to go over the Main Estimates 2012-2013 for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

[English]

I think you have a small deck in front of you, which I will briefly walk you through. I will give you an update, an overview of the estimates, a breakdown of the estimates by program activity, and a quick explanation of the key changes from last year's main estimates.

Before I walk you through the deck, if you'll allow me I'll pause for a few minutes to talk about the main estimates process in general. As some of you may know, the main estimates process is fairly technical. It allows the department to put forward their proposed budget for the coming year for approval.

What we do when we prepare the main estimates, basically, is we update our budgets in reflection of the past funding decisions that have been made since the last main estimates. Most of the funding decisions actually stem through the federal budget process.

So point number one is that these main estimates for 2012-13 don't actually reflect the decisions, for example, that will be coming through the next federal budget, which is scheduled to be on March 29. By the same token, last year's main estimates did not include the funding decisions for our department that stemmed through the budget 2011. Therefore, a lot of the fluctuations that you see are actually a result of funding decisions that were taken last year, in budget 2011.

I'll walk you through some of these.

A misinterpretation I also want to point out is that when you take a look at the main estimates document itself, an increase or a decrease does not necessarily mean a direct increase or decrease in a funding source, a funding envelope. As an example, if we get \$100 million for the construction of a ship over five years, our cashflow or spend will not be \$20 million a year for five years. It will vary from year to year, probably starting for the initial stages at a couple of million dollars and working up.

You may see in the year three main estimates spending relating to that construction of \$40 million, and then the following year \$20 million. In the main estimates analysis you would see a decrease in our budget of \$20 million, which is not necessarily a decrease to the funding envelope but simply a fluctuation in the cashflow.

Again, some of our fluctuations are obviously due to that this year. If I go to page three, you can see that overall for 2012-13 the department is seeking a little bit below \$1.7 billion, compared to just over \$1.8 billion in last year's main estimates. That's a decrease of approximately \$157 million. As I said, later in the presentation I'll walk you through the main reasons for these changes.

Our budget is basically split into three key areas: what we call the vote 1, the vote 5, and vote 10. Under the operating expenditures, we have just over \$1.1 billion. This includes the salary dollars for the personnel-type expenses. We have to note that DFO is an extremely operational department, which relies on its people and assets to deliver the programs.

Under vote 5, capital expenditures, we have \$313 million—a slight reduction there. That's mainly due to fluctuations in the construction of ships and the cashflow aspects of it.

Under vote 10, which is our grants and contributions section, you will see a considerable decrease, of over 50% from the main estimates last year. These are mainly due to some of our key programs that are sunseting in March of this fiscal year. I will go through the main ones a bit later.

The two last items are what we called statutory items or legislated items: basically the department's contribution to the employee benefit plans.

I'll move to page four. The three following pages are basically a breakdown of the main estimates by our three main strategic outcomes and the program activities that relate to them. Be assured that I'm not going to go through every number; I'm just going to talk about the highlights.

On page four, basically you will note the department has 26 program activities, including the internal services program activity. The first strategic outcome you see is the economically prosperous

maritime sectors and fisheries, which includes the programs that support sustainable and effective use of Canada's water resources. Under there you will note we have a projected spend of \$456 million.

● (1535)

Fifty percent of that, or close to, is linked to the two first program activities that you see. The first is integrated fisheries resource management, for \$111 million, which largely includes the activities to manage the recreational and commercial fisheries.

Small craft harbours is the second one, with \$106 million. Again, here you'll note that a considerable portion of our capital funding is linked to that particular activity, the construction and important repairs to the small craft harbours we have across Canada.

To finish off the page, you'll also note a column there called "revenue credited to the vote". You see a number there in red. There are a couple more in the next couple of pages. This represents a revenue. We call it a revenue with respending authority—and it's under the Canadian Coast Guard—by which certain types of revenues that are collected we are entitled to spend back against that program activity.

We'll move to page 5, under "Sustainable Aquatic Ecosystems Strategic Outcome", which includes the programs that contribute to the conservation, protection, and sustainability of our aquatic ecosystems. You will note that out of \$238 million, close to 70% is spent towards compliance and enforcement, which includes monitoring and surveillance-type activities, and our habitat management program.

Turning to page 6, we see our last strategic outcome is safe and secure waters, which includes the programs that contribute to maintaining and improving maritime safety. This is our largest spending area, \$675 million, of which 80% is locked into the fleet operational readiness program, which ensures that our fleet and ships crews are ready to operate, and our shore-based asset readiness program. You will also note that 67% of our capital funding is dedicated to these two program activities. For example, the funding for the construction of ships is linked to that.

On that page, I'll say one last word concerning internal services. You will note that we spend close to \$296 million in internal services. Some may think that's high. We have to take into consideration that our department is the second-largest asset-based department in government, and the replacement value of our assets is approximately \$19 billion. Under internal services we have the funding in support of our real property activity, to support our real property footprint. As I said, not many departments have the footprint we have, from a real property perspective. Of the \$296 million, \$118 million is dedicated to real property.

Now I will move to page 7, to talk a bit about the main increases and decreases.

If we start off with the key increases to these main estimates, you will see an increase of \$14.3 million that was given to us through the last budget, budget 2011. Actually, the department received \$57 million over two years, starting this current fiscal year. So we had \$43 million this fiscal year as a result of the last budget, which we accessed through what we called a supplementary estimates process. What you see now in the main estimates, because we've adjusted based on that funding decision in the previous budget, is the second-year planned spending relating to that. The money was given to us to repair the small craft harbours as a result of the storm damages of December 2010.

Item number two shows an increase of \$8.2 million. This is again a budget 2011 decision. This is an extension to the government's program, the federal contaminated sites action plan. DFO received close to \$26 million over five years for that program. The \$8.2 million is actually the planned spending related to that activity for fiscal year 2012-13.

The last item you see there is a budget 2011 decision relating to help Canadians adapt to the impacts of climate change under Canada's clean air agenda. DFO received \$16.4 million over five years, and the \$5.1 million is a reflection of our planned spending for that particular activity in the coming year.

I'll jump to the two last pages. On page 8 you'll see the decreases to this budget. The \$40.1 million that you see is for our most important program, the Pacific integrated commercial fisheries initiative, a program that is sunsetting. Through budget 2007, the department received \$175 million over five years for that program, and basically the last year of the program is being completed now. The amount of money in the last main estimates for this fiscal year was \$40 million. This is disappearing from the main estimates this year.

● (1540)

There's \$23.4 million that is contributing to the creation of the Shared Services Canada agency. This is the agency that was created to better manage much of the IT type of spending. Approximately 44 departments contributed from a financial perspective for the creation of that new agency. Our share at DFO was \$23.4 million.

The \$19.9 million is related to the sunsetting of the divestiture of the non-core harbours program. Through budget 2008, we received close to \$45 million over four years for that program.

Item 4 is a decrease of \$18.9 million relating to the strategic review measures that were announced in budget 2011 for our

department. The reductions announced in budget 2011 for our department are actually \$56.8 million, so we're building up to a reduction of \$56.8 million in year three. The first-year reduction was \$9.1 million, which happened in this fiscal year, 2011-12, so money was taken away, again through the supplementary estimates process. The \$18.9 million is the reduction to the DFO budget as it is related to that exercise. In next year's mains, the reduction will be \$56.8 million.

The \$14.3 million is a sunsetting program that also is coming to an end. It is a sunsetting program relating to the Atlantic integrated commercial fisheries initiative, so this is one of our other sunset programs that is being completed this March.

On page 9, among the three last items you see, is the key fluctuation explaining the key decrease of \$13.1 million. That's in relation to the cashflow issue relating to the lobster sustainability program. In 2009, the department received close to \$65 million over five years for the lobster program. That program is sunsetting in March 2014. The cashflow for 2011-12 was \$21 million, and the projected spending for the completion of the program in 2012-13 is \$8 million, so this is why you see a decrease of \$13 million, and, in the final year, \$5 million.

The \$11.9 million is a decrease in funding to support science and sustainable fisheries. We received that back in 2007, with \$104 million for five years. A portion of that program is sunsetting. We have an ongoing portion of approximately \$10 million, but the sunsetting portion is actually ending this March and it is \$11.9 million.

The last item on the sheet is a \$10.2 million decrease. It relates to funding we received for the implementation of the Species at Risk Act. Again, in 2007 we received \$73.4 million over five years. A portion of that funding is sunsetting and a portion is ongoing. The portion that's ongoing is approximately \$8 million, and the portion that's actually sunsetting in March, because it's the last year for that money, is \$10.2 million.

I'll close this off at the last page and not repeat myself. I'll close by saying that this presents an overall view of our main estimates for 2012-13. Again, I remind folks that any decisions relating to budget 2012, which is anticipated in a few weeks—which could reflect also the famous decisions around the strategic and operating review exercise—would be addressed in that budget, so they are not reflected in the mains that you have right now.

Merci, monsieur le président.

• (1545)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Huppé. I really appreciate that overview and really appreciate the speed with which you ran through it. Thank you very much.

We'll proceed right into questions at this point.

Mr. Kamp, we'll begin with you.

Mr. Randy Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Ms. Dansereau and team, for being here to help us understand the estimates. It's not always an easy job, so I appreciate the clarity you've brought to it so far.

Just to follow up on Roch's explanation of these significant decreases, when you're referring to sunsetting programs like PICFI, for example, the Pacific integrated commercial fisheries initiative, or ACFI, or the science funding of \$11.9 million that's on there, for these programs that are five-year programs—so we would see them coming to an end this year—does that necessarily mean that they're coming to an end? Is it possible or likely that we might see an extension of these programs in the budget in a couple of weeks and that we'll then of course see them in subsequent main estimates? Can you just clarify that for the committee?

• (1550)

Ms. Claire Dansereau: We shouldn't make any assumptions around future spending around these programs. As all sunsetter programs do, they undergo a review at the end of five years to determine their value to Canadians, and then there are further budget discussions about them. So there are no decisions at this point. Seeing them here does not mean that they will continue or that they will come to an end.

Mr. Randy Kamp: Okay. Thank you for that.

Ms. Dansereau, near the end of your comments you referred to the modernization initiatives that have been ongoing. In particular, you referred to the coast guard initiative as it was developed through the strategic review process. I just wonder if you could give us more information about that. Does that impact the main estimates? And if it does, what progress are you making? At the end of the day, what might the coast guard look like after its modernization initiative?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: Thank you for the question. I will ask Jody to speak in greater depth to the question itself.

The technologies we use, particularly telecommunications but also any other of the tools we use, are moving and are rapidly changing and we need to take advantage of those. Wherever possible we need to be using the most modern technologies to provide the best coverage possible. So the changes you've heard us talk about for the

past year are a result of that kind of modernization as a result of technological change.

Jody will speak to this in greater detail.

Ms. Jody Thomas (Deputy Commissioner, Operations, Canadian Coast Guard, Department of Fisheries and Oceans):

Certainly the modernization of the coast guard is technology-based. Whether it's the new vessels that are coming into operation—we have ten vessels under construction right now, midshore patrol vessels and a new hovercraft that will change our capacity on water, because they are newer and better vessels—or some of the work we're doing to ensure that we maintain the same level of service to Canadians and to mariners and maintain the same safety profile but are able to do it with fewer people, we are leveraging technology wherever possible.

You will see in future that the coast guard includes an equally or potentially more effective on-water presence and provides an equally effective response to mariners, albeit from fewer locations, as we have seen the closure of the marine rescue subcentres.

Mr. Randy Kamp: Do we see examples of these changes, or are they reflected in the main estimates?

Mr. Roch Huppé: Actually in the reduction for year two in the \$18.9 million I was referring to, very little savings come from the coast guard at this point. The savings relating to the coast guard will appear mainly in year three. So actually around \$150,000 of the \$18.9 million is linked to coast guard initiatives at this point in year two.

Mr. Randy Kamp: Good. Thank you for that.

Let me just say as I move on here that I've done a number of events with the coast guard over the last year, and the morale seems to be quite high. So keep up the good work there.

Continuing on with the modernization theme, though it is not directly related to the main estimates here, we've been aware of the public consultation that's gone on throughout Canada, not just on the east coast. I'm just wondering, Ms. Dansereau or Mr. Stringer or Mr. Balfour, if you can tell us a little bit about that consultation. What motivated it? What are the issues that were brought to the forefront in the midst of it? What format did it take? And where is this leading in the future?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: Those are good questions. I will let Mr. Balfour and Mr. Stringer give more detailed answers on this, but I can tell you where it came from.

The department has been looking at its suite of policies for a number of years now. You may all know that we are in constant consultation with our stakeholders to make sure that the policy suite we have is actually legitimate and suitable to their needs. So when we began—I think it was in 2007—there were 40 such meetings across the country, to start the discussion around various policies. Then we announced the modernization within the strategic review, which led to some changes and some concerns on the part of our fishers, because there hadn't been a lot of consultation.

Once the announcements were made around strategic review, we reignited the consultation process to really discuss how we can better support the future of the fishery through our policies. We all know it's very complicated, and there are myriad rules, and we need to see if there is any possibility of reaching a consensus on our way forward in a world that is very much changing.

So it stems from both an ongoing consultation system we have with our stakeholders and the implementation of strategic review. Mr. Stringer and Mr. Balfour led these consultations, and Ms. Mithani was also there to make sure we could provide science-based answers.

I don't know, Mr. Chair, if you would like some further details on that.

• (1555)

The Chair: You have ten seconds left.

Mr. Kevin Stringer (Assistant Deputy Minister, Program Policy, Department of Fisheries and Oceans): As the deputy said, we've had these discussions for years, and this is the next round of discussions. It was largely based on a request from many stakeholders who were asking about our strategic review announcements around stability, what that was about. We talked about putting the fishery on a firmer footing, longer-term plans, those types of things. We had a number of conservation policies as well, sustainability policies we wanted to go out and consult on. We were consulting on sustainability policies; there were three of them. We were informing on how we're moving ahead with stability and a predictable and transparent environment and we were asking about what other views fishers and others may have in terms of our rules in terms of supporting economic prosperity going forward.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Ms. Doré Lefebvre.

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, for coming to explain the main estimates of Fisheries and Oceans Canada. We really appreciate that.

As I was reading the main estimates, I noticed that the budget for icebreaking services was being completely cut. In terms of icebreaking services, could you tell us specifically which services will be eliminated and how many jobs will be lost?

Mr. Roch Huppé: There are actually no cuts. There is a change in our program architecture. Icebreaking services are included under

what we call marine navigation services. So two program activities have been merged into one.

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre: So are any jobs being cut?

Mr. Roch Huppé: No.

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre: Great.

I am going to yield the floor to Jonathan.

Ms. Claire Dansereau: There are no reductions either.

Mr. Roch Huppé: Yes, there are no reductions.

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, NDP): Marine traffic is expected to increase. Perhaps the answer will be the same, but we can see in the budget that aids to navigation services are affected, eliminated. How will the department be able to fulfill its mandate if marine traffic increases?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: I can assure you that aids to navigation will never be completely cut; we are still going to have those services. Meanwhile, Roch will give you the technical explanation as to where you can find that money in the budget.

Mr. Roch Huppé: Those two programs that you mentioned are actually the two programs that have been merged to create marine navigation, one single program that now includes the icebreaking program and the aids to navigation program. So there are no budget cuts; there are simply two budgets that have been merged under the same program activity.

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay: Okay.

What was the amount in the past and what is the amount now that the two have been merged?

Mr. Roch Huppé: On the previous page, you can see that the amount for 2011-2012 was 37.7 and now it is 39.3.

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay: Thank you.

I will now yield the floor to my colleague Ryan.

[English]

Mr. Ryan Cleary (St. John's South—Mount Pearl, NDP): Thank you.

From the estimates, we talk about the significant decreases, and they are significant. You add them up and it's \$35 million. Plus, you have the decreases that are coming, that are expected with the end-of-March budget. I believe each federal department is looking at cuts between 5% and 10%.

My question is a pretty broad question. Considering the cuts we've experienced and considering the cuts that are coming, how can Canadians expect to have faith in the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans to carry out its mandate when so much of the funding has been cut? Mr. Kamp, when he asked his question, asked about morale within the Canadian Coast Guard. But what's the morale like in DFO overall?

•(1600)

Ms. Claire Dansereau: Thank you for the question.

I think there are three parts to it. One, we can't talk about the future in future budgets, so I can't predict whether our budget will go up or down. We know we put forward proposals.

Mr. Ryan Cleary: Maybe you can talk about Canadians having faith in your department to do what needs to be done.

Ms. Claire Dansereau: Certainly. That was the third part of the question. The second part of the question is the magnitude of the cuts that you see here. As we did say earlier, some of the cuts, or what appear to be cuts, are sunsetter programs, and we don't know whether they will be found in the next budget.

On the issue of morale within the public service in general, I can say that there was a survey done. As you know, we do a survey every three years. We were very pleased to see that morale is not decreasing. There are areas where people are concerned, obviously, and because of the survey we will be able to work on those areas.

In terms of service to Canadians, we can assure you that the programs and the desired outcomes of the programs don't change for us. We will make sure that the service to Canadians is what is required according to our mandate. As you know, strategic review was designed to allow us to look at areas that might not be in our mandate to try to streamline and move forward, as any good business ought to do. So we are confident that the budget that is being discussed here is one that will meet the needs.

Mr. Ryan Cleary: I want to get specifically into that \$11.9 million cut to science and sustainable fisheries. How will that impact various regions at DFO? For example, how will that impact Newfoundland and Labrador?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: That's one of the sunsetter programs, and it is one we are looking at very carefully. As I say, we don't know what will come from the budget, but any priority areas of science that need to be done will be done.

Mr. Ryan Cleary: What difference will the Newfoundland and Labrador region see in science with that almost \$12 million cut?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: I can't tell you specifically in that almost \$12 million cut, because, as I say, there is still some consideration on that. I can say that there was some nervousness last year when we talked about multi-species assessments and some changes to how we do our science. We can assure you that we are simply moving towards multi-species assessments for those species of fish that don't require annual assessments. For those that do require annual assessments, the science will continue in order for us to be able to make sound decisions. Science will be targeted at allowing us to provide the minister with the best information to make the best decisions for Canadians.

Mr. Ryan Cleary: Let me ask you a question, then, on multi-year assessments. The question has been raised by industry whether or not that would apply to every species out there. The concern has been raised that shrimp, for example, off the northeast coast of Newfoundland may fall under a multi-year assessment. Would it?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: Some species require assessment even more than once a year. Some species require a yearly assessment, and some species are okay for a three-to-five year period. Our

decisions on that will be based on the requirements of the species. Whether the shrimp will be.... No, I would say not. It will not be a multi-year species, whereas some of the groundfish will be.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Ms. Davidson, you have the floor.

Mrs. Patricia Davidson (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Thanks very much, Mr. Chair.

Thanks very much for being with us today. We certainly appreciate the information, and certainly the explanation beforehand was very helpful. Although a lot of us have been through the estimates several times, they are always still confusing, so it's great to hear the explanation.

My riding is on the Great Lakes, so I'm going to talk a little bit more about that area of DFO.

First of all, I want to talk about invasive species. We know that it's a real, great threat to our watershed systems. When I'm looking at the estimate, it appears that program funding for the aquatic invasive species is in fact being decreased. Could you explain why that would be? Why would they cut that funding when we're looking at really important things such as the Asian carp? I know we're working with our U.S. counterparts, but everything we are talking about is just horrendously expensive.

Have I read that correctly? Is that amount being decreased?

•(1605)

Mr. Roch Huppé: No, actually the amount is fairly stable. We have a difference of \$40,000 on that particular item. That amount remains stable from the last fiscal year.

Mrs. Patricia Davidson: Okay. How does that compare with what the United States is spending on invasive species? Do you know that?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: Roch won't be able to answer that.

We are obviously a much smaller country than the United States. We try to keep our funding somewhat in parallel with theirs, although we will never be able to fund to the extent they do. But we do work very closely with them through a series of working groups on carp and on other species. They do appreciate the efforts we make, and they are supportive of our approaches. I can't say exactly what the comparisons are, but we work with the United States on anything we do in the Great Lakes and other parts of Canada where there is a relationship with them.

Mrs. Patricia Davidson: It's my understanding that we don't have any specified programs for the Great Lakes. What kind of funding support is available from DFO for dealing with things that are specific to the Great Lakes fisheries?

And when we're talking about funding, I'm glad to hear the funding is not being decreased to the invasive species portion, because I think that's extremely important. Is there any way we can address the urgency of protecting the Great Lakes waters from these invasive species? Is there a particular program we could enter into?

I just don't think our investment is in line with the importance of the fisheries in that area, whether it be commercial or sport, and the protection of our Great Lakes waters in general.

Ms. Claire Dansereau: Thank you.

The management of the fishery itself is delegated to the province, but management of the aquatic invasive species is something we do jointly with Ontario and the United States.

Siddika can speak to some of this. She's on the Great Lakes Commission, and then there's an aquatic invasive species working group.

We are extremely active. Could we do more? Probably. But we know we're paying very close attention, certainly to the Asian carp and the sea lamprey, and to the other species that might be at risk.

We also work with the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters. They can reach a whole lot of people who might be bringing species into the Great Lakes.

A lot of our focus is also on education, and we've done some good work on the ballast water. You may know that.

We look at various ways we can educate the public to not bring in the species and make sure we have the systems in place for an emergency response should Asian carp actually breach the barriers that are there.

Siddika can talk a little bit more about the work we do in our various working groups.

Dr. Siddika Mithani (Assistant Deputy Minister, Ecosystems and Oceans Science Sector, Department of Fisheries and Oceans): With the U.S., we do have a joint research program looking at research monitoring analysis of aquatic invasive species. What's really important and very critical is... I previously talked about the binational risk assessment that should be published very shortly. A lot of work on the Asian carp is coming to a critical stage. Within the binational risk assessment, we've looked at arrival, survival, establishment, and spread from a scientific perspective. That particular document will provide management with potential

areas for monitoring and what management needs to do in order to look at prevention.

It is coming to a head, and we will see a lot more management and joint management programs, particularly with Asian carp, but also joint research with aquatic invasive species.

• (1610)

Ms. Claire Dansereau: If I may add, we can't say arrival, survival, and spread, because it hasn't arrived.

Mrs. Patricia Davidson: Did I understand you correctly, in answer to my colleague's question about the ice-breaking, that there is no change in that and it's rolled into a different area in here?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: That's correct.

Mrs. Patricia Davidson: As you know, my riding is the largest hub for the coast guard in all of Canada. Those are things that are certainly of interest to me and the area I represent.

Are there decreases in here that are going to impact the local hub of the coast guard?

Ms. Jody Thomas: No. There's nothing in the main estimates that affects the coast guard based in Sarnia at all, or their work in the Great Lakes area.

Mrs. Patricia Davidson: When you were doing the presentation you talked about significant increases, including \$5.1 million to help Canadians adapt to the impacts of climate change under the clean air agenda. I think that's a staggering amount, and maybe some of it could be better used for invasive species and some of the things that are quite pertinent, I think, to the protection of our waters.

Ms. Claire Dansereau: If I may, we will not be dealing with the clean air component of that. We will be dealing with any potential impacts of climate change. That could be aquatic invasive species. It could be damage to small craft harbours. It could be a whole series of things.

We will not be dealing with the clean air. Exactly how you describe it is where—

Mrs. Patricia Davidson: When will those things be rolled out? When will we know that?

The Chair: We have time for a quick answer.

Dr. Siddika Mithani: Currently we are looking at priorities within DFO in terms of research, monitoring, surveillance, etc. That funding is being looked at on a priority basis—a list of priorities for DFO and what research would be required under this particular funding envelope. It also includes freshwater issues; it's not just limited to climate change as a whole.

So there will be some funding going toward some of those issues that you mentioned.

Mrs. Patricia Davidson: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Welcome to all.

For 2010 through to 2011, what was the small craft harbour budget? Was that the largest over the last number of years?

Mr. Roch Huppé: I don't have the exact numbers in front of me for 2010-11—it's two years ago—but the fact is that it's true, in 2010-11 the number was higher as a result of the economic action plan money.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: How much higher was it? Do you have any idea?

Mr. Roch Huppé: It was probably around \$100 million higher.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: So it was \$100 million higher; and there are still a few wharves that could stand a few dollars.

Mr. Roch Huppé: Potentially, yes.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Okay. Thank you.

The amount for the Atlantic lobster sustainability measures was reduced from \$21 million to \$8 million—a \$13-million decrease. What was the reason for that? Was it because it did not take capacity out of the fishery, or is it possible that there's another program that would be coming into play that would help remove the capacity in the fishery?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: It's not a reduction in the program itself; it's a matter of how the cashflow was distributed over the five years.

You may know that this was a proposal-driven program. When we described the main estimates, we described what last year's cashflow or spending would have been. This year's is lower because we're reaching the end of the program.

So it's simply a matter of how the money was distributed over time.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: I thank you very much.

What was the total amount allocated to that program?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: It was \$50 million.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Was it spent?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: It will be spent when the time is up.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: All of the \$50 million?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: Yes.

•(1615)

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Thank you very much.

The big concern is the loss of \$12 million in science. Do you see this as having a major impact on the scientific information that's provided by the department?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: Well, as we say, we don't know yet if that's where we will be with the budget in the future. In the meantime, we are making sure that the priorities that are really required for science and for decision-making will be met.

So we will make sure there is not that significant an impact.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: So it might not be that there will be these cuts?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: Well, as in all mains—

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: If these cuts come into play, which we suspect they will, will they have a major impact on the scientific information that fishery is able to receive?

Ms. Claire Dansereau: As I said, we will prioritize in the scientific activities that we need, and I can't predict.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Are you reducing the number of issue-specific science experts on DFO staff? Has there been a reduction? If so, I'd just like to know how many.

Ms. Claire Dansereau: There has been a change in our approach, which we are currently implementing, as we said earlier, through strategic review, moving towards multi-year science. That's as much as we've done so far.

And the minister has arrived.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Thank you very much.

I want to certainly welcome the minister to the committee.

Hon. Keith Ashfield (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): It's always good to see you, Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: And very good to see you.

Now, I wonder if there's any possibility we could get an answer—

Voices: Oh, oh!

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: —on the only thing my fishermen are concerned about and want to know: Is it true that you confirmed to a number of fishermen at the Boston Seafood Show that this massive midshore trawler from the Barry Group, as it's suspected, would receive a licence to be able to fish herring deeper and take more herring? Is it true that they did not catch herring last year, and that this new method, and this bigger vessel, will allow them to catch herring, and possibly end up removing the herring stock from the Gulf of St. Lawrence?

Mr. Minister, I'm sure you're aware of the devastating effect this will have on the fishery. We all know that herring is the food source for all the fishery. I'd like to have this confirmed. Is it true that you have indicated that this vessel has received a licence to fish in the gulf?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: On a pilot project basis, yes, that is true. Similar to what we did last year off the Magdalen Islands, they conducted a pilot fishery and were unsuccessful in that fishery. The pilot project we're trying for this year is on the edge of 4T, a mid-water trawl. It's a one-year pilot project.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: As you can understand, Mr. Minister, this is of great concern to my fishermen.

What would the TAC be for this pilot project?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: I'll leave the technical questions on the TAC to Mr. Balfour.

Mr. David Balfour (Senior Assistant Deputy Minister, Ecosystems and Fisheries Management, Department of Fisheries and Oceans): The quota for this project would be within the 5,000 tonnes that are assigned for the project, which is within the allocation that's provided to the Barry Group. There are no additional herring being provided to the seiner group, other than what is already provided for in the management plan. It will be a well-monitored project, with observers on board and dockside monitors to ensure that the quotas are respected.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: I understand quite well, Mr. Balfour. But am I correct in saying that they were not able to catch the quota last year, but because of the change in the gear they will be able to catch the quota this year? Keep in mind that off Fisherman's Bank and Pictou Island, and areas that I represent, the herring catch is way down. Possibly you'll be able to announce today that the quota will go up in these areas, but I would wonder what is the rationale for why this would take place when it seems to me that the catch is going down instead of up. What would be the reasoning? It could be a pilot project, but a pilot project for what?

It's my understanding that they could not catch the herring with the net size they had last year. Correct me if I'm wrong, but you have now allocated to this group a deeper, larger net that will catch the herring. This means that you're going to take herring that could not be caught previously out of the mix. What will happen if one entire school or family of fish is removed? Where do we go then? Do you have any plan for that?

It's a very serious issue. I was involved in this herring issue. And it's not Liberal-Conservative, it's government, period. It's just that it's wrong, in my view.

• (1620)

Mr. David Balfour: First, science advice tells us that the herring that congregate south of the Magdalen Islands, at the edge of the St. Lawrence Channel, in area 4T, are a mix of fall-spawning herring, and that—

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Fall and spring, you're talking about.

Mr. David Balfour: It's primarily a mix of fall-spawning herring. This will be the third year of the project. In 2010 this project was able to take primarily fall herring, with a very modest catch of spring-spawning herring, and the seiners used their allocations of spring herring to be able to account for those catches. Last year they did not, as you pointed out, get very successful fishing results, and the reason for that—

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: That's easy for you—

The Chair: Mr. MacAulay, your time's expired here. I've been more than generous.

Mr. David Balfour: —is that the herring are congregating at lower depths of water. But the current integrated fisheries management plan in fact provides the authority to allow the use of a mid-water trawl in the herring fishery, so this year it's been decided to allow this project to proceed, all within the quotas assigned to the company, using a mid-water trawl, with the monitoring regime that we have in place in terms of observers and dockside monitors, in order that this company can see if they can harvest the herring they have the quotas to harvest in that area and within the sustainability imperatives that are important to us.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Balfour.

Mr. Minister, I want to say welcome to the committee. It's always a pleasure to have you here.

Hon. Keith Ashfield: I was almost hijacked by Mr. MacAulay when I walked in the door.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: I wouldn't do that.

The Chair: That's quite common in the committee here, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, I believe you have some opening comments. I'll give you the floor to make your comments, and then we'll proceed to questions.

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon, and thank you for inviting me to discuss Fisheries and Oceans Canada's main estimates.

I want to thank my deputy, Claire Dansereau, and members of our department's management team for starting the discussion with the committee. I understand that our chief financial officer has presented the highlights of our main estimates to you already.

The estimates represent a snapshot in time of the government's spending plans. Our fiscal outlook for the year ahead will be reflected more fully in the budget that will be presented in two weeks by my colleague, the Minister of Finance.

I'd like to take this opportunity first to thank this committee for its excellent work. I appreciated your insight into the snow crab industry in Atlantic Canada and Quebec, and I'm looking forward to your report on closed containment salmon aquaculture.

I'm also very appreciative to have this chance to talk with you and share my thoughts on Canadian fisheries, aquaculture, and other marine sectors, and to inform you about how we are advancing the three main strategic objectives of Fisheries and Oceans Canada: economically prosperous maritime sectors and fisheries, sustainable aquatic ecosystems, and safe and secure waters.

Under the objective of economically prosperous maritime sectors and fisheries, we continuously undertake activities to ensure that Canada's fisheries and related economic benefits are operating at their fullest potential.

Under sustainable aquatic ecosystems we focus on the conservation, protection, and sustainability of Canada's aquatic ecosystems by managing the risks that affect species, oceans, and fish.

Under safe and secure waters we lead, deliver, and maintain the preparedness for the maritime component of the federal search-and-rescue system with our partners.

As I am sure you're aware, there is a lot going on in our marine environments in addition to fishing. The total value of Canada's oceans and marine activities, including fisheries, offshore oil and gas, marine transportation, aquaculture, ecotourism, and cruises, is currently worth more than \$28 billion, and there remains considerable unrealized economic potential.

Fish and seafood are one of the largest single food commodities exported by Canada. The sector currently employs approximately 80,000 Canadians who are involved in commercial fishing, aquaculture, and processing activities.

After five years of decline between 2004 and 2009, last year represented a small increase in Canada's export numbers. While this is a positive indicator, I believe we still have work to do to make sure that Canada remains a world leader in this industry. There are also significant growth opportunities in the fisheries, with world demand expected to continue to grow over the next decade.

The World Bank estimates that \$50 billion is lost annually from this industry around the world due to poor management. According to a forecast by the OECD, global per capita consumption of seafood is projected to increase by about 5% in the next eight years. This represents a tremendous opportunity for more jobs and more economic growth in our coastal and rural regions. There is a growing global demand for the product, and we could be better positioned to capture that market share.

Canada's fishery sector is going through fundamental changes driven by significant and unprecedented shifts in global economics, market demand for sustainable seafood, and environmental realities. According to Christian Brun of the Maritime Fisherman's Union,

The main problem our Atlantic fisheries face is price for its products. ...the dockside price for lobster has dropped sharply since 2008 because of both the strengthening of our Canadian dollar and the on-going recession in the United States, our main lobster market. These are the main reasons why the Canadian lobster fishery is less competitive and prosperous today than it was a few years ago.

Mr. Brun goes on to say that we need to look at ways to increase the value of our fisheries and work together to make things better.

I agree with Mr. Brun. We have important challenges ahead of us to ensure that Canada's fishery and aquaculture sectors take advantage of growing market opportunities and maximize the economic value of this resource in a dynamic and changing global marketplace.

The recent engagement exercise undertaken by DFO was intended to do two things: talk about change that is ongoing in the department and industry, and review future opportunities for the industry. There is no doubt that this sparked a lively debate, and one that is, quite frankly, welcome.

• (1625)

This is a preliminary discussion to examine the multiple rules that drive our current system and to see how fisheries management can be advanced to meet the needs of today.

The department is currently working on some changes to our management practices, which were outlined last year. We are developing evergreen multi-year fisheries management plans for key fish stocks where levels are sustainable. We are also introducing a multi-year planning cycle for science advice to support management plans and total allowable catch limits for fisheries.

Moving to this multi-year approach provides conditions that allow individual fishermen to better plan for the long term, to make better business decisions, and to maximize the potential of the harvest. Doing so should eliminate some uncertainty for fishermen that results from using an annual approach.

Through ongoing and constant consultations and dialogue, the department is constantly reviewing and renewing its policies to better meet the needs of fishermen today. We are also constantly reviewing and renewing how we protect fish and fish habitat across the country. We're blessed with an abundant array of natural resources, which we should be proud of, and we should take seriously our responsibility to conserve and protect them.

Some of the federal fisheries policies that currently exist to protect fish and their habitat are not focused on the real needs of Canadians or the environment. I am sure that you, as members of Parliament who represent Canadians, are well aware of instances in which Fisheries and Oceans Canada policies go beyond protecting habitat and frankly become irritants to farmers, landowners, municipalities, and others.

No decision has been taken at this time, but we are looking at ways to change fisheries policies so they focus on the priorities of Canadians rather than prevent Canadian farmers from cleaning out ditches, stop people from draining flooded fields and campsites, or disallow cottage owners from keeping up their properties.

Finally, Fisheries and Oceans Canada includes the Canadian Coast Guard, a proud national institution that plays a key role in the maritime economy through ensuring the safe navigation of marine transportation and providing maritime services such as search and rescue, environmental response, and ice-breaking.

The coast guard continues to deliver on its motto: Safety First, Service Always. The Canadian Coast Guard provides the on-water platforms for other government departments and agencies for research or law enforcement or public safety.

We are very pleased to be celebrating the coast guard's 50th anniversary this year. We will be celebrating the tireless contribution of the men and women of the Canadian Coast Guard throughout this year, and I invite all members of the committee to visit our website for information on upcoming events. We are honoured that the coast guard is now featured on a Canadian stamp, and that the CCGS *Amundsen* will be on the new 50-dollar bill.

We are also very proud that the largest and most capable icebreaker ever built in Canada, the *John G. Diefenbaker*, in addition to many other smaller vessels across the country, is now under development. In November I had the opportunity to unveil the first of the new Hero class vessels being built at the Irving shipyard in Halifax. These vessels are named after Canadian heroes killed in the line of duty.

The mandate of my department is important to all Canadians. Canada is blessed with the longest coastline in the world, as well as with abundant natural resources and beauty, things of which we can all be very proud.

We take seriously our responsibility to conserve and protect our resources and to ensure that they contribute to the economic prosperity of our country today and for our grandchildren.

Thank you very much.

That's my opening statement. I'd be happy to address any questions.

• (1630)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister.

We'll begin with Mr. Kamp.

Mr. Randy Kamp: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have just one question. Then, with your permission, I'll turn it over to my colleague Mr. Leef, who will have some additional questions.

Thank you, Minister, for being here. It's always good to hear about where you think things are headed for Fisheries and Oceans Canada.

My question is about the ISA virus. Over the last several months we've heard about it a number of times. It gets raised in this committee from time to time as well, with regard to both the west coast and, more recently, the east coast.

I'm from B.C., so I wanted to ask you what is happening with regard to this virus in B.C. The most recent report I've seen is actually from yesterday. One of the anti-aquaculture activists indicated in her blog that she had identified another five fish with the ISA virus. She did point out that she bought most of them in an Asian supermarket, so I'm not sure what we think of the chain of evidence there and so on.

Can you or your officials tell us just generally what we should be thinking and what comfort we can take in terms of the presence or not of the ISA virus in British Columbia?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: My answers to the question in the House I think have been fairly clear in that regard. We're always wary about making sure we address this issue and ensure it's not present on the B.C. coastline. It's never been confirmed in wild Pacific or farmed salmon in British Columbia. That's the position we take, and it's based on all the testing we've conducted over the course of many years.

CFIA is the lead for the investigation into all of these reportable diseases, and it constantly addresses these concerns and goes through testing processes to ensure ISA doesn't exist. But to date, we have no confirmed cases of ISA in British Columbia farmed or wild salmon.

Mr. Randy Kamp: So you're confident, between your department and CFIA, that the monitoring program to be proactive about that—not just testing when one is reported—is adequate.

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Yes, we are confident that we understand the importance of this issue. CFIA is currently going through a process of developing a new testing mechanism to ensure we are at the top level on this. We feel confident to date that we're in pretty good position. We regularly test salmon, both wild and farmed. If we can improve that, that's all the better. Of course we're always looking for improvements in anything we do.

Mr. Randy Kamp: Thanks very much.

•(1635)

Mr. Ryan Leef (Yukon, CPC): Mr. Minister, you touched on this in your opening remarks, and I know you've addressed it a bit in the House, but I'm trusting that the Canadian public will probably find tuning into this committee more interesting than watching question period. So I'll maybe give you another opportunity to provide us with some of the examples we've heard you mention around the strict application of regulations and policies that, quite honestly, people in rural and urban Canada probably find defy common-sense application and are convoluted at times. We certainly hear that.

It impedes not just development activities. I think we hear the opposition—not this opposition—a lot of times talk about how we're trying to do something to purely enhance business. You did give some examples about how these applications are just affecting small operations, farmers trying to clear fields. Maybe for the benefit of the committee you could just highlight a few of the examples you've touched on in the past of where we need to make more sensible application of these policies.

Hon. Keith Ashfield: We're looking at the current policies. There have been a lot of concerns expressed by Canadians from a habitat perspective right straight across the country—not only in the west but on the east coast I hear it all the time—and how we need to improve the processes we use to ensure people aren't harassed in their everyday lives.

Sometimes our habitat rules go a little too far. One of the examples I gave today in the House, for example, was of a field that was flooded. An annual jamboree takes place in that area and they wanted to drain it to ensure it was ready for the summer jamboree, which we almost lost, by the way. Fish had ended up in that field, carp. And because of section 35 they had to fish that area before they could drain it, which didn't make a lot of sense. Those types of things should not happen. We put at risk an old jamboree that had been going on for some years. Those types of applications don't make any sense.

Another example is farmers who have a ditch running through their property and want to clean the ditch out. But because a fish might pass through, we don't allow them to clean out their ditches without going through extraordinary efforts and costs and potentially, if they don't meet those requirements, fines. There are a lot of areas that don't make sense for Canadians. We have to try to make more sense of them.

At the same time, we do have to protect our habitat and we have to protect our fishery, but the rules we have... There is little or no flexibility in the current rules to address those types of issues. So I think it's important that we take a look at them and see if there's something we can do.

The Chair: Thank you. Your time's expired.

Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. Fin Donnelly (New Westminster—Coquitlam, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Welcome to the committee, Minister. Thank you for coming in front of us and bringing your team. I appreciate your presence and your time here.

The government is planning to do away with the fleet separation and owner-operator policy, and in Atlantic Canada the independent fleet sector is the largest private sector employer. It's made up of 10,616 individual licence-holders. The sector creates an estimated additional 20,000 jobs for crew members. There are also indirect jobs in boat construction, gear supply, and maintenance. There are about 1,300 coastal communities that house these independent fishing enterprises. I want to note, too, that we've introduced a motion on the subject, so this committee will be talking about that in short order.

I'm wondering if the government has done any analysis of the potential impact of the elimination of this policy on independent fishers and coastal communities.

Hon. Keith Ashfield: First of all, right off the bat you say that we're going to eliminate these things. We're currently reviewing all of our policies, so I don't think it's fair to say we're going to eliminate anything.

Of course I am concerned about our fisheries and our fishing communities. We entered a process where I was seeking input and advice from fishermen and people across the country with an interest in fisheries who could provide us with information and advice on how we could improve the overall management of the fishery. We have received a lot of information, a lot of advice. We're currently looking at all that. I don't feel that I should just accept the advice I receive from DFO. I think I have to go out and see for myself. I engage Canadians. I have to listen to fishermen to get their feedback.

I've heard a lot of fishermen say that we have too many rules, that it doesn't make sense, that it's inhibiting their opportunity to grow. If it's inhibiting their opportunity to grow, it's going to have an impact on the communities where they live. So I think it's important that we take a look at the overall policies of the department. If we can improve them to make it better for fishermen and ensure that we have vital fishing communities, that's all to the good. These communities are an important part of eastern Canada and western Canada, and inshore as well. We have to be aware of that.

I think it's incumbent upon me to take a look at ways we can improve and grow the fishery.

•(1640)

Mr. Fin Donnelly: You're not planning on eliminating this policy?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: It's purely consultation at this point, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. Fin Donnelly: If there were to be a decision to eliminate this policy or change this policy, would there be an analysis done on the impact?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Well, that would be conjecture, to begin with. Certainly we're always evaluating, and there are ways to obtain information on the Atlantic fishery, not only through DFO but also through other organizations, like ACOA. They do analyses of the fishery on the east coast of Canada. That's one example. There are ways we can ascertain the impacts. We're slipping in our export ranking, which is not a good sign. If we don't do anything, we're not going to have a fishery.

Young people aren't entering the fishery. It's getting more and more difficult for them to get involved. They're voting with their boots, so to speak, and they're heading west, where they can make a good dollar. A lot of them are not prepared to live a life where they're just making a minimal wage.

We have to ensure that we can grow that area. We have to make sure we have people to work in our fish plants, and that's becoming a problem. We have an aging workforce, and we are having great difficulties in attracting people to work in the fish plants. In the southeastern part of my province, they have to bring in 200 people a year because they can't get people to work in the fish plants. There are some major concerns we have to worry about if we're going to have a fishery for the future.

Mr. Fin Donnelly: I understand. The input and the feedback I'm hearing is that they want to see a recovery plan as well and a commitment to a recovery plan, especially on the Atlantic coast.

In your opening remarks you talked about habitat protection. In the questions you also pointed out an example of a jamboree in a field. Isn't it more to the point of looking at pipeline projects and that you've been intensely lobbied by large organizations, with more of a focus on pipelines and oil transportation off the coast, perhaps mining and other major activities? Isn't that more of a concern? Certainly it's come to light.

As you know, I've been asking in question period about this fact that the department intends to make sweeping changes to section 35 of the Fisheries Act, and that will have a major significant impact on habitat protection. With cuts of \$10.2 million to species-at-risk recovery, \$11.9 million from science and sustainable fisheries, and cuts of \$6.7 million to environmental assessment regulation for major natural resource projects, is it safe to assume that DFO is indeed pulling out of habitat protection when assessing major projects? I specifically mention pipelines, oil tankers, mining operations, and not just farmers' fields, bridges, roads, and housing developments.

●(1645)

Hon. Keith Ashfield: It wouldn't be responsible for me as Minister of Fisheries to do anything that would impact on habitat, habitat protection, and the protection of fish. That's my primary focus. We're looking at all of our policies, but rest assured that it would not impact...if there are any changes. Who knows? I don't know for sure. No decisions have been made, but we're looking at things.

The primary thing is that we will protect our habitat and our fish. The funding programs that you mentioned were sunset programs, and I think my staff has probably talked to you about those already.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Sopuck.

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette, CPC): Thank you very much.

I have one initial comment, quickly, looking at your three strategic outcomes. As I look at my colleagues from this side of the House, four of the six of us come from freshwater areas. So I think we all put a plea in for more fisheries enhancement work in freshwater areas. Minister, that's fair warning that I think we'll be pushing the department in that direction, hopefully.

I will follow up on Mr. Donnelly's questions.

Minister, it seems obvious to me that if departmental expenditures and efforts are reduced in these "trivial areas", like worrying about farmers' fields and jamboree grounds, and so on, you will be able to devote more resources to the high-priority habitat areas Mr. Donnelly referred to.

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Thank you for your question.

Certainly there will be more focus on species of fish and habitat, and we should probably be spending more time focusing on these rather than the ones you indicated. Based on that, it would make sense that we could realign our resources and do a better job of enforcing issues that should be our primary interest.

Mr. Robert Sopuck: Yes, I couldn't agree more. As a person who loves fish to catch, eat, look at, and just be around, I must say that we can't underestimate the challenges that our fisheries department faces in managing fish. In fact, in the Oceans Day on the Hill event yesterday, one of the speakers pointed out that counting fish is just like counting trees, except fish are invisible and they move around. So the challenges that you face are absolutely enormous, especially in managing open-ocean fisheries.

One of the things I'm very interested in is the area of fish population enhancement. I didn't see those words in any of the documents here. At DFO, do you plan to continue the great work that you've done with groups like the Atlantic Salmon Federation in creating a private-public partnership in the \$30-million range to enhance a fish that is worth at least \$138 million to eastern Canada?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: There was a trust fund put in place of about \$30 million for that particular program. That was implemented to use the interest garnered from that fund to invest in fish enhancement, so that's an ongoing effort. They have their funds. They had some challenges when we had a downturn and the recession, but they're well on track again now, and they do great work.

Which do you like better, Atlantic salmon or B.C. salmon?

Mr. Robert Sopuck: I'm an Atlantic man, I must say.

In that regard, I do think that your department should take some credit for the rebound in the Atlantic salmon stocks. It's a prime example of what can happen when like-minded groups in both the public and the private sectors work together. My only plea is a one-word plea: more. Those programs really work, and they're the kinds of programs that people actually want.

In terms of the Species At Risk Act, one species I'm very concerned about in inland Canada is the sturgeon. The fact that it is potentially a SARA-listed species has some tremendous potential impacts on Manitoba's hydro development, potentially in the order of \$2 billion. Again, is that a situation we can work on to ensure that those developments can proceed, and that these species will be conserved?

• (1650)

Hon. Keith Ashfield: I might defer that to somebody on staff here who has more knowledge about the sturgeon than I do. I know we have our sturgeon in Atlantic Canada as well. Specifically to projects....

Mr. David Balfour: In a general sense, we'd be looking for opportunity for mitigation so that there could be a way forward to allow economic activity to occur, while at the same time protecting a species at risk. That would be the basis of engagement we'd have in this project, as we would with others.

Mr. Robert Sopuck: I had a meeting with people from the Canadian Hydropower Association, and they were very concerned about the Species At Risk Act, as you know. One particularly egregious example was where they were stocking the river with sturgeon that they paid for and raised themselves. If one of those fish had become entrained, they would have likely been in legal jeopardy. That's not a failure of your department; that's a failure of the act itself. I think that the Fisheries Act and the Species At Risk Act are two acts we need to look at.

I want to just get back to the habitat enforcement side of things, Minister. Do you think that today's habitat enforcement programs that deliver very few results, in my view, can be refocused to become enabling programs to assist local communities right across the country to enhance and conserve fish populations of interest to those local communities? Is there a possibility of refocusing those efforts on something you were discussing a minute ago?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: There's a lot of that now. In British Columbia, for example, we have people who work with local groups for stream enhancements and those types of things. If we can refocus ourselves, perhaps we may be able to spend more time in those areas, but it's premature at this point. We're just looking at everything in general.

Mr. Robert Sopuck: I have one more question.

In terms of the Pacific salmon enhancement programs, can you describe them? Those are multi-million-dollar fisheries, and I'm a big fan of salmon enhancement programs on the west coast. Are they still going, and are they being funded at a level that they can be effective?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Let me defer that again to Mr. Balfour. He'd know the specifics.

Mr. David Balfour: Going back to Roch Huppé's presentations on main estimates, there are no reductions to the budgets for the salmon enhancement program. That's a program that is a mix of hatchery operations, semi-natural production, and a lot of collaborative work that's done with community-based organizations to produce salmon and to restore and protect their fish habitat. It does make a direct contribution to both the fisheries and to the departmental implementation of the wild salmon policy.

Ms. Claire Dansereau: We will keep a close eye on that program, though, because there have been some projects in the past that have actually created some harm to some of the wild species. So we do keep an eye on that.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Go ahead, Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Minister, I don't even recall if I welcomed you. If I did, I will again. It's very good to have you here. And I have a number of questions.

Fisheries are very important where I come from, and I think you understand that. Do you believe advisory groups are important in the process? Do you consult with advisory groups and take their recommendations? Just how do you handle that?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Well, advisory groups are obviously important to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. We consult on a regular basis with many people, and obviously we take their advice, and if there are opportunities for us to use that advice, we will.

First-hand knowledge, dealing on the ground with people who are actually living what they live, that's the type of information we need to make decisions.

• (1655)

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Thank you very much.

Did you discuss with the herring advisory group before you made the decision to give the Barry Group this quota, which as far as I can find out is not very acceptable to anybody who's involved in the herring fishery?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Well, my understanding is that there was a meeting of that committee last week or the week before, but Mr. Balfour has the details. I believe he was there.

Mr. David Balfour: I wasn't at that meeting, Minister, but it did take place last week. That meeting was primarily focused on advice around setting TACs for the spring- and fall-spawning herring stocks. Also at that meeting, there was a reporting out of the results of the pilot fishery 4T on the edge of the St. Lawrence channel and the results for 2011.

At that meeting, the department did inform the participants that we were going to allow the participants in the project the use of mid-water trawl in the 2012 project, as is provided for already in the integrated fish harvesting management plan.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: What you're telling me, Mr. Balfour, is that there was no consultation with the herring advisory group, that the department informed them as to what was going to take place. Would that be correct, just for the record? Or was there discussion on whether this should or should not happen? It seems to make sense to me that if you have an advisory group, perhaps you might look for some advice from them before you make the decision. All I want to know is whether you did.

Mr. David Balfour: At this meeting—

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Or did you in previous meetings? Did you discuss with the herring advisory group as to whether this quota should be given to the Barry Group? That's all I want to know.

Mr. David Balfour: The Barry Group has its quotas as a seiner. There has been no creation of quotas as a result of this.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: I stand corrected, Mr. Balfour. It was the change in vessel and the change in the type of net—the larger net that can go deeper.

You explained quite clearly to the committee that this is a quota they have, but this is a quota they couldn't catch. And in Prince Edward Island they cannot catch their quota either.

I just want to know if you discussed with the advisory group that you and the department or the minister were going to allocate whatever—a trial run or whatever it is in the fishery—in order for them to get 5,000 tonnes of herring, when everybody else in the Atlantic region cannot catch their herring.

Was there discussion or was there not?

Mr. David Balfour: The 5,000 tonnes is the allocation this company had in 2011 and will have again in 2012.

A mid-water trawl is permitted in the herring fishery and is provided for already in the integrated fish management plan. On the basis of the results of the experiment in 2011, where we discussed the herring were congregating at lower levels in the water column, we are going to permit the company to use a mid-water trawl in order that they have a better opportunity of harvesting what is—

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: I am aware.

Mr. David Balfour: —a quota they have been provided, which was established within the sustainability limits on the basis of scientific advice, a quota they're provided for. This is in the same way we would work with other gear groups to see how we could find ways and means to improve their ability to harvest their quotas too.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Do we expect that the quota for Prince Edward Island—off Fisherman's Bank and other areas—will

go up or go down? What do you expect will take place? You must have the information. You have the scientists. You have the numbers.

Mr. David Balfour: There's scientific advice that was presented at the herring advisory meeting last week that is suggesting that the spring-spawning herring stock is slightly inside the critical zone, which will likely mean that there will be advice coming forward for us to look at a reduction in TAC on spring herring.

The fall-spawning herring has dropped slightly into the cautious zone. Again, we'll have to consider that in terms of TAC, but—

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Thank you very much.

Obviously, then, we're probably in the critical area with the stock, but still we're allowing different types of nets and vessels for midshore, for the Barry Group. Was the same type of...? What happened off the coast of British Columbia when you changed the halibut quota from 88% and 12% to 15% and 85%? Was there consultation with the commercial fishermen? Did they agree with what you did?

● (1700)

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Well, certainly there was consultation with all interested parties on the west coast in terms of the halibut fishery. It was a move from an 88% and 12% split to an 85% and 15% split. There was significant consultation by my parliamentary secretary over the course of the last year. We looked at all of the original processes that were put in play to determine that number and we felt that it required an adjustment. So there was consultation leading up to it to get people's feedback—absolutely.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: All parties are happy—

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. MacAulay. Your time has expired.

We'll move to a three-minute round at this point.

Mr. Leef, you'll lead off.

Mr. Ryan Leef: I get another turn: look at that.

I'll finish off with the line of questions you were going to ask.

Thank you, again, Mr. Minister.

Let's switch to the safe and secure waters portion, one of your three strategic outcomes. In the presentation we received before you got here, the final statement was “In times of restraint we strive to achieve these objectives by streamlining and increasing our efficiency in all areas”. We also heard, though, that the program services where it may be cut are still going to be designed to meet the needs of Canadians.

Now, sometimes in the House we hear the opposition doing some fearmongering on this. I won't mention names, because it might turn out to be the exact same as my name—

Voices: Oh, oh!

Mr. Ryan Leef: They talk about government putting lives in danger by moving the resources for the marine rescue sub-centres. Can you maybe talk about how the reallocation of resources in the marine rescue sub-centres is going to serve Canadians' needs and how it's going to meet the objectives of finding the efficiencies that we need to find?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Yes. We did considerable analysis of our overall network. We felt that we could consolidate our sub-centres into working more closely with search and rescue. At the same time as saving money, we felt that we could also provide an enhancer, actually, because people would be working side by side, together.

With today's technology, there is absolutely no reason this would impact at all, in any way, shape, or form. And certainly I would never have made that decision if I thought if we were going to be putting mariners at risk. I think it's fully feasible and doable.

Mr. Ryan Leef: And there certainly are other operations that exist outside of your department where call centres and dispatch services are provided in other fields.

I think Mr. Sopuck alluded to a point. It's not quite related, but if we're able to centralize and focus our attention with efficiencies, that's going to translate into some savings for us and allow the department to put their resources—both financial and human—into the areas that are I guess of greatest importance. Maybe you could give us a quick comment on that point.

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Certainly.

You made the same mistake I did when I first addressed this question and used the words “call centre”. It's not a call centre, by the way. I apologize for that. They are sub-centres, and provide a great service.

In terms of the consolidation with the joint rescue centres, again, I believe it is a positive step. We can not only gain efficiencies, but I think we can gain a better, safer service because of the fact that we have people working jointly together side by side. The consolidation process is under way. We believe it will be a better service once they are up and fully going. We're going to have language capabilities for ensuring that we have both French and English centres that will provide the necessary languages to provide a safe service for mariners. We believe overall that this process is a good one. We stand by it.

•(1705)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Leef.

Mr. Cleary.

Mr. Ryan Cleary: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Minister, the biggest concern on the east coast of Canada, and off Newfoundland and Labrador specifically right now, is the idea that the Conservative government would remove the fleet separation or owner-operator policy. I understand from your answer to Mr. Donnelly that it is hypothetical and a final decision hasn't been made. But it's still a major concern. It's out there.

The big concern that's been expressed is that if you remove those policies and we move towards an individual, transferrable quota system, as has been in place in British Columbia now for years, the small-boat fishermen are pushed out of the industry. The individual transferrable quotas are accumulated by fishermen and processors, and the small-boat fisherman, as I say, is pushed out.

Let me ask you the question Mr. Donnelly asked another way. Do you have any problem with the ITQ system that currently exists in British Columbia?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Let's go back a bit to the previous part of your question when you talked about the consultation process, or me trying to get information back from fishers.

I didn't think it was the right thing to do to limit debate. I wanted to open debate on fisheries in general. If I went into this process and said you can talk about this, but you can't talk about this, this, and this, that's not fulsome, wholesome debate. I wanted to hear back from everybody and to get their views. I'm hearing all types of views, and that's fair.

I was at the International Boston Seafood Show over this past weekend, and believe me, I heard lots of views. Some were fairly positive views, but mostly people, even people who are inshore fishers, admitted to me during that process that they felt there had to be some modernization of the fishery. I don't think anybody would argue with that. I don't think anyone would argue that there has to be change made. But what the change is, that's what I'm trying to gather information to understand.

In terms of the west coast, my understanding is—and Mr. Donnelly may be able to provide different information, I don't know—that the ITQ system on the west coast, after getting over the initial problems at the start, has worked fairly well. They seem to be functioning quite well there.

Mr. Ryan Cleary: One of the main problems that I see from my research is that what fishermen say is that more than 70% of individual transferrable quota leases are leased out to fishermen. By the time the fishermen pay their resource rent, there is very little left over in terms of a profit for the fishermen or for their crew. You haven't heard those similar concerns?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: From the west coast I have not, and I have been out there a few times.

Mr. Ryan Cleary: I have one more quick question.

The Chair: Very quickly, Mr. Cleary.

Mr. Ryan Cleary: Did I hear you, Mr. Minister, in your opening statement say that the biggest problem right now with the fishery is the price of products? I didn't hear that right?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: I was referring specifically to the lobster industry.

Mr. Ryan Cleary: Okay, not to the fishery in general?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: No.

Mr. Ryan Cleary: For your information, the biggest problem on the east coast is a lack of fish.

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Exactly. Seals could be part of that reason too.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Allen.

Mr. Mike Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Minister and staff, welcome.

I have just a few questions, and the first one is about aquaculture. It's a two-part question. The first is just a little bit of a transition now from the B.C. situation. How's that going at this point in time?

We're hearing a lot of testimony as we're doing our study, and I'm looking forward to actually getting the study done, but when we actually produce that.... We're hearing a lot of testimony with respect to a transition and what closed containment would look like. People have projected that it could be 10 to 20 years before you could ever move onshore and that type of thing.

What are the department's plans with respect to investment in future research with respect to aquaculture and closed containment, and aquaculture on land—over and above some of the investments that are put in facilities out in B.C., for example?

• (1710)

Hon. Keith Ashfield: First of all, aquaculture is becoming a much larger portion of our overall fishery, and that's worldwide. About 50% of the fish now are coming from aquaculture, so it is important. It's a safe, sustainable, growing industry. There are challenges. There are a number of them, as we've seen on the east coast with some issues around ISA and sea lice. We're developing programs jointly with the provinces to address this. Of course we had about a \$980,000 investment, or something of that nature, in British Columbia, for a closed containment site, a portion of it coming from DFO. So we want to understand those issues as well.

I think there are challenges around it all. Whether it can be cost effective doing it in a closed containment site and whether we can be competitive with the Chiles and the Norways of the world, we don't know. I think it's important that we take a look at it.

I appreciate the work you're doing on it as a committee. It's very important work.

Mr. Mike Allen: Minister, I'll ask two last questions, and these are mostly local and they involve the wild Atlantic salmon in two of our major river systems in New Brunswick, one being the Miramichi and one being the Saint John River system.

As you are aware, we have invasive smallmouth bass in Miramichi Lake, which is in my riding, but we also have the situation—and we had a chance to see this last year at the Tobique Narrows Dam—where a few of the salmon were caught in the fish ladder while going up over the dam. Can you provide an update to myself or the committee on how we're doing on that invasive species situation on Miramichi Lake? What is the current status on the discussions with N.B. Power and other utilities on downstream smolt bypass at these hydro dams?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: My understanding on the smallmouth bass issue in Miramichi Lake, and that's a worrisome issue, is that we're using a process to fish them out. I think it's been quite successful. I'll let Mr. Balfour address that in a moment.

On the N.B. Power issue and the smolt, it's my understanding they've had recent meetings and it's moving along very well with an MOU to address the concerns, and that N.B. Power seems to be quite interested in that process, moving forward.

Perhaps Mr. Balfour would have some more specifics.

Mr. David Balfour: The project in terms of the removal of smallmouth bass is showing good promise. The catch rates in the second year of that project have reduced, and that's indicative of a reduction of production. There's another year to run on that project. We'll be assessing the results of the project after the third year and

determining the next steps then. But we seem to be on track in terms of seeing a reduction in the population of smallmouth bass in that area.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Minister, of course the big concern we have—and you tell us you're discussing it, looking at it, or thinking about it—is the owner-operator policy. What concerns a lot of the people I represent.... And I'm not against these people either. For example, Bill Barry wrote a letter in the St. John's *Telegram* indicating how wonderful, important, and necessary this change in policy was.

Have you had discussions with these groups or other groups like that?

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Certainly.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Good.

Have you had discussions with fisheries groups? I've talked to 30-some fisheries groups across Canada, and not one of them.... And I'm not saying you're going to do it. I pray to God that you do not. I also wonder, if it's right to ask, what view your department has on owner-operator policy. Does that have any influence on what takes place?

If you decide to make this move, will you allow this committee to travel through Atlantic Canada and talk to fisheries groups? Would you advise that? I am concerned about the groups you have talked to. I'm not saying you didn't, but have you talked to fisheries organizations, or can you give us a fisheries organization that would support this? If they do not support it, do you believe that will kill it? Are the large corporations deciding what's going to take place? I beg of you, because of what will happen where I live and the people I represent, it's so vitally important that if this is removed a large portion of it will be gone.

I would like to leave those questions with you. I know that you care. Please make the decision yourself and think of the human beings who will be hurt so much if you take it away from them.

• (1715)

Hon. Keith Ashfield: You can put a lot of questions into one question. Thank you.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Well, I just want one good answer.

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Who's going to judge the answer?

An hon. member: The audience.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: They're our judges.

Hon. Keith Ashfield: I've talked to multiple organizations across the country about the fishery and their concerns about the fishery overall. Even the MFU is saying there are changes that need to be made. They'll let us know what they're looking at.

Are they in support of fleet separation? They're not. A number of organizations aren't. But it's part of the whole debate. It's part of getting people interested, talking, and understanding.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: They're interested.

Hon. Keith Ashfield: Absolutely, and it's a great thing. If we can have an honest, open dialogue and hear back from people on their concerns, what they'd like to see our fishery look like in the future, how we can be sustainable, and how we can maintain the vitality of our small coastal communities, that is the kind of information we need to have for our long-term plan on fisheries. That's what it's about. No preconceived ideas—

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: There's nobody who doesn't want to preconceive anything more than I don't want to. It's a horrible thought that this would happen.

But do you agree that the committee should travel?

The Chair: Mr. MacAulay, I have to interrupt you there. As per the standing rules, the bells are ringing at this time. You've exceeded your time limit.

Mr. Minister, before we adjourn I want to thank you and your officials, on behalf of the entire committee, for appearing today and being so open in our discussion. We really appreciate it and we look forward to seeing you again before the committee.

Thank you very much.

The meeting is adjourned.

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and
Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

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.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les
Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

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