



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

## **Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans**

---

FOPO • NUMBER 008 • 1st SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Tuesday, October 18, 2011**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Rodney Weston**



## Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans

Tuesday, October 18, 2011

• (1540)

[English]

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

I apologize for my tardiness. I was at a photo op trying to encourage people to vote for the Bay of Fundy as one the seven wonders of nature and it ran a little late. I apologize.

Hopefully you all have gone online and voted. If not, you still have lots of time to do that at votemyfundy.com. This is a public meeting, so I figured I had better get that out there.

The notice of the meeting is to take into consideration the subcommittee report. I believe you all have a copy of the report in front of you. Your subcommittee undertook to ask the analyst to provide a work plan for our study on aquaculture. I don't know if you want to take a couple of minutes...or you've had a couple of minutes already to take a look at that.

Are there any questions or comments?

Mr. MacAulay.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan, Lib.):** We had quite a period of time waiting here.

**The Chair:** Did you? Then you've studied it in depth.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** I just got in ahead of you.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Are there questions on the subcommittee report? I'd like to ask for a mover for that report.

Do you have a question, Mr. Allen?

**Mr. Mike Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC):** The report says the committee will resume the study on aquaculture in the Pacific region from the previous Parliament, but I don't think that's really what we said we were going to do. I think we said we were going to do it on closed containment.

“That, the Committee resume the study on aquaculture in the Pacific Region from the previous Parliament”...that doesn't seem to be the gist of what we talked about at the last meeting. We talked about closed containment, as opposed to a continuation of the study. That would sort of set us in line with the motion that was passed in the last Parliament, which we said we could put aside if we wanted.

I'm not sure this reflects what we had a long, drawn-out discussion about.

**The Chair:** The clerk is telling me that the title is still the same as what's in the subcommittee report. But what you're suggesting, Mr. Allen, and you're quite correct in suggesting, is that the discussion the subcommittee had was to undertake a study on aquaculture in the Pacific region, and that was based on the evidence gathered from the previous Parliament. Does that make sense?

**Mr. Mike Allen:** We're not really resuming. We carried our evidence forward.

**The Chair:** I didn't say “resume”. I said “undertake” a study on aquaculture in the Pacific region based on evidence from the previous Parliament. Would that be more in line?

**Mr. Mike Allen:** No, it's nothing like what we had talked about.

**The Chair:** Please enlighten me, because we did talk about—

**Mr. Mike Allen:** I think it's fair to say that the committee undertake a study on closed containment aquaculture that was initiated from a committee study on aquaculture in the Pacific region during the last session of Parliament. That might start to make some sense to me, but what we talked about clearly was closed containment aquaculture. We said we were not able to pronounce ourselves on all the stuff the Cohen commission was going to be doing. We said that closed containment was something we could probably get our hands around and get some meat into. We could do it in a very nice, neat timeframe and produce a report some time early in 2012, based on a schedule.

This seems to infer that we're going to do more than that. When I look at the work plan it makes me even more nervous, because the last time we were discussing this we were talking about a lead-in to the report that might be a few sentences on the evidence. We talked about putting stuff in an appendix. But clearly it was a move toward closed-containment aquaculture. So unless something is going to say that it's closed containment, I'm not sure that's in the spirit of what the subcommittee agreed to.

• (1545)

**The Chair:** What I'm trying to get to is what you want in this. Give me some wording for this motion.

**Mr. Mike Allen:** That's what I just gave you.

**The Chair:** No, that was a—

**Mr. Mike Allen:** I gave it to you on the front end. You forgot when I was into my comments at the back.

**The Chair:** Okay, so you added to it. You completed it. Thanks.

**Mr. Mike Allen:** It should say “That, the Committee undertake a study on aquaculture in the Pacific Region that focuses on closed containment.”

**The Chair:** I'm trying to clarify this for the clerk. It's a new study, is what we talked about.

**Mr. Mike Allen:** It is new, yes.

**The Chair:** But we're using the evidence from the previous Parliament.

**Mr. Mike Allen:** That's okay. The motion says that. I'm okay with that.

**The Chair:** That's what I said earlier when I was changing it around. But do you specifically want the words "closed containment" in there? Is that what you're suggesting?

**Mr. Mike Allen:** Yes, I do, because that's what we're focusing on.

**The Chair:** Well, that's what I'm trying to get to.

**Mr. Mike Allen:** Yes, it should say "undertake a study in aquaculture in the Pacific region focused on closed containment".

Let the Library of Parliament analyst prepare a work plan for this study for the next eight weeks.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cleary.

**Mr. Ryan Cleary (St. John's South—Mount Pearl, NDP):** My question is about travel. I see that travel took place in November 2010, but according to page 4, the first commercial-scale ocean-based closed containment units began at Campbell River only in January 2011.

If this study is on closed containment units and the first one opened in January 2011 and your travel ended in November, shouldn't this study include travel to see this first closed containment unit?

**The Chair:** It can be adopted in the work plan if you want to add that for travel.

**Mr. Ryan Cleary:** Yes, I'd like to. If we're talking about it, I'd like to see it.

**The Chair:** Now, though, we're talking about the motion for what we're going to work on.

**Mr. Ryan Cleary:** Yes, sorry.

**The Chair:** Mr. MacAulay.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** In the introductory motion, if I remember correctly, we were going to refer briefly to the hearings that you had when you travelled and to all the hearings we had previously. But we were not going to get in the way of the Cohen report. I think that's what we said here at the meeting last time.

**The Chair:** Yes, we did, and that would come in the work plan.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** I think that's what we should do.

**The Chair:** Do you want that in the introductory motion?

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** That's what I thought we agreed to the last time, if we agreed to anything.

I don't think we want to do all this and not make note that anything was done before.

I suppose it wasn't on closed containment, really, when we started out on this. But the thing has changed. When we started out, it was more on sea lice and all this, and now we have the Cohen report coming out. It would be a pity if we contradicted it. I think that's the way we were talking, the last day we sat around here. We were going

to refer, not heavily but somewhat, to what was done and then look into closed containment more. That's what we were going to do. That's what I would think the motion would need to say.

• (1550)

**The Chair:** What Mr. Allen is suggesting is that the motion would say:

That, the Committee undertake a study on aquaculture in the Pacific Region focused on closed containment, with evidence from the previous Parliament, pursuant to the motion agreed to on Thursday, June 23, 2011, and that the Library of Parliament analyst prepare a work plan for this study, for the next eight weeks.

Does that make sense, Mr. Allen? Does that sound like what you were saying?

**Mr. Mike Allen:** Yes.

**Mr. Randy Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission, CPC):** Would it be including evidence, because it will only be part of the evidence?

**The Chair:** What I said was, "with evidence from the previous Parliament".

**Mr. Randy Kamp:** I think we'd better say "including evidence from the previous Parliament". Otherwise it might sound as if that's the only evidence we're going to look at—

**The Chair:** Okay. That's a good point.

**Mr. Randy Kamp:** —to write the report.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. MacAulay.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** So that would cover what we did previously when we had all the hearings on sea lice. Is that what you're saying?

**The Chair:** Basically, we're saying we're not going to forget about that evidence that we've already gathered. We're going to use it in this study.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** But we're not going to make fools of ourselves either and start contradicting the Cohen report.

**The Chair:** Oh, no.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** That would be helpful.

**The Chair:** As you will recall from our discussion in the subcommittee, we didn't want to go down that road. That was a big part of it.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** That was my understanding.

**The Chair:** Yes.

Mr. Kamp.

**Mr. Randy Kamp:** I think the place to include the rationale for the study and what we did before would be in the actual report. We can debate that when we get there, rather than in this motion, which is basically a motion to say we're going to study closed containment aquaculture.

**The Chair:** Mr. MacAulay.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** We're also saying "including the evidence of the last...", which would cover it.

**The Chair:** Mr. Hayes.

**Mr. Bryan Hayes (Sault Ste. Marie, CPC):** Mr. Chair, the word “focused” is throwing me off. If we’re “focused” on that, that doesn’t mean that’s all we’re doing; that leaves room for something else. To me it should be simply that we undertake a study on closed containment aquaculture, period. I don’t understand the need for “focused”.

**The Chair:** Yes.

To your point about the Pacific region, Mr. Kamp, are we only talking about salmon, or are we talking finfish aquaculture?

**Mr. Randy Kamp:** Finfish aquaculture maybe.

**The Chair:** Mr. Donnelly.

**Mr. Fin Donnelly (New Westminster—Coquitlam, NDP):** I was actually fine with the motion as it was. I think until you get into the specifics of defining what that is, which is essentially the work plan, then it gets trickier. Now we’re diving into it, yet I do appreciate Mike’s comments. I would be happy to support that at that point, but now getting in and removing the Pacific focus, the Pacific region, I think we have to be careful of the implications of that.

From my recollection, when I first joined the committee back at the end of 2009, the Pacific salmon was the reason we were to move to that as a work plan item. Then it became a focus on aquaculture and the impacts on the Pacific salmon. Then it became very much a look at the impacts of sea lice from fish farms on wild salmon.

It makes a lot of sense to let the Cohen commission do its work. They’ve heard in greater detail than I’m sure we can in limited time what the impacts of sea lice on wild salmon from fish farms are going to be. Fair enough. If they’re going to tackle that and provide recommendations to the government, that will hopefully be helpful and beneficial. But I think we need to focus the work we’re doing, certainly on salmon, and commercial-scale or commercial-size aquaculture is at issue.

We have closed containment facilities for other types of fish or finfish on land in North America already. We have lots of examples; it’s simply different species, like trout and tilapia. But we don’t have that for salmon. We have pilot projects, and we’re now looking at scaling up. That’s the issue. My understanding is it’s the scale and size for the salmon farms that’s at issue. I think it’s healthy that we’re going to go in that direction and look at closed containment and is that feasible for this industry, but how specific we have to get in this motion, I’m not sure.

Certainly, I’m fine with the wording that Mike has suggested thus far.

• (1555)

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

Mr. Allen.

**Mr. Mike Allen:** Following up on what Fin said, I think you’re right. We want to try to keep this quite tight, if we can. If we were going to say that the committee undertake a study on closed containment salmon aquaculture, I’m okay with that; I think we’re okay with doing that. If we keep it that tight, closed containment salmon aquaculture is really tight. That’s what it is.

When we were mentioning finfish.... I want to make sure that if we want to go that tight, we can.

**The Chair:** Mr. Donnelly.

**Mr. Fin Donnelly:** Are you suggesting that we drop Pacific region and open it up to Canada?

**Mr. Mike Allen:** We only have one example. Whatever we study on this, the economic principles, waste management, whatever, it’s going to apply everywhere really, so I don’t see it as being necessarily an Atlantic thing. It’s going to be where a closed containment facility is located and the economics of it going forward.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cleary.

**Mr. Ryan Cleary:** I have a question for new members of the committee. I think it would be helpful if I had an exact definition of closed containment.

**The Chair:** I don’t have one right here, but Mr. Donnelly will....

**Mr. Ryan Cleary:** Can we have it now, though, before we move on? This is the discussion, but I need to know exactly what closed containment is for me to participate in the discussion.

**The Chair:** Let’s ask our analyst to give it. I could give you my opinion.

**Ms. Kristen Courtney (Committee Researcher):** I don’t know if I have anything official either.

• (1600)

**Mr. Fin Donnelly:** Mr. Chair, could we hear the motion as amended at this point?

**The Chair:** Yes. It’s a work in progress, but what we have here at this point in time is:

That, the Committee undertake a study on closed containment, including evidence from the previous Parliament....

The discussion that we’re having right now is whether it’s in the Pacific region or if it is for the entire country.

**Mr. Fin Donnelly:** You dropped “aquaculture”? You just said “closed containment”.

**The Chair:** Sorry, did I? Yes, I guess Georges has that highlighted there.

We really don’t have a motion at this point in time. It’s a work in progress.

That, the Committee undertake a study on closed containment aquaculture, including evidence from the previous Parliament....

Then it goes on beyond that.

Mr. Kamp.

**Mr. Randy Kamp:** We would, I think, support the motion as it was currently read.

One definition of closed containment is any system of fish production that creates a controlled interface between the fish and the natural environment. It’s defined in various ways. As we’ve seen in the study, there are different views on just how controlled, whether it’s on land or in water, or whether it’s recirculating with fresh water or salt water.

To Ryan's earlier point, the committee did go to this one outside Campbell River to look at it before it was actually in production. It would probably be instructive to see it in production, if we could justify that travel, and maybe see something else out there.

Closed containment is a concept rather than a geographically specific thing, so I think to put in closed containment in the Pacific region or anywhere doesn't make a lot of sense. I think we should just leave it broad like that. As Mike said, and as Kristen said in one of the points, if the Cohen commission, for example, finds there is a need for a more controlled interface between the wild and the farmed fish, then it would be good for us to be able to know if the technology is there and so on. I think we would have made a good contribution to that whole discussion that's taking place in British Columbia at the moment.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cleary, does that satisfy you, the definition that Mr. Kamp read to the committee?

**Mr. Ryan Cleary:** It does. The reason I had a question about it was because we have salmon and trout farming off the south coast of Newfoundland, and the type of farming we have has been described as closed containment, in that the salmon or the trout don't interact with wild species. But some people say this is not actually closed containment because the tide washes through the sea cages. So I was just looking for a more....

I understand what Randy just said, yes.

**The Chair:** I will just point out that aquaculture, that form of fish farming, is usually referred to as open net aquaculture. We're quite familiar with the fish farming on the south coast of Newfoundland.

Closed containment is generally referring to something that's in a tub almost, if you want. It's isolated. Randy's definition is more technical in nature.

Are there any other comments?

The motion we have right now, the work in progress, I should say, is:

That, the Committee undertake a study on closed containment aquaculture, including evidence from the previous Parliament, pursuant to the motion agreed to on Thursday, June 23, 2011, and that the Library of Parliament analyst prepare a work plan for this study, for the next eight weeks.

Questions?

Ms. Davidson.

• (1605)

**Mrs. Patricia Davidson (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC):** What's the motion you're referring to here, the June 23rd motion?

**The Chair:** That's to bring the evidence forward from the previous Parliament.

**Mrs. Patricia Davidson:** Okay. All right.

**The Chair:** Mr. Donnelly.

**Mr. Fin Donnelly:** I think with the change, losing the Pacific region—essentially the indication is that you're talking about salmon—could we consider adding the words, “undertake a study on closed containment salmon aquaculture”?

**Mr. Mike Allen:** That wasn't read out. That was one word that was missing. I agree with you.

**The Chair:** All right. Do we want to try again?

The motion is:

That, the Committee undertake a study on closed containment salmon aquaculture, including evidence from the previous Parliament, pursuant to the motion agreed to on Thursday, June 23, 2011, and that the Library of Parliament analyst prepare a work plan for this study, for the next eight weeks.

Any other questions, concerns, or comments?

So moved by Mr. Donnelly.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** We'll take a few minutes here while we go in camera. Just take a break and talk amongst yourselves.

[*Proceedings continue in camera*]









**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>