



Fisheries  
and Oceans

Pêches  
et Océans

DFO - Library / MPO - Bibliothèque



12005583

Meeting of  
**ATLANTIC COUNCIL  
OF FISHERIES MINISTERS**

December 7, 1981  
West Block,  
Parliament Buildings  
Ottawa

SH  
224  
.A8  
M56  
1981d

tricted

c. 2

 **Canada**

135017

THE LIBRARY  
BEDFORD INSTITUTE OF  
OCEANOGRAPHY  
BOX 706  
DARTMOUTH, N.S. B2Y 4A2

DECLASSIFIED  
DÉCLASSIFIÉ  
NOV 28 1995

EV  
224  
A8  
1156  
1981A  
C3

NOTES  
RESPECTING THE MEETING OF THE  
ATLANTIC COUNCIL OF FISHERIES MINISTERS  
ROOM 308 WEST BLOCK  
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS  
OTTAWA  
DECEMBER 7, 1981

FISHERIES AND OCEANS  
LIBRARY / BUREAU DE LA  
PÊCHERIE ET Océanographie  
OTTAWA, ONTARIO  
K1A 0E6 CANADA

NOTES

MEETING 2/81 OF THE ATLANTIC COUNCIL OF FISHERIES MINISTERS  
OTTAWA  
DECEMBER 7, 1981

Chairman

The Honourable Roméo LeBlanc  
Minister of Fisheries and Oceans  
Canada

Members

The Honourable Patrick G. Binns  
Minister of Fisheries and Labour  
Prince Edward Island

The Honourable Jean Garon  
Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food  
Quebec

The Honourable Jean Gauvin  
Minister of Fisheries  
New Brunswick

The Honourable James Morgan  
Minister of Fisheries  
Newfoundland

The Honourable Edmund Morris  
Minister of Fisheries  
Nova Scotia

Secretary

Ms. Debbie Gill  
Head, Conference Secretariat  
Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa

In Attendance

See Annex A

NOTES

ATLANTIC COUNCIL OF FISHERIES MINISTERS  
DECEMBER 7, 1981  
OTTAWA

Item 1 - OPENING REMARKS AND REVIEW OF AGENDA

The Chairman, Mr. LeBlanc, opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda and asking his provincial counterparts for any additional items they wished to discuss under Other Business. Mr. Gauvin requested boat subsidies, Mr. Morgan the commercial capelin fishery in the Atlantic region, crab fishing licences in Newfoundland and federal-provincial agreements in relation to the fishing industry - in particular, clarification of the role of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans as it pertains to DREE, and Mr. Binns requested the addition of licences in the inshore fishery.

At this point the delegation from Quebec arrived and the amended agenda was reviewed for their benefit.

In his opening remarks, the Chairman welcomed the recently appointed Minister of Fisheries for Prince Edward Island, the Honourable Patrick Binns, to the ACOFM and bid farewell to the former Minister, Mr. Leo Rossiter, who had recently resigned from the provincial cabinet to take up other governmental duties.

The Chairman continued his remarks by referring to the advantageous geographic situation of the East Coast where, since 1977, and the achievement of the 200 mile economic zone, Canadians have been able to catch their fish close to home while being located next to the rich U.S.A. market. He referred to the boom and bust cycle of the industry and the early warnings of the current down cycle. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans was attempting to get the industry to focus on marketing, quality and fleet organization in an attempt to deal with the current economic difficulties.

At this point the Chairman called on Dr. Art May, Assistant Deputy Minister, Atlantic Fisheries, to review the Groundfish Plan.

Item 2 - 1982 Atlantic Groundfish Management Plan

Dr. May introduced the 4th draft of the Plan by referring Members to the new format. Six categorizations of vessels had been established for "housekeeping" purposes. These were:

- fixed gear, less than 65 feet
- fixed gear, 65 to 100 feet
- fixed gear, greater than 100 feet
- mobile gear, less than 65 feet
- mobile gear, 65 to 100 feet
- mobile gear, greater than 100 feet

Dr. May noted that all stock quotas had either remained at the same level or had increased from 1981. He mentioned four stocks in particular which were still of concern to various groups. There were the 2 Gulf cod stocks, 4X haddock and 4X cod. Other concerns which had been raised at the recent AGAC meeting were those of company quotas and sector management.

With regard to NAFO area 4RS3Pn it was noted that in 1981 the total catch would substantially exceed the TAC due to overruns predominantly by the fixed gear and small (less than 65 feet) dragger sectors. For 1982 fixed gear stocks would be managed under quota. A further breakdown of 4RS3Pn cod by season and area had been introduced.

For NAFO area 4Vn4T the quota would be up slightly from 1981. Dr. May noted that the fishermen in area 4X had protested any cod quota and those with vessels of less than 65 feet did not want trawlers fishing haddock in that area.

The document showing in graph form the catches of the four major East Coast fishing companies was outlined by Dr. May and served to show that while the large vessels had been curtailed in the Gulf, production had more than been offset by allocations from the Scotian Shelf and areas north and east of the Gulf.

The issue of company quotas was discussed by Dr. May who noted that DFO had come very close to reaching agreements with the 4 major companies on what amounts would be given to each of them. A final meeting would be held December 15, 1981 in Halifax with the large and smaller companies and provincial government officials would be invited to attend. Company quotas were being proposed as a means of bringing more order to the fishery for 1982, particularly in relation to marketing. It was hoped that consensus on company quotas could be reached by the companies themselves.

Further discussion on company quotas ensued with Mr. Morgan and Mr. Garon stating in general that they favoured this proposal as a solution to the undisciplined fishery last year. However Mr. Morgan feared that if the fishing was good in 2J3KL for a short period of time the companies would still try to take their catches all at once.

Mr. LeBlanc mentioned the possibility of nationalizing the east coast fishing industry as one option if the companies were unable to govern themselves. On this subject, Mr. Morgan replied that he would not oppose the government telling the industry what sort of product they should be producing for the market. Nova Scotia opposed nationalizing the industry as it felt government intervention was already excessive. Furthermore Nova Scotia did

not want to lose any reduction in its access to the offshore 2J3KL cod which it feared might come about with the arbitration by the federal government of company quotas for this area. Dr. May concluded the discussion by stating that no final percentages had been allocated to the four large companies for 2J3KL cod but they would be sharing a total of about 80,000 mt arrived at after subtracting from 92,500 mt 3,000-4,000 mt for the smaller companies, and 10% or 9,250 mt for other purposes.

The next topic for discussion was sector management, which had been introduced in September, 1980 at the Gulf Groundfish Seminar. The industry had expressed some opposition to this management plan for various reasons. Sector management was introduced in order to control the increasing mobility by larger vessels in the less than 65 foot category and bring more order to the fishery. It would prevent vessels moving "en masse" to another area once their own area had closed.

Mr. Morris commented that Nova Scotia was still opposed to the 65 foot cut off for vessels managed within the sectors. Nova Scotia had 269 vessels between the lengths of 45 - 65 feet and therefore would prefer the cut off at 45 feet. Mr. Morgan and Mr. Gauvin had no particular concern with the sector management plan. Nova Scotia would be prepared to move in a more progressive way on sector management but it felt the maximum level of 65 feet was too high. Dr. May noted that if 45 feet was taken as a maximum it would mean delaying the implementation of the plan for a year and in addition creating a new category of vessels 45 - 65 feet. If this was the case, Nova Scotia would reluctantly go along with the Plan as it now stood.

Mr. Morris further requested that the boundary line between 4T and 4Vn be moved 7 nautical miles to the west for sociological reasons. Dr. May noted this concern and replied that for statistical purposes it was not easy to move the boundary but officials of the Department would manage the boundary as if it was moved to the west as requested by Mr. Morris. There was certainly no intention to cause any disruption to specific communities on the northern tip of Cape Breton. This would accommodate Mr. Morris' request.

The Chairman then opened the meeting to general comments on the 1982 Groundfish Plan. Mr. Gauvin expressed concern that non Gulf based vessels (NGBV) of more than 100 feet were being given a 2,600 mt allocation for redfish when GBV of less than 100 feet were having difficulty fishing. He felt that NGBV should not be allowed into the Gulf and Mr. Garon supported this position. Dr. May commented that when the large vessels were removed from the Gulf it was on condition that when stocks started to rebuild they would be allowed to return. In this case redfish stocks had started to return so the NGBV were given some consideration.

However it was noted that the GBV had received a higher percentage share of the increase than the NGBV. In addition, the large stern trawlers had been completely excluded from fishing cod in the Gulf and in recompense the small allocation of redfish was assigned. On this matter, Nova Scotia opposed the position of New Brunswick and Quebec but Prince Edward Island supported it.

Mr. Rossiter questioned whether there was any long term plan for the Gulf or would there be changes every year. In reply, it was mentioned that there would be adjustments to the plan when necessary.

Dr. May mentioned that he had received continuing representation from provinces and industry concerning the need for allocations for the plants at the mouth of the Gulf.

Regarding redfish quotas, Mr. Andrew noted that there was no size stipulation on NGBV vessels over 100 feet fishing redfish in 4RST. He felt that if vessels of more than 100 feet were to be allowed in the Gulf, only vessels of less than 1,050 BHP should be there. He was supported on this matter by Newfoundland. Mr. Morgan supported Nova Scotia's position that NGBV should be allowed back into the Gulf and felt that the cod allocation of 4,500 mt to NGBV over 100 feet and less than 1,050 BHP in 4RS3Pn was inadequate and should be increased to 7,000 mt. He also felt that if the mobile gear quota for cod in 4RS3Pn was being divided between 4S and 4R3Pn the fixed gear quota should be divided as well. If there was a separate quota, each area would be protected by its own quota if bad weather prevented fishing in 4R or 4S. Dr. May would look further into this concern.

For the area 2J3KL Mr. Morgan welcomed the return of an allowance for the fixed gear allocation of 115,000 mt for vessels under 65 feet however he was concerned that there was no accommodation for the resource short plants on the north east coast. In general, Mr. Morgan felt the overall 1982 Plan was a definite improvement over the 1981 Plan. Dr. May replied that 10% or 9,250 mt of the offshore quota for 2J3KL cod was to be kept for other purposes, one of which might be for resource short plants.

Mr. Morris' comments on the Groundfish Plan included support of withholding 10% of the offshore quota for 2J3KL cod and increasing the NGBV quota for 4RS3Pn cod from 4,500 mt to 6,000 mt. He did not wish to see 4R and 4S cod split as such if this meant essentially creating provincial quotas which he was opposed to. He supported quota management for 4X cod and felt trawlers should be allowed to continue taking 4X haddock, two concerns which had been raised at the recent AGAC meeting.

Mr. Garon supported Newfoundland's position on the division of 4R and 4S cod. He also felt that the fixed gear quota should exceed the mobile gear quota particularly as the emphasis of the Department was on quality improvement. There was little incentive to change to longline gear and improve the fish quality if the quota was not going to be increased substantially. He suggested for fixed gear vessels under 65 feet an increase to 40,000 mt from 37,000 mt and a decrease in mobile gear from 32,000 mt to 29,000 mt. Dr. May noted these suggestions. Mr. Morgan supported the decrease from 32,000 mt for mobile gear to 30,000 mt and suggested the 2,000 mt difference be given to NGBV over 100 feet in 4RS3Pn to increase their quota to 6,500 mt.

New Brunswick mentioned the need for further dividing 4T cod for fixed gear under 65 feet to guarantee a better division of the total catch for Maritime fishermen later in the year. At the present time he felt too great a percentage of the TAC was going to Quebec which fished earlier in the year. Prince Edward Island's position was that the TAC of 60,000 mt for 4T should be reduced to 55,000 mt in order to get a better size mix and therefore more profit to the industry.

### Item 3 - Economic Situation of East Coast Fishing Industry

Mr. Gary Vernon, Assistant Deputy Minister, Economic Development and Marketing, DFO, reviewed the current cost/price squeeze affecting the industry. Inflationary factors and high interest costs were causing Canadian products to be less competitive to foreign markets. In addition international political factors such as reference prices, tariffs in the EEC and difficulties with Spain were hindering expansion of sales. Sales to the U.S.A. which had increased did not bring adequate cost returns to the industry.

Factors affecting Canada's success in marketing were the lack of a coordinated approach to the marketplace by the processing companies, destructive price competition, inconsistent quality and lack of initiative in developing new products and new markets.

An internal factor outlined by Mr. Vernon which had led to the cost/price squeeze was the overinvestment in catching and processing facilities. He noted that the East Coast had a monthly processing capacity of 200,000 mt of pelagic and groundfish species based on a single shift 6 day workweek, while maximum average throughputs had only been 134,000 mt. The debt load and overheads from this investment hindered Canada's competitive position in foreign markets. As an example, the number of registered plants in the Atlantic Provinces had increased 35% from 519 in 1977 to 700 in 1981.

Dr. May reviewed the status of the East Coast catching capacity noting that holding the fleet stable, implementing company quotas and improving the quality and yield of fish landed were means of reducing costs.

Mr. Don Tansley, Deputy Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, outlined possible short and long term solutions to the current crisis. Short term assistance had been requested by companies in the form of inventory support through the Fisheries Prices Support Board and loans or loan guarantees. It was pointed out that in the past two years the four main companies had suffered nearly \$100 million in losses. Total short and long term debts, mainly in the form of interest costs, had doubled in the past four years, resulting in increased plant and inventory costs.

A wide range of long term options were being considered. These included ways of rationalizing the harvesting capacity already mentioned, rechanneling investment in processing including more efficiency oriented efforts with DREE, more federal-provincial cooperation in restraining processing, consideration of foreign investment in the processing sector, and quality improvement measures. As well, amending the Fisheries Prices Support Act to improve price stabilization, creating a specific marketing agency, revising the Salfish Act to market products other than salt cod, encouraging market development, and institutionalization of over-the-side sales were possible options. In summary, in order to improve the cost/price squeeze, order in the marketplace through consolidation and reduction of harvesting costs were seen as the two areas for focusing.

Mr. Morgan agreed entirely with Mr. Vernon's assessment of the problems and gave specific examples of the situation in Newfoundland. He felt that the overinvestment in Newfoundland had come from expansion more than an increase in number of plants. However, Mr. Morgan noted that no new processing plants were to be allowed in his province and a freeze on plant licences had recently been imposed. He also felt that marketing procedures of the companies left much to be desired, particularly of the medium and smaller companies and steps were now being taken to consolidate their marketing practices. Nationalization of marketing activities he hoped would not occur and he was prepared to institute legislation on bleeding and gutting at sea for draggers and otter trawls although he had reservations that the infrastructure would need to be changed. He agreed with the Chairman that efficiency in the processing and harvesting sectors was the key. Inventory support assistance at this time, particularly for flatfish, was critical in the short term. Mr. Morgan concluded by stating that inefficient companies should not necessarily receive continued assistance and it would be necessary to review each case in detail.

Mr. Morris stated that in Nova Scotia no public funds would be used to create any additional processing capacity. Regarding harvesting capacity, Nova Scotia wished to cooperate with the federal position. Mr. Morris reported that Nova Scotia had 6,600 fishing vessels over 22 feet of which the provincial loan board had assisted in some way with 2,200 vessels and loaned 1,400 new ones. Nova Scotia was gradually tightening up the loans process and at present had \$93 million at risk in the fleet. It was noted that National Sea and Nickerson's owed the province \$49 million of which \$7 million was on boats. Their accounts were up to date. Mr. Morris welcomed additional dialogue with the federal government on short term solutions.

In the longer term, Nova Scotia would welcome joint federal-provincial marketing efforts. On the question of quality improvement, subject to a clear understanding of the program, Nova Scotia would support Newfoundland in mandatory gutting, bleeding, washing and icing. Nova Scotia would go along with a legal federal-provincial framework in order to insure discipline in the marketing area, but if possible would prefer a more open system.

Mr. Garon stated that the economic situation in the fisheries had been brought about by Canadian monetary policy, too many "fly by night" operations and lack of quality. He felt the need to improve quality quickly and to change current marketing practices. Inefficient catch methods should be eliminated and consideration should be given to fishing for specific markets. In addition, Quebec was opposed to the financing of boats by the plants. It also opposed government intervention in marketing from an historical viewpoint as traditionally such federal structures had not helped the province's industries.

Mr. Gauvin noted the difficulties faced by the smaller fish companies in New Brunswick. The Minister stated that marketing should be handled by the private sector but at the same time he was pleased with the federal government's efforts to improve quality. Mr. Gauvin was not certain whether the province or the federal government had the right to establish Regulations to improve fish quality. Mr. LeBlanc replied that once the fish were on land their processing came under provincial legislation.

Prince Edward Island's position was that it could not afford a reduction in processing plants and it did not favour consolidation of the processing industry. The province had only one off-shore plant. Mr. Binns felt a devalued dollar would improve Canada's competitiveness in world markets. In addition he wanted no increase in 4T quotas so that a better size mix would develop. Prince Edward Island favoured federal, rather than provincial control of quality improvement measures such as mandatory bleeding and gutting, at least of the policing aspect. Long term, five

to ten year, planning was favoured. Mr. Rossiter requested additional crab licences so that the present plant capacity could be utilized. At the present time Prince Edward Island vessels had no facility to bleed and gut on board and this measure would mean less fish for the fishermen. If the long term plan for the fishery was made clear Prince Edward Island might be prepared to consider mandatory bleeding and gutting for some aspects of the fishery.

The Chairman in reviewing the provinces' comments, clarified his position by stating that he did not mean to advocate nationalization of the marketing sector but he wanted to see the best group possible work towards improving the markets.

Mr. LeBlanc felt that if certain fishing operations should continue for social reasons then the government would be prepared to seek funds from the social rather than the economic funding "envelope" at MSED. He was however greatly encouraged by the provinces' general support of the quality improvement program but he felt unless mandatory gutting and bleeding was adopted by all provinces equally it could lead to quality discrepancies between provinces.

Dr. May noted that the present quotas for the offshore fleet could be taken with 15-20% less vessels than at present and the saving in fishing costs would equal \$20-25 million per year. It was hoped that company quotas, if introduced, would reduce the number of trawlers to some extent.

Mr. LeBlanc questioned the provinces on how the processing sector could be made healthier. Mr. Garon replied that he felt the federal inspectors in Quebec were not strict enough and that substantial investment would be involved in upgrading plants if new Regulations were applied. One approach noted might be to obtain funds from DREE to start modernizing the plants. Mr. Andrew questioned what was to be done with the retired vessels. Did one retire the boat or the fishermen? It was felt that there was need to retire both. Mr. Andrew felt that retiring vessels in the Gulf might be difficult due to the social impact.

Mr. LeBlanc commented that some form of orderly marketing was needed to combat the competitors. Ideally it would be excellent if the companies would work together but he had seen little sign of this in the past and he did not imagine that a more unified industry solution was likely to occur. This was why the government was moving towards the licensing of export products. The Chairman concluded by stating that his officials would be preparing proposals and he hoped the provinces would take a positive approach towards improving quality.

Dr. May reported that if fishermen received an adequate price differential for high grade fish this would automatically improve the fish quality. However, to initially obtain a high quality product would involve added costs, whether public or private.

#### Item 4 - International Issues

Mr. Vernon noted that agreements had been reached with nine of the countries that had fished in our zone before the extension of jurisdiction. Two agreements, the EEC and U.S.A. were still pending. In all negotiations, Canada sought commercial and political benefits, in return for access to its surplus stocks. At one stage the approach was to seek a direct balance between commercial benefits and the quantity of surplus allocated. The industry had opposed this position. The Canadian negotiating position then evolved toward the objective of a "satisfactory trade relationship" or some semipermanent access to foreign markets. This was the rationale behind the EEC agreement. The agreement would give Canada a long term benefit of tariff reduction in return for a commitment of nonsurplus resources (ie. cod). It would limit the salmon catches off west Greenland to an equivalent of 1,190 mt over two years and give Canada a fixed tariff reduction on cod, redfish and some herring. The EEC would get fixed access to designated quantities of cod and squid each year for the period of the agreement. There had been considerable opposition from industry and some provinces to this agreement but Mr. LeBlanc felt that the opposition was stronger one year ago. The issue was really whether Canada could afford to allocate a fixed amount of a non-surplus resource for possible preferred access to future key markets. There was no guarantee that the industry would be able to sell to these markets but at least the chances would be improved.

Mr. Morgan expressed disagreement at the length of the agreement. He did not want to be tied into a six year agreement with no guarantees that the EEC would purchase fish. He suggested that the Germans could fish the stock, have it landed and processed in Canada and have the value added subject to tax before marketing the fish in Germany. He also opposed the emphasis on one stock, 2J3KL cod, but it was pointed out in response that this stock had shown the best growth of any Atlantic stocks.

Mr. Morris questioned whether the U.S. could be involved in the trading off of allocation for tariff purposes. In reply Mr. Vernon stated this would not happen because the Americans were also moving in the same direction as Canada. The Americans were making arrangements to supply their own market with their own fish and also sell their resource to maximum commercial advantage for their fishing industry. These factors could have long term detrimental effects on our market. It was also noted that Canada was dealing with the EEC by letter on the issue of reference prices to indicate that if it tried to block Canada out of the market by raising reference prices, Canada would in turn deny the EEC access to Canadian allocations.

Mr. LeBlanc expressed his disappointment that the industry was not more progressive looking on this issue and accepting of this agreement.

#### Item 5 - Marketing

This item had been covered in previous discussions and a paper entitled Canadian Fisheries Marketing Overview prepared by Mr. Vernon was distributed to the members.

#### Item 6 - Other Business

##### A. Capelin Fishery

Mr. Morgan expressed his concern that the capelin had not come in to the beaches to spawn this year and this could be the reason for the poor inshore cod fishery. The fishermen in Newfoundland were going to ask for a two year ban on the commercial capelin fishery. In reply, it was noted that a government-industry seminar on capelin, sponsored by DFO, was to be held in Clarenville, Newfoundland on January 19-21, 1982 at which time these problems would be looked into.

##### B. Crab Licences

Mr. Morgan requested the DFO look at additional harvesting licences for crab if the stocks warranted. This matter was now under review by the regional office of DFO in St. John's. Mr. Moore expressed some reservations as he felt that in Quebec there was overproduction of crab and problems in marketing.

### C. Federal-Provincial Agreements

Mr. Morgan's third concern was the increased involvement the DFO was playing with DREE in the administration of fishery related projects. Formerly DREE arrangements were cost shared between the federal and provincial governments with the provinces proposing the projects and the federal government approving them. Mr. LeBlanc replied that the administration of DREE projects was to be shared more by other federal departments if the project was a federal concern. This was a change in cabinet policy and was occurring with other federal departments as well.

Mr. Binns expressed concern that if DREE funding was being taken over by Ottawa Prince Edward Island would not know what projects were being planned. He suggested a joint management system so that his province would be involved in the developmental aspect as well as the regulatory one in DREE programs.

### D. Vessel Subsidies

Mr. Gauvin expressed his concern with the percentage level of federal vessel subsidies being reduced and the ceiling of \$100,000-\$125,000 being placed on subsidies. This was resulting in the province having to loan more money to the fishermen and it was encountering difficulties in obtaining these funds. Furthermore he questioned whether this policy would be permanent.

Mr. LeBlanc replied that this was a difficult situation as on the one hand there are too many vessels and on the other hand he was being asked to subsidize vessels. He stated there may be some leeway to increase the 12% subsidy for \$1,000,000 vessels slightly but it would never reach the 25% maximum level granted other less costly vessels.

Mr. Gauvin also questioned whether licences should be tied to fishermen or vessels. Dr. May replied that the Levelton Report stated that the licence should be tied to a fisherman to fish a particular vessel. Mr. Andrew spoke of the difficulties of a province when a boat is repossessed. In this case DFO allows the fisherman two years to obtain another boat. Mr. LeBlanc suggested this item be put on the agenda of the next FPAFC meeting for further discussion.

Mr. Garon raised the issue of additional trawler licences granted last year when there was supposed to be a freeze on these licences. It was explained that these licences were conversions from fixed gear to mobile gear with existing vessels and the licences were very restrictive. It was anticipated that by the end of 1982 there would be a total of 15-20 conversions. No new vessels were involved.

#### E. 1922 Agreement

There was some concern expressed by New Brunswick that the 1922 Agreement gave Quebec the authority to licence vessels which could fish anywhere in the Atlantic and that Quebec could greatly increase its number of vessels. Dr. May did not think Quebec had the authority in the 1922 Agreement to do this but this in effect was happening. Mr. Gauvin requested that there be some stated policy on this matter and the Chairman replied that this was being looked into at present. Mr. Garon added that statistics showed that Quebec had not increased its effort to the extent the other provinces had.

#### F. Prince Edward Island - Licensing

Mr. Binns requested that further attention be paid to the full-time, part-time classification of fishermen for the purposes of licensing. There seemed to be a lack of consistency in the issuance of these licences. Mr. LeBlanc agreed that licensing was an ongoing problem and suggested Prince Edward Island officials meet with DFO regional officials on this matter.

#### G. Catch Failure Insurance

Mr. Morgan requested that a long term catch failure insurance plan for fishermen or a price stabilization fund be implemented. In addition a fishing gear insurance plan deserved some consideration. The inshore fishermen were having severe problems this year and discussions between officials of both governments would be appreciated. Mr. LeBlanc replied that unemployment insurance was the best solution at present for the fishermen.

In conclusion, the Chairman noted that the suggestions brought forth by his provincial counterparts for the 1982 Groundfish Plan would be considered and further work on solutions to the economic situation would be undertaken.

The meeting adjourned at 4.20pm.

Prepared by:  
The Conference Secretariat  
Communications Branch  
Department of Fisheries and Oceans  
Ottawa  
January 1982

In Attendance

Provincial

J.T.G. Andrew	Deputy Minister Department of Fisheries New Brunswick
Y. Boudreau	Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Quebec
K. Henriksen	President Canadian Saltfish Corporation St. John's Newfoundland
B. Knight	Director Resource Programs Department of Intergovernmental Affairs Newfoundland
D.A. MacLean	Deputy Minister Department of Fisheries Nova Scotia
A. Maloney	Chairman Fisheries Prices Support Board St. John's Newfoundland
R. Moore	Assistant Deputy Minister (Fisheries) Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Food Quebec
H. O'Connell	Deputy Minister Department of Fisheries Prince Edward Island
L. Rossiter	Former Minister of Fisheries Prince Edward Island
P. Vagneux	Director-General Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Food Quebec
L. Walsh	Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat Quebec

Federal

P. Comeau	Acting Director-General Atlantic Operations Directorate Department of Fisheries and Oceans Ottawa
L.J. Cowley	Director-General Gulf Region Department of Fisheries and Oceans Memramcook New Brunswick
R.A. Crouter	Director-General Scotia-Fundy Region Department of Fisheries and Oceans Halifax Nova Scotia
B. Deacon	Departmental Assistant to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans Department of Fisheries and Oceans Ottawa
E.B. Dunne	Director-General Newfoundland Region Department of Fisheries and Oceans St. John's Newfoundland
C. Friend	Media Advisor to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans Ottawa
D. Gill	Head, Conference Secretariat Department of Fisheries and Oceans Ottawa
M. Lapalme	Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet (Communications) Federal Provincial Relations Privy Council Ottawa

A.W. May	Assistant Deputy Minister Atlantic Fisheries Department of Fisheries and Oceans Ottawa
P. Meerburg	Program Officer - Atlantic Communications Branch Department of Fisheries and Oceans Ottawa
Dr. B.S. Muir	Director-General Resource Services Directorate Department of Fisheries and Oceans Ottawa
D.D. Tansley	Deputy Minister Department of Fisheries and Oceans Ottawa
B. Tobin, M.P.	Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
G.C. Vernon	Assistant Deputy Minister Fisheries Economic Development and Marketing Department of Fisheries and Oceans Ottawa
T. Widyaratne	Conference Secretariat Department of Fisheries and Oceans Ottawa