


Tim Oldham

From: Rebecca McColligan on behalf of Scrutiny
Sent: 12 June 2009 09:41
To: Tim Oldham
Subject: FW: Bass and lobster Limit Letter

-----Original Message-----

From: Ian Perrier [mailto:
Sent: 11 June 2009 22:38
To: Scrutiny
Subject: Bass and lobster Limit Letter

This e-mail has been received directly from the Internet: you should exercise a degree of caution since there can be no guarantee that the source or content of the message is authentic.

If you receive inappropriate e-mail from an external source it is your responsibility to notify Computer Services Helpdesk (telephone 440440).


The Full States e-mail Usage Policy can be found here:
http://intranet1/aware/internet_email_issues.htm

Please see attached a letter requesting that the proposed bag restrictions are revised and that the problem is dealt with by addressing those who not only break the law but also evade taxes.

The normal sea angler, both shore and boat does not pose a threat to bass stocks and one who runs a few pots purely for the table, adheres to size limits and returns berried lobsters again is no threat.

Regards

Ian Perrier



6th May 2009

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed “bag limit” for anglers of five bass and five lobster in any one day. I am an angler, not an amateur fisherman, and there are a variety of reasons why I feel this proposal should not be introduced.

I do not believe that the limit is being imposed in an effort to conserve fish stocks, if this were the aim then a control of local commercial fisherman plundering the breeding bass stocks congregating off the west coast of Guernsey would be more appropriate. Furthermore, the impact of the average angler on bass stocks is at best minimal. The same logic applies to lobster stocks where it is undoubtedly the commercial fisherman who take significant numbers of lobster stock. There are already size limits in place relating to both species and surely if these were rigorously enforced the conservation impact would be significant.

Once again, on a conservation note, I regularly return any lobster that I catch which are carrying eggs. Two years ago I returned the largest lobster I have ever caught as she was carrying eggs. The same day I saw cooked lobsters for sale from a commercial outlet, bearing eggs. If conservation is the issue keeping egg laden lobsters should be banned.

If a five fish limit is imposed then it will surely encourage the practice of continually returning the smallest fish caught to the sea, dead. There is no mention of this being an unwelcome practice in the proposal. I cannot believe that anglers, as prescribed by the law, throwing dead bass back into the sea has any credibility in the name of conservation.

I regularly fish over the low water period from a tidal mooring, an eight hour trip. Under this proposal I could quite conceivably catch my limit of bass within the first hour of the trip. I then have seven hours to wait until my mooring is accessible again. Am I supposed to stop fishing? Or do I continue fishing and continually return the smallest specimen?

It seems to me that the issue that this proposal attempts to deal with is the illegal sales of bass and lobster. In this case I find it offensive that a blanket restriction is being considered, with a fine of £20,000 being threatened to ordinary leisure anglers, rather than fining both those amateur fishermen who sell fish illegally **and** those that knowingly purchase fish from unlicensed fishermen in order to cut costs. This is where the real issue lies.

Yours,

(Ian Perrier – added by officer)