


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

From: Gregg le Tissier [mailto:
Sent: 12 June 2009 14:36
To: Scrutiny
Subject: FW: Should leisure anglers have catch limits?

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

Dear Sirs

I am surprised that anyone in the CI, a community closer to the sea than many, could possibly give any further credence to the already widely discredited and pointless idea of bag limits on recreational fisherman.

This idea has been put forward before in Europe on several occasions and widely and roundly denounced as bureaucratic interference from those far removed from that part of society impacted, without any scientific foundation let alone common sense basis.

Put simply, all the fish caught by all the recreational fisherman in the Island in ANY YEAR WOULD BARELY EQUATE TO ONE DAYS DECENT CASH FOR A PAIR TRAWL, let alone one boat (or pair) in any one year.

That very few fisherman ever catch 5 bass in a day, let alone regularly, further highlights that the proposal would have practically zero benefit in reducing catches while creating significant inconvenience and of course negative political perceptions.

Given such simple math, what on earth is the point of this suggestion?

Certainly it has nothing practical to do with preservation of fish stocks. It would certainly lead to yet more unnecessary red tape and expense, let alone perceived Government interference with voters.

If you are actually serious about preserving fish stocks, the answers have been around for many decades. There is a huge body of research available- dare I say have a quick *trawl* through Google.

Locally one of the most effective solutions would be to have marine conservation areas. Where this has been done the results have been truly dramatic. The fish stocks grow dramatically and lead to a 'spill over' effect ie leads to significant increase in the surrounding areas as well. This is most effective in areas with a 'local' rather than 'migratory' fauna, but nonetheless is positive in all cases.

This also leads into supporting the local fishing industry- by nature an industry with a shorter term outlook than is necessarily in their own interests.

- 1) A relatively small reduction in total fishing grounds would lead to longer term increase in overall catches, a net positive
- 2) Charters: Hand Lines/Rods could still be allowed in such marine conservation areas but trawling/netting/potting/trots prohibited. As mentioned above, recreational fishing actually accounts for a very small % indeed of the overall impact.

- 3) In particular this would support the Charter industry. *Done correctly this would also improve our international standing and be a potential huge positive for tourism, very much magnifying the effect.*

Remember:

- a) The significant negative press Gsy received for its handling of its west Coast bass marks and political interference with boundaries. Politically there was also the considerable negative impact in international press over the very poor political handling of marine fuel levies
- b) Angling is by far the no 1 recreational sport in the UK (+10m anglers in UK alone) so a huge interested sporting community
- c) Still, if you went ahead you would probably drive a few more fishing tourists to Gsy.....

Handled badly such ideas can have very significant economic downsides that impact on a wide swath of our communities, especially tourism with its integrated impact on our specific CI economies.

Handled correctly and with a little thought there are not only viable solutions to aid marine preservation (which one would hope was your objective even if it is hard to believe from the pointless suggestion of bag sizes), but also provides significant opportunities and potential benefits in actively pursuing and advertising the CI. Eg this could actually enhance recreational fishing (the exact opposite of your bag limit proposals), provide international coverage that could lead to improved fishing tourism (which as a completely separate issue may require targeted bag limits, tag/release schemes, possible including state-sponsored research in conjunction with research institutions such as universities, the list goes on).

If there was a series of marine conservation areas we could incorporate the diving community as well eg Sark in effect is already such a site but has yet to take advantage of such, esp regarding dive tourism.

A co-ordinated approach could also include numerous other topical 'green' areas that already exist in the Islands but about which there seems to be little awareness but nevertheless could be brought to into the loop from a tourism perspective: a small selection would include fish farming (eg restaurants sourcing their produce locally), other water based recreational activities (several groups in the CI focused on this area), wind/tide/wave energy generation etc all linking into the hospitality industries.

There is an opportunity here for the CI to lead others by way of example.

As is so often the case, the opportunities would be magnified if the Islands worked together, especially on an issue such as this were we basically share the same stretch of water. At the coal face this is not a problem for most of us (hence a friend asking me to make a submission to you in Jsy) but I suspect I am whistling in the wind politically.

Notes:

- *I am writing this as a result of inter-island friendships gained by working in the finance industry, but our common interests in fishing/surfing/diving are the driver of this email - you will find that this is common throughout the Islands.*
- *For some bizarre reason politicians seem to think that once you enter the finance industry you cease to exist as a person outside of your day job and cease to have outside interests.*

- By far our preferred form of 'client entertainment', and I understand this also common in Jersey, is to take clients fishing for the day. This is true for much of the finance industry making us as an industry a growing supporter of the local charter community.

- We now have numerous London-based firms that take local clients out fishing for the day- for them a novel form of client entertainment and another positive for the local economies. This is but one small example of a growing trend and again one that could easily be expanded to the benefit of many, but if the charter industry is damaged by ill-conceived ideas the reverse could be true.

Basically ? for lb there are much better ways to a) enhance marine conservation and b) opportunities for the local community/economies that should help encourage positive rather than negative debate on such areas.

One last thought before you then look for political measures in the commercial fishing industry:

80-90% of all catches in the North Sea are thrown back dead into the ocean due to ill-conceived rules and politics.

Yes, there is a problem with over fishing- but also a huge one due to minority groups self-interests, short-termism, ignorance and politics over-ruling science, common sense and now considerable research and experience.

Let us do something unusual -think!

Regards

Gregg Le Tissier

Guernsey

Email: [redacted]

Tel: +44 (0) [redacted]

Fax: +44 (0) [redacted]

From: Simon O'Donoghue [mailto:[redacted]]

Sent: 02 June 2009 11:40

To: Gregg le Tissier; [redacted]

Subject: FW: Should leisure anglers have catch limits?

Simon O'Donoghue

[redacted]

Channel Islands

Tel: + 44 [redacted]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

From: simon o'donoghue [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 27 May 2009 19:27
To: Simon O'Donoghue
Subject: Fwd: Should leisure anglers have catch limits?

Begin forwarded message:

From: simon o'donoghue [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Date: 27 May 2009 19:15:39 BST
To: scrutiny@gov.je
Subject: Should leisure anglers have catch limits?

Dear Sirs

I read with interest your comments reference catch limits in tonight's JEP. I am very surprised and disappointed that you are not in any way identifying with the real issues that we are facing. Surely you need to identify the issue and then come up with something that resolves this problem not just tinkers with the minor issue of what leisure anglers take home. Come on chaps do you really think leisure fisherman would be able to catch more than five bass in a day. No chance!

I do somewhat get the impression that whomever is recommending these measures is somehow trying to implement some sort of job or role for themselves. Lobsters and Ormers and or bass need to have minimum size increases and that I am sure every commercial fisherman will agree. If you take North America as an example where wide mouthed bass were having the same issue as in Jersey. Minimum size was increased, not just formulated to fit a plate, thus allowing for a breeding season and now the problem no more.

What about stopping netters as another option? Whatever it is you implement you have to implement something on Commercial how matter how politically unsavory that may appeal. Anyway whom is on this committee maybe persons with links to Commercial looking at this poor recommendation?

Simon O'Donoghue
And yes I have a Commercial license!!