



Submission to the Ministerial Advisory Panel on the Last In, First Out Policy in the Northern Shrimp Fishery

*Treat all fishery participants Equal while
Correcting the inequities to Northern Labrador.*

By: Ronald Johnson

June 3, 2016

Table of Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|
| Introduction | Page 3 |
| MAP Requested Views | Page 4 |
| Terms of Reference | Page 6 |
| History Snapshot of Unfair Treatment | Page 7 |
| Requested Outcome from Review | Page 8 |

Introduction

- Born and raised in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Labrador
- Employed in fishery management positions for 27 years
- Employed with Torngat Fish Producers Co-operative for 24 years
- Worked diligently on the continuous struggle to protect and advance North Coast Fishery

MAP Requested Views

1. *Should LIFO be continued, modified, or Abolished?*

A. Personally, Feel resources is at a stage that all participants should be treated equal

- Pro-Rated decline to all participants
- No removal of either sector from the fishery specific SFA's

B. My employment life dictates that LIFO must be Continued

Due to the fact that Northern Labrador has not been treated fairly with allocations since 2000 and Torngat Fish Producers only have offshore quotas

- All Parties Understood & Agreed to the later named LIFO policy
- LIFO policy and Threshold has been major component of all Management Plans since 1997
- Removal of the Offshore from SFA 6 will result in a 36% decline of revenues, which is 100% used to subsidize onshore North Coast processing operations and will devastate the future

2. *What key considerations should inform any decision to continue, modify, or abolish LIFO?*

Apply the long term DFO sharing Principals

- Conservation
- Economic Viability
- Threshold of 37,600 tons remain
- Adjacency be respected
- Priority given to increase Participation of Aboriginals
- Employment maximized in both harvesting and processing

3. *If support changing or abolishing LIFO, what would be the elements of new access & allocation regime?*

This already exists in the latest Management Plan dated in 2007

- Conservation
- Recognition of Aboriginal Treaty Rights
- Equity
 - Fair and consistent manner
 - Does not create or exacerbate excessive disparities

Unfortunately, the above policies were not followed in their entirety, Conservation has been followed only.

There are many examples of this statement, in which DFO has not following their own established principals.

TOR – What constitutes an appropriate access & allocation regime?

The main statement to this TOR point is a Correction of Past Errors to the North Coast of Labrador

To Actually follow the established

- TAC Sharing Principals
- New Access Framework
 - Conservation
 - Aboriginal and Treaty Rights
 - Equity
- The Criteria
 - Adjacency
 - Historic Dependence
 - Economic Viability

The Nunatsiavut Government Land Claim has been ignored as it should provide 11% to them for adjacent areas, being SFA 4 & SFA 5. Currently they only have 2% and 8% for those areas. No one assumed that the land claim agreement would result in waiting for over a decade to reach the DFO agreed amounts.

Remove cod/crab affected fishers allocations in SFA 5 and then convert them to an Inshore allocations with the majority being provided to Northern Labrador and remaining to Southern Labrador to be fished by inshore vessels for landing to an inshore processing facility in Labrador.

Remove the SFA 4 patronage quota called “Inshore” and provide to Nunatsiavut Government for inshore harvesting. The NG designate fishers are the only ones that have harvested quota from SFA 4 in the last couple of years. The Frozen at Sea Companies that have been provided this quota since 1998 has never attempted to harvest this so called “Inshore” allocation.

History Snapshot of Unfair Treatment

Below are bullets, showing titles of how the North Coast of Labrador has been unfairly treated by Industry, especially by DFO.

- Cod Collapse prior to 1989
- No NCARP/TAGS programs – Requests Rejected
- Snow Crab north of 54'40 zone took 2 years only due to DFO unwillingness
- Unfair access to Northern Shrimp – NO inshore allocations for SFA 5
- Combining of Turbot zones from two zones 2GHJ & 3K to a one zone 2+3K for the Benefit of Island Fishers (FFAW)
- Province against North Coast Shrimp Plant would not provide a licence
- 2003 adjacent SFA 5 increase provided to affected cod closure & crab reduction participants of southern Labrador and Northern Peninsula, NOT the only adjacent region being the North Coast of Labrador
- 2003 Special allocations in SFA 5 to be landed to processing facilities
- In 2007 temporary licences converted to regular licences for who geared up in 1997 or 1998. The north coast of Labrador fishers did not have an opportunity to gear up due to no quota.
- No great amount of Labrador fishers received licences in the SFA 6, for which they are adjacent
- NO North Coast fisher was temporary or are regular Northern Shrimp Inshore licence holders
- SFA 4 Inshore allocation is a patronage and never attempted to be harvested inshore since 1988
- The long awaited NG land claim has been turned into a stop gap measure and used as a maximum to work towards. When it should have been awarded to them at signing of Land Claim
- All parties in Northern Labrador only holds 2% inshore and 8% offshore of the TAC for SFA 4, 5 & 6 which is 74.5% of the overall TAC for all zones
- NG holds less % of adjacent zones than the non land claim participants
- No Interest from the NL All Party Committee to understand the importance of shrimp to the North Coast, they do not Represent Northern Labrador
- FFAW, Island participants, Province, etc. all tout adjacency at this opportune time, when they are on record infringing on non Adjacent areas.
- FFAW and Province requesting those special allocations to be made permanent which is in SFA 5
- No consideration for TFPC loss of revenue and implications to processing facilities

Requested Outcome from Review

Provide Northern Labrador the respect and dignity they deserve.

Please, correct DFO's past Errors, this can be accomplished by:

1. SFA 6 Abolish LIFO, and pro-rate any decline (All Parties treated Equal)
2. SFA 5 Remove all Cod/Crab affected fishers allocations and convert to an inshore competitive – Majority to Nunatsiavut Government & remaining to Southern Labrador
3. SFA 5 Ensure Nunatsiavut Government will have the Minimum 11%
4. SFA 5 To EA the Northern Coalition Quota to the Companies, due to the fact that they are companies that work in the hardest areas of our Country while providing the most benefit to their regions
5. SFA 4 Convert the Patronage inshore (702 mt) to Nunatsiavut Government
6. SFA 4 Ensure Nunatsiavut Government will have the Minimum 11%

The above changes will bring the North Coast where it should have been since 2003, if the long standing DFO Sharing Principals, New Access Framework and The Criteria were followed.

Northern Labrador deserves fair treatment, and this will not be taking away from others but will be bringing back what has been borrowed for the last 13 years.