

Susan Playfair: Well, I think on this extent I really expect you to correct me on this [inaudible]. [laughter] I think the reason I was curious about the occurrence of 1990 is I think that that really it ended the fisheries way back when we had all of the foreign trawlers over here. They hadn't some [inaudible] as to how far offshore they had to do that made any sense. So, what happened is that this has just being taken and because it's about time that we had a resource that would go on forever. Then I think when all of a sudden finally the ruling was put in place and the foreign trawlers had to be kept off the inshore fishing grounds, then what happened is, and of course we know all of this, but then the government suddenly saw this as the new frontier. So, with that perception, it was almost like a gold rush that money was handed out to fishermen. Of course, I mentioned this in the book, that they in many cases fishermen didn't want to buy another boat. They were very happy with the boat they had. But they wanted to see if they could get some of the money available to maybe upgrade the boat, but that wasn't possible. You had to get a chunk of money at that time. There was that much of a feeling that the government couldn't do enough to make profits with the revenue produced in the situation. So, at that time, I think you started with what was perceived as a huge opportunity here. Money was poured into it. As a result, the inshore fishing ground suddenly became not decimated. But they were really threatened because you had a much larger system impact on the same amount of fish. I'm trying to figure out how to jump forward. [laughter] So, I think, in my mind, that's where the problem started. Then when it was perceived that all of a sudden – well, the other thing too is that it all comes into supply and demand. You used to have huge [inaudible] that would come up and deliver fish to the fish [inaudible] in Boston and they would get pennies for the fish. Then of course, as the fish start to diminish, of course the cost goes up. So, that's part of the overall [laughter] reason, I'm sure. So, what was happening is that a lot for the consumer, all of a sudden fish that used to be readily available for pennies on Friday – and there was a huge demand for these very unexpensive fish on Fridays especially for people who were Catholic – all of a sudden you had even more pressure on the – at that time, you had more pressure from the buying public. Then what happened as the two things converged, the pressure being placed on Friday by the church was, well, I don't know whether it was eliminated. But anyway, people left them.

Fabienne Lord: People knew down here though.

SP: Exactly. In a sense that was a good thing. It was a good thing because the supply was lessening while the demand was lessening also. Around that time, and I'd have to go back and check it again, [laughter] the...

FL: You are open to.

SP: Please. [laughter] Well, it was perceived that, wait a minute, we've got to regulate this. Now, we have something that has gotten out of hand and we're beginning to see that the number of people who are harvesting the fish is beginning to make an impact that we hadn't quite figured out. Then we began seeing all of these rules coming in. I hate to use the word bureaucracy, but bureaucracy began to be set up. That fed on itself and more people were brought into it. I think it's safe to say that it became an entity unto itself. Even though obviously there were a lot of motives, there was a real need for this. I think that as you began to see a bureaucracy that was under enormous pressure granted to suddenly with the Magnuson-Stevens Act, there were terms and regulations as to what was expected. They were rebuilding goals. So, the various regulatory

bodies suddenly had to adhere to two of these new set of rules. Meanwhile, the fishermen, there were at that time the same amount of fishermen, but they were suddenly told they couldn't just go out and fish the way they've been able to before. I know the collapse is a word [laughter] used in these things. So, I wouldn't say that was a collapse, but that was where you suddenly began to see some of the real protests starting up. I remember very well when the fishermen from New Bedford came. I saw them from that house out there motoring up in some of the worst weather to one of the early protests march at Keyport.

FL: Well, we saw them with lots of [inaudible].

SP: That's right. Exactly. So, I think, in my mind, that was a turning point as far as the system and really coming face-to-face with what they were being dealt here and what they had to deal with. I hadn't heard a lot, although I'm sure it was being voiced in the fishing community. But up to that time, I hadn't heard a lot about the real deprivation that the fishermen saw as a result of these regulations. So, I guess at that point, you begin to approach where we are today. You've had a lot more of the same. You've had all of the amendments on top of amendments and the amendments to the system. You've got amendments on the amendments. My feeling was that no one really knows where anything is at, at this point. I think one of the bright spots, well, two bright spots actually, one is that there was a connection. I'm not sure there's been enough of a connection maybe between the concept of marine sanctuary and the fishing community and seeing marine sanctuary as a means of possibly protecting fish to the point where the resource could be improved. Ultimately, fishermen could be fishing around the edges of these sanctuaries. Now, I think you see much more of that out of this country, but in any case. I wanted to say after the marine sanctuaries. Oh, and also obviously the – well, what do you call them? (ICPs?) or sector formation anyway. That the concept of sector formation began to be seen because I think that the fishing community it had to come up with something. Everyone had to come up with something because the fishing community and the regulators, everyone's been working in a totally unworkable situation that is, from what I can see, going nowhere.

FL: Well, at the time they were also making [inaudible]. They did not regulate anything before, so they have to commit a way to regulate as well.

SP: Yes. But that's not what the sector – you're saying what the sector is?

FL: Well, I am saying with all the [inaudible].

SP: Right.

FL: You were saying in order for [inaudible] water.

SP: Right. Exactly. Well, what I mentioned is two things. I think there's two. My feeling, and I think that this is something that a lot of people who've looked into the history, the one thing that you can really relate to when you're talking to the public and you're trying to explain a little about the fisheries and the whole situation with the regulations position and the public, et cetera, the one thing that I find that they always understand is bycatch. When you explain bycatch, everyone sees this is a disaster. So, the fact that you've had regulations that have been put in

place to protect what is a limited resource, and basically, the way they're set up is causing the people who are harvesting this resource for the public to throw away the same resource that supposedly is being protected. That people immediately understand and it begins to make them aware of why something needs to be done. So, I think that, in my mind, the real plan and concept of formation is that it addresses that and the regulations they say, I know does not address that kind of – so, I guess in a nutshell, that is a bit quick summary. Frank, where did I go wrong?

Frank Mirarchi: Well, you are very, very [inaudible].

SP: Oh, well thank you. [laughter]

FM: The only thing I differ with is that you seem to imply that before the foreign fishery, it was a utopian fishery.

SP: Well, no. It was just after. As I see it, it was just after the 200-mile limit came in. Then my understanding is that the young fishermen had a short utopia. Am I wrong?

FM: Well, yes. My thinking is this, there's never been stability in fisheries. It's not an inherently stable enterprise. As far back as I can remember, the people that fished before me that told these stories was, there was just a constant recycling of wooden boxes because there were no [inaudible] in place, there was no regulation. People just moved in and moved out of the fishery according to how great an opportunity they perceived in it. The technology didn't exist just excavate the fish. All you did is fished down to the level that it became economically not viable any longer and then people moved away. In recent years now with these available technologies, we probably could physically harm the sustainability of fish. Back in those days, it wasn't a physical thing, it was an economic thing. But there was never a period of time when everyone was just fat and dumb and happy when fishing.

SP: But I do think that the inshore fishing, like you, [laughter] when after the foreign trawlers were moved offshore, suddenly you had no one competing with you here.

FM: That's totally true. But my thing is a little different, that it wasn't so much the offshore level absence or presence. It was the amount of fleet. We had gone through a boom right after the Second World War. There was no fishing during World War II because everybody was either serving in the Airforce or they were doing something and it was dangerous with the submarines to [inaudible] offshore fishing. So, the fish had seven years basically from [19]41 to [19]45. That would have been four years to repopulate. So, when fisheries started in the early 1950s, so it was a lot of fish. Those fish were fished out. When I first started fishing by the 1950, there weren't so many fish. Fishing wasn't that great. It began to increase again, actually, in the late [19]50s into the early [19]70s. Then the next big dabble wasn't so much the presence or absence of foreign fishermen, it was the subsidization, which you correctly identified, of the American fleet that caused the next in downturn. We really didn't compete that much with the foreign fishermen. It was foreign fishing just quite close to the ocean. It wasn't specific to the coastline, within maybe 20 or 30 miles. But there was nothing way inshore. You wouldn't see [inaudible] trawler. It wouldn't upset the mud or anything like that.

SP: But the roots [inaudible] on Georges Bank.

FL: Or that.

FM: Absolutely, the Georges Bank. But not really in close. So, it's a little bit different. Absolutely, the Georges Bank fishermen were up against it. I know they were basically, yes, not able to compete. They were individual enterprises pitching against foreign government-supported fleets basically. To your point, I absolutely agree. Just my interpretation that there never was an under economically equilibrium, never would be a sustainable fishery that would be constantly producing at maximum sustainable yield. It's a problem that many have control for NFY all the time. Never there, and you're supposedly right, on the line. Then that's why we've never been able to achieve that. We probably never will be able. Whereas the natural cycle of fishing is like this. You never anticipate, but you're always either coming and going. There's never ever a happy and full [inaudible] for very long.

SP: Well, another thing when Frank had started talking, I realized that I didn't mention the impact of great more or high-tech electronics, et cetera, because that's when the [inaudible] had a huge effect on equipment there.

Male Speaker: When did that come in? 1940?

SP: Well, I don't know. I could ask you that.

FM: It was a different revolution.

SP: Yes, right.

FM: But the first was LORAN.

SP: [inaudible]

FM: The LORAN technology was actually developed in the Second World War for bombers so they could find Japan, basically.

SP: I remember LORAN on boats in –

FM: In the [19]50s, yes. They were all military [inaudible]. They were black boxes. So, the first consumer LORAN came out in the late [19]60s, early [19]70s. I bought a boat in [19]67 and I got a brand-new marine LORAN. They were not that good. You could find yourself within 1,000 feet or so.

SP: [laughter]

FM: Well, then the next big revolution was GPS. GPS came along in the early to mid-[19]90s, I guess. Not more than 20 years old now. That's totally revolutionized that. So, then you now

have a 10-meter repeatable precision. You need to find a needle in a haystack, literally, and it did. Susan is absolutely right. Those levels of precision basically made all of the natural [inaudible] of the fish go away. So, likely what you're doing was there were fish everywhere. The natural difficulty of certain areas, particularly with this kind of thing, the dragging and that where you need basically [inaudible] from flat bottom. If the area was complex on a rock, but even if you didn't know where the rocks were, that was pretty much risky to the fish even though it wasn't really typical bottom. If you could dig and find your way around with the GPS there was no problem at all. All of a sudden, that little sanctuary is dark. It was almost anywhere.

FL: Around the rock.

FM: Around the rock. They would hide under the rock and you found them. It really definitely did enable overfishing to occur to a much deeper level, I guess. If you look at overfishing then as a depletion from whatever the equilibrium biomass level it makes you provide would be. The GPS didn't go much deeper with technology than they would. It was just a fumbling and bumping into things like we did in the [19]60s and [19]70s.

SP: Also, comparing what Frank has been saying, way back to the time of the schooners, there were some people who were really concerned at that time about the fact that it wasn't a resource that was going to go on forever. When the [inaudible] came in, there were people who were objecting to that and writing letters and saying, "This is going to decimate the fisheries. You can't let this happen." Now, of course, that's pretty [inaudible] fishing. [laughter]

FL: Now, what [inaudible] the other way. [inaudible] to buy more boats.

SP: Yes, exactly. Well, that was much later.

FM: It's never that coherent policy. The policy has been depending on things, one way or the other. Oh my God, what we did was terrible fisheries. Oh, we need more fisheries. Who could be blamed?

SP: [laughter]

FM: The other thing what they're doing that we haven't talked about, but I think there's definitely an issue here, is the role of judicial intervention. This Amendment 5 was basically participated. I know this well because I was on the council. But Conservation Law Foundation through the Secretary of Finance saying that the interim plan and legislating the interim plan is [inaudible]. They get that thrown out if it's not compatible with the national standard of Magnuson. The settlement was in August of, yes, 1991. It was the first day I was on the council. It was the August council meeting in 1991.

FL: Back when [inaudible] really. But one of my problems was that the mullet fishermen were [inaudible] wanted me out of business. All the [inaudible] and we learned that way by knowing by them. Then we tracked that fishing [inaudible] are you out of business, I would like to know. Because we really found that over and over again. That is my biggest problem. How do you access people's thoughts? One is saying things that [laughter]

SP: Well, I think that many of the people who have been doing this successfully here in New Bedford came to this country and they didn't speak the language well and they just did something that they knew how to do. Then where they lived allowed for that. An analogy, you could say people who were farmers came to this area and they found they could work on cranberry farms. While other people went to New Bedford and they found they could go out and they could fish. So, the climate whenever it allowed it. Then I think those same people when they were suddenly faced with governmental control of what they were just doing naturally, didn't know how to deal with that. They didn't understand and they didn't understand a lot of the things that were written. They didn't understand a lot of the things they were being told. So, as a result, probably people learned to yell louder. [laughter]

FL: They yell louder.

SP: That we do.

FL: Well, a little bit. Most of the fishermen that yell were Americans who were not – because first the fishermen would not go in the afternoon.

SP: Well, I think that...

FL: Some of them, yes.

SP: I think they've had to become much more sophisticated. You have, well, two generations. [laughter] What's his name? Martin? Dave Martins.

FM: Dave Martins.

SP: Yes, Dave Martins is a very well-spoken scientist who grew up in...

FL: I actually met him today.

SP: Oh, okay. Great. Well, he's wonderful. He'll have lots of good information for you. [laughter]

FL: Well, I was standing with him in the meeting while the [inaudible].

SP: But I think you'll find that [inaudible] from a Portuguese family. Her family had owned fishing boats, and became very, very well versed as a protective measure. You really had to. So, yes, not all of the [inaudible] fishermen went to meetings. But more and more started realizing they had to go to meetings to understand how their livelihood was going to be affected.

FL: So, that is my biggest problem, is to be asked what happened without reading out what people were claiming.

SP: Yes.

FM: I'm just going to say it's unfair to these people who were making these claims because I was in the same position. We didn't think we were going to survive. When they told me that my days would be reduced to eighty-eight, I said, "I can't do that. That's taking two-forty days a year now." But we did. We adapted. Later on, we did that to where we were fishing twenty-five days a year and still making a reasonably good living, not as good a living as we had made in the [19]80s and early [19]90s. But we're still here. We're not failed by any means because then we wouldn't even consider [inaudible]. The council at its most extreme never got during the debates on Amendment 5 or 7 to the levels of days that either were produced by Amendment 42, for example. Yet people were surviving on the days of Amendment 42. We were able to adapt.

SP: I think adapt is the real key with everything that goes on with the fisheries because the fishermen have no choice. They have to adapt to whatever comes along, whether it's the weather, it's the regulations and so they learn fixing their boats up from nothing out of sea, whatever. They learned a way of life that has forced them to be extremely adaptable.

FL: What about the [inaudible]?

SP: What about it? [laughter]

FL: [inaudible] you mentioned that you went to the council and [inaudible] system. Do you remember documents or anything like that?

SP: You mean the council meetings?

FL: Council meetings or between an amount of people who came for those meetings.

SP: Yes. The councils were an eye opener for me when I first started going to the meetings. This is my own view as an outsider, I came away thinking this is just a total scam. Nothing was being accomplished here. It seemed because we went over and over and over the same rulings and nothing really got changed. Meanwhile, I was talking to the fishermen who were trying to get points across, and they would stand up and say, "But you see, if you go to an area or whatever it is, 125, [laughter] there's such and such a condition there and it's not being addressed." Well, then the meeting would go on and it still wouldn't be addressed. So, I quickly, again as an outsider, had a view that this was a very unworkable system. So, that's why, I guess, obviously the council [inaudible], but that's why I feel that the concept of sector really needs to be pursued because that's the best alternative that anyone sees at the moment. I think I just need to get some water.

FM: It's right there. It's out there [inaudible].

SP: Oh, great. Thank you.

FM: [inaudible]

SP: Thank you.

FL: [inaudible]

FM: No, absolutely, that's his job.

SP: I'm not sure how else. That was my impression of the politics that I was seeing.

FL: My impression is that all of these discussions were outside of the meeting.

SP: This was in the back room. [laughter]

FL: Yes, a lot of the discussions were done [inaudible] the meeting was not being recorded.

SP: Definitely.

FL: It is extremely hard to document. [inaudible] Then people that were there [inaudible] I really wanted that to be true. I [inaudible] I feel there is something.

SP: It's terribly confusing when you're an outsider. It's extremely confusing. You come into it and you adjust to the system. The system even though it supposedly welcomes outsiders, I don't know how it could keep on doing what it's doing and make things more user friendly or more outsider friendly. But it's very confusing, I think. At least in the beginning I began to really make an effort to try to understand it better. But anyway.

FL: Well, it [inaudible] a little bit then you miss it. I believe one [inaudible] that did not help [inaudible]. We might want to jump into the fight, but otherwise, I am wondering if you have written down what you have [inaudible].

SP: Well, you do it and it's self-noted. You did have people from Conservation Law getting up and making points.

FL: But they were [inaudible]?

SP: Yes, that's true.

FL: So, [inaudible] because I heard among the fishermen that is a resource for everyone. Well, it is a resource for everyone, it is a resource for them too. As the consumer, how [inaudible] as opposed to you owning a private fleet of [inaudible] as much as you, why would I have a say in this?

SP: Well, the public is able to go to these meetings. I think the average person doesn't have time unless they have to go off to two, three council meetings. [laughter]

FL: We do not go because it is also very confusing, because it is difficult to understand. Do you see changes? I know you made a lot of community changes in the community structure of people?



SP: Well, in one sense, yes, because I think it's safe to say when I first started talking to fisherman, there was still – well, let me go back a little bit. The nature of this, although it's the minutes now with the electronic, but the nature of the system was if you had a perfect spot where you worked on something, you were out on the scene and you just found a perfect school of fish, you don't really want to be telling go [laughter], you're taking the boats a mile away where this perfect school of fish is. I think it became a menace within the fisheries that the fishermen were a little bit secretive, one from the other. Then to add to that, you have different conditions in New Bedford from what you had in Gloucester and different conditions in [inaudible]. So, I think that there was much more hostility between these different factions. I think that what's happened as a result of these regulations and the council meetings, I think that there's been a much greater understanding that, wait a minute, we're all going to be out of business unless we work together on this. So, that was one thing that I became aware of that I could see. That movement to an understanding, that fishermen really had to work with each other in order to stay afloat.

FL: So, they did begin to work together.

SP: Yes.

FL: While some fishermen [inaudible] nothing. They have had [inaudible] and they cannot even [inaudible] for fisheries.

SP: But I think the fishermen as the community have realized – there are still, obviously, they take out commercial hook system where they have a very unique kind of fishery. I think there's still resentment in some areas for it and a lot of it has to do with misunderstanding. But anyway, for the fact that they've been able to get that whole system with everything, et cetera. So, there's still a small area. There are areas where different facts exist and they don't entirely see eye-to-eye on the others. But basically, as I see it, there's been more of an understanding we're all in this together than there was when I first started looking at this.

FL: That is interesting.

SP: Would you agree, Frank?

FM: No.

SP: Oh, no. [laughter]

FM: No. I wish to disagree with what you've just said. It's probably worse now. Fisheries is insubordinates to the [inaudible].

SP: It is. [laughter]

FL: Well, you also had [inaudible].

SP: Yes, exactly.

FM: It's qualitative. Yes, I'm sorry. I don't have my best numbers. But the problem we have now is between the people who have an allocation and the people who don't have allocation. 50 percent of the fishermen hold 95 percent of the allocation. In number 15, 6 percent of numbers. 50 percent of numbers have 5 Percent of the allocation in number 16. The antipathy there is palpable too. Among the people with the haves and the people that had the 95 percent, there's a growing awareness. Particularly something that interests me, and that is that the – well, I think going back to this human long-term instability, it is for a reason. It's not there just because there's just an amount of same people, it's because there were no secure property rights for fisheries. Because of that, people jump in and jump out opportunistically. They get the most they can possibly get in the least amount of time with the least consideration of sustainability, because their real interest is their personal net take from the fishery. Sustainability is basically shared with everybody. So, it's much more of an asset to catch a lot of fish fast than it is to fear information and fear political coherence. For the most part, they have never provided fishermen with a unique advantage. It's all standard with the [inaudible] model because there's actually a quasi-property right that is created. So, the disconnect between the haves that does not have the quasi-property right, the 95 percent stakeholders, and the 5 percent stakeholders that have no property rights that are focusing on common property, actually that is worse than it's ever been. Where it's going to lead, I don't know. I suspect it's going to end up in court.

SP: On the other hand, just taking a broad view, I remember that well, suddenly you have people putting on a big waterfront program in New Bedford and you have all of the ladies, Angela Sanfilippo, who formed the Fishermen's Wives in Gloucester, going down and always being part of that and involving their husbands, et cetera. That's a different way of looking at it. But I think that you wouldn't have. They couldn't stand each other twenty years ago. [laughter] So, I guess there may be two ways of looking at it here. Actually, what you're talking about is very recent and I'm not that in touch with it.

FM: Well, going back a little bit further then, the constantly shifting alliances. Originally, the alliance is maybe focused more on a gear type or a region. Dragger versus six gear system and small boat, haves were situated up [inaudible] in New Bedford and Gloucester, for example. Perhaps you're right. Those types of antagonisms have subsided. Now, for example, in our fishing sector here in the South Scituate, we have almost equal numbers of gillnet fishermen with a couple of [inaudible] fishermen and trawler fishermen [inaudible] fishermen on fish boats. You're right again to say that fishermen from Gloucester or New Bedford have a little difficulty in cooperating among themselves. But all I feel here is not a change so much in time, but a change in degree. That the life has shifted and those earlier divisions of via type of region have subsided. The new division of haves and have nots, if you will, allocation versus not allocation, are going to be the new fracture point.

SP: This whole thing with New Bedford, who I gather they're the 5 percent, right? The people who were, well, like the mayor of New Bedford who's standing up for the fishermen.

FM: Not really, no. That's a totally different issue.

SP: Who were the 5 percent?

FM: They're mostly new [inaudible] to the fisheries, people that came in the last few years make that to value the people they promised. Their premise was bought this house [inaudible].

SP: Oh, that's good. Oh, nice to see you.

FM: [inaudible]

SP: Oh, nice to see you.

MS: Nice to see you, yes.

FM: Let's go back to what's going on in the [inaudible].

MS: Yes, [inaudible] and all that.

FM: The issue with the mayor, just to clarify, is that none of the people who have been allocated enough of an allocation. Everything is roughly around 50 percent. Everything to do with what's called the setting of the annual catch limit because of some of the uncertainty in the management system right now, they basically have to look at the risk of various lockdown paths to take to allocate. They can't take a risk approach. So, every time there's an uncertainty, they have to discount for that uncertainty. The discounts keep adding up and they added up to almost on average, 50 percent of the total reliable tax is out there. It's available to the systems that you can't have. There's a risk of overfishing if you do. So, basically the 50 percent, whether they're people or whether they're just permits, they're effectively voiceless right now in the system. I just think that the pressure is going to build to the point where as soon as this fishery opens next week officially, May 1st, a Saturday, Sunday, the so-called common pool of the 50 percent in numbers through all 5 percent of the quota are going to go fishing under a system which is very similar to that that occurred on the West Coast before they all went to IS2 where they have a Jersey fishery. They go out, everybody fishes in competition with one another. When the 5 percent is taken [inaudible] large plan, and they all stop. The fishery is usually a complete disaster with people getting hurt if the weather is bad, too much product of low quality and very low value is produced. Then the market here disappears because then nobody for the remainder of the fishing season has anything to sell. So, this is bad as it possibly can get. I think that the stress of that situation is going to engender some sort of litigation before it goes on because it's so bad.

SP: Do you think though that they should get it started May 1st just to get something started? Or do you think this would be more in place?

FM: Well, it's something you put in place with a common pool. It is basically the same system that we've lived under since Amendment 5 with the exception that there is now an annual catch limit versus what was called then a [inaudible] catch. It certainly went over, which we always did. They just took a few more days off past year. Now, it's going to be done within a year so that they have to have a way of actually turning off the fishery like turning off the fish. That

goes right back to the [inaudible] of how a fishery is going to be run. They did it on the West Coast and people accepted that as their norm. But just [inaudible] in Columbia told me that those openings were just enormously stressful to the fishermen there because they basically had to make their year's pay. This was not just an intellectual exercise for them. They had to be ready. If the boats broke down or something went wrong, they were screwed basically. They couldn't regain that opportunity because the [inaudible] on a common pool allocation. So, if the weather was bad and they had to go out or they were just at risk for getting hurt or killed or not making any money. It was often a choice. There was no good alternative for them. These were the guys that survived this transition. So, trawler fishing was terrible when I'm asking these people. There were guys I would say were long gone. Who knows what's happened to them, but it's probably nothing good. But the guys that survived it are so happy to be out of that system and so relieved that they can now just fish at their own pace and work more towards running a stable business and toward a marketing strategy rather than just going out and catching fish as quickly as possible like they had to in the past. But again, the transition is ugly and the transition is key. We were talking before you came, Susan, about the differences between what happened on the East Coast of Canada and on the West Coast of Canada. I can't put my finger on it, but we talked about Nova Scotia, which I know a little bit and Newfoundland which Fabienne knows a little bit about more than I do and how basically the fisheries just atrophy to the point in both those places where the only holders is a quarter were where we integrated food corporations that coalesced around the ocean as a feedstock for their processing facilities versus on the West Coast where at least the surviving individual enterprises not only survive, but thrives. Why that is, I don't know. But there's a point that somebody, I guess, can figure it out. I have no idea what created the difference.

SP: Well, I think the difference is the culture in this because we've been fishing for so long and being part of the culture and being part of the settlement on that.

FM: You go on the waterfront in Vancouver and it's all about the fisheries. They haven't been there that long because there was nobody living there in the 1880s or so.

SP: So, that's why it's easier to see that it's just a business.

FM: Maybe so, I don't know the answer. I mixed up my appointments here this morning, something terribly unjust. I'm in this uncomfortable position, but Peter and I really need to talk for a little bit. So, maybe we're going to walk down to Dunkin' Donuts or something like that. Any one of you, all of you, can come along with us.

SP: Who are you interviewing next?

FL: Well, no one actually. Well, unless there is someone hanging around.

FM: I don't think I've seen anybody.

MS: I think I've indicated in the email that it's going to be [inaudible].

FM: So, the [inaudible].

FL: Yes, on the others [inaudible].

MS: I'm just going to change it.

FM: Yes, you should.

[end of transcript]