

Crises Management

The purpose of this letter is to point out the pitfalls of the past and present mythology to all aspects of fisheries management, with an emphasis on planning and assessment.

The present system is a proven failure both in the desired results, and the security of the existence of all participants, which include all those that have a dependency on the existence of fishing activity.

In the last year we have seen the institution of an Integrated Groundfish Plan, and the tabling of a new bill C-45. Though the general perception is that there was a great deal of consultation on the implementation of these initiatives, the consultation is limited to those that believe that they must support these initiatives, or there will be dire consequence.

It is impossible to make any business decisions without knowing well in advance of what the DFO might decide to do, what it will achieve, what the goals are, and whether or not it achieved these goals. In other words there is no plan.

It is essential that if there is a desired result, then that result should be clearly defined, and all participants should take part in achieving these results.

Major changes in policy that affect the way in which we conduct our fishery, should be implemented over time. Where individuals or segments of existing fisheries, to which these individuals or segments have made significant investments, are adversely affected, it is also necessary to provide a significant time frame and mechanism to adjust to these changes.

When changes are made to fishing activity to protect and enhance our fisheries resources, it is essential that if these change when applied, will achieve the desired result. These changes in fisheries must encompass a responsibility to follow through with all aspects of protection, to ensure that the results are being achieved.

It should be clear that in order to see improvement in fisheries resources that we must have benchmarks to which we can assess this improvement. If

fisheries are restricted, and we still don't achieve the desired results, we must look elsewhere to achieve these results.

Giving more power to government through bill C-45 achieves little in respect to setting and achieving these goals, as the Minister has not appropriately exercised his responsibilities under the existing Fisheries Act.

Given the fact that certain aspects of Bill C-45 give the Minister discretionary powers over allocation of resources, these allocations are, or could be, directed towards the accumulation of economic benefit to a few at the economic expense of a majority. Thought this reallocation of resources might result in a negotiated increase in financial commitment on the part of those benefactors in reallocation, this financial commitment is absorbed in the bureaucratic system of management.

It seems clear to me that the priority to management should be, to assess the resources and habitat, to set goals that improve both the environment and increase stock abundance and set goals that are clearly defined.