

North Pacific Fishery Council

	Act	Info	Have Seen
DIRECTOR		B	
ASST. DIR	✓		ma
SECRETARY	file		
ADMIN. OFFICER			
INFORMATION			
LIBRARY CLERK			
CLERK TYPIST			

D FISH COMPANY

98119 • AREA CODE 206 • 284-2750

March 14, 1977

Remarks: Put in Sec. meeting record - including list of attachments

North Pacific Fishery
 Management Council
 Post Office Box 3136 OT
 Anchorage, Alaska 99510

Dear Mr. Branson:

Enclosed is a copy of my testimony on December 4, 1976, on behalf of the New England Fish Company. Due to an oversight, a copy was not sent as promised. Please accept our apologies.

Sincerely,

Ralph G. Hoard

Ralph G. Hoard
 Area Manager

RGH/lrr

Enc.



T E S T I M O N Y
REGIONAL COUNCIL, ANCHORAGE - DECEMBER 4, 1976

We at New England Fish Company believe the 200-Mile Act encompasses a broader area than most realize, giving the Regional Council a great deal more responsibility than appears on the surface.

We feel that there are five major benefits from the Act:

- 1) Conservation of the resource
- 2) Employment on vessels (to include shipbuilding)
- 3) Employment on shore
- 4) Foreign exchange earnings
- 5) National control of a protein resource

To ensure these national benefits, the following regulatory provisions should be considered in carrying out the intentions of the Act:

Conservation

- 1) Sound, coordinated research between state, local, federal and international agencies should be used to determine optimum sustainable yield and, where appropriate, additional knowledge of controllable factors, affecting the strength and security of the resource concerned, should be obtained (for instance: availability of food, temperature changes or biological conditions affecting survival, pollution, interrelationships of species, etc.).
- 2) Quotas should be set to build optimum sustainable yields.
- 3) Quotas should be properly policed and made to stick.

Employment on Vessels (including shipbuilding)

- 1) We fully support the Act in allowing first priority to American fishermen and United States flag vessels. We are against allowing foreign ownership of our vessels.
- 2) We think the Council should support government programs of vessel construction for fishermen, companies or shipyards.
- 3) We note that Canada is requiring everything to be landed for further processing. This is one extreme and food for thought. Another approach that could be employed on the excess production that the American fleet can't physically harvest, if any (and we question this), would be to allocate to foreign fleets on the basis of economic benefit to the United States. For example, foreign fleets joint venturing with U.S. companies, delivering to U.S. ports, provisioning in the U.S. (thus causing economic benefit to the U.S.), should have a higher priority and their quotas should be indexed to the level of increased benefit to the U.S. Processing on shore would earn a higher quota than processing at sea on a foreign vessel and then transshipping on U.S. carriers through U.S. ports; or transshipping on U.S. carriers through U.S. ports gets a higher priority than not touching shore at all, etc. (the key being value added processing in the United States).

- 4) The foregoing approach allows for closer supervision of what the catch actually is by all parties.

Employment on Shore

- 1) Shore employment is the largest employment source and basis of tax revenue (income taxes, property taxes, etc.).
- 2) The Council should support government programs to train, house and locate employees. It should support immigration of workers if shore population is insufficient to support expansion of processing.

Foreign Exchange

The more local activity (supplies or processing) with free trade to foreign markets will generate favorable foreign exchange.

National Control of Protein Resource

Supply of food, like oil, will become a major world economic factor. U.S. ownership of boats and plants maximizes the options of the United States.

We would encourage the Council to take into consideration the entire scope of economic factors involved, before policies are set, that could have adverse effects on our seafood resources in the future.