

Subject: RE: Mullet netting

Dear Mr Wills

Please see my comments are in red type below, whilst your message is in blue.

Firstly although I feel 3 months is an unacceptable length of time to wait for a reply I would like to thank you for dropping all other work in order to respond. I agree wholeheartedly with you, but I would point out that it is also unacceptable for me to be working the ridiculous hours over my allotted hours that I am (up to 400 per year, plus several days lost holidays each year), in order to respond to the statutory tasks at hand. I am not complaining in the slightest because I do the extra hours unpaid through my own choice, but I offer the information to demonstrate that we are not sitting back doing nothing with our time or resources, and do not have spare capacity to always immediately respond to 'concerns' from taxpayers and/or stakeholders. My officers are also regularly working in excess of their paid hours. The fact is that we do not have enough personnel to carry all the tasks at hand and that situation will not change over the coming years especially with the forming of IFCA's. Rightly or wrongly, mullet along with several other species, is not seen as a priority area by CEFAS (the fishery scientists) or the government through Defra or the MMO. You have given me nothing of substance in your emails that causes concern for the species locally, so it is of low priority to ourselves also. If you, or any other interests can come up with evidence (not supposition or accusations) that there is real pressure on the species in the Cornwall inshore area, then I and my officers will give it the appropriate time (whilst having to drop other areas of work) to assess the situation in the same manner we do for any other species. That has always been the case.

I would like to take this opportunity to reply to the points in your letter and ask a few supplementary questions.

Again I would like to take issue with the fact that because large catches of mullet are still being made you seem to equate this with a healthy fishery. I assume that because you have given no statistics in

your letter regarding these regular big catches that you have not researched this statement and are merely assuming the stock is healthy without checking back over the years to see if there has actually been a decline. Please read my previous message, I have spoken at length to CEFAS, who in light of the fact there are no other scientific authority on the species that I know of, are the experts The most popular opinion is that most of these shoals are not even from our waters but are fish simply over wintering, which makes the real impact of this netting even less certain Who's 'popular opinion' and where is the data supporting this? "Opinion" is supposition and not evidence so I do not have the luxury of being able to act upon it.. Surely you must agree that without this information you are in no position to assume anything especially as you admit that there is very little data regarding mullet stocks.

With this in mind I find it difficult to understand why you do not feel the need to support a restriction or ban on beach seining especially when you state yourself that you do not like the idea of 'species of any fish being caught while they are in roe(by commercial fishermen, or anglers)' Perhaps you did not read all my last message, as I said ".... my personal view is not sufficient to create laws banning the activity". Surely this would be the perfect opportunity to show that the CSF is serious about protecting fish stocks by targeting a fishery that has very few links with the commercial fishing industry and obviously has little or no economical effect on any commercial fisherman when we read things in the press like, "There is no big financial gain but everyone ends up in the pub after the fish have gone to be sold at Newlyn fish market" (Cornish Fish Auctioneer Robin Turner as published on 6th February 2007 in The Cornishman). That certainly has the air of recreational rather than commercial about it! Are you really suggesting I and my Committee consider banning or restricting recreational fishing activities, or is it just the ones that you do not pursue?

With regards to the foul hooking of fish it is something that I and any other civilised person also detests, In fact it is deemed so barbaric that it is actually against the law for this practise to be carried out in fresh water. Which leads me to the question as to who this other person was that spoke with such knowledge (or lack of) on the subject. I say 'lack of knowledge' as I find it extraordinary that you are trying to compare the foul hooking of fish to hooking a fish in the mouth, and I find it even more extraordinary that you would concede that it was a fair point without finding out some basic information. Firstly it has

nothing to do with it being 'sportsmanlike' I would of thought that it was common sense, the fact is fish have very few if any pain receptacles around the mouth as opposed to the rest of the body, so the pain they would suffer when foul hooked would be far greater, plus a foul hooked fish that rips itself free will almost certainly die a slow and painful death, while a lost fish hooked in the mouth would suffer no ill affect. As has been the case so many times in our discourse, you have completely missed the point that I was making. I have made my feelings on foul-hooking very clear, but from a fishery managers perspective, it is entirely irrelevant if a fish is caught and killed by foul hooking, or by mouth, because it is one less fish to be managed. As regards the pros and cons of fish pain receptors, I suggest that is an area you may not wish to to highlight too much in public.

I would also like to point out that the majority of anglers now practise catch and release and not only with mullet but with most species Not so, if my officer's observations at sea and around the coast are an indicator. Usually most fish that are of a good size and are edible, are retained for the pot. Some anglers practice catch and release, but certainly not a majority of those we come across. You go on to say that unless there is 'evidence that the activity is having a detrimental effect or evidence that stopping it would have a beneficial effect' no byelaw can be made, surely it is your responsibility to collect this evidence to evaluate whether a byelaw is justified or not! [snip: your responsibility] yes it is our responsibility if sufficient evidence is forthcoming to suggest a measure is needed. It is not our responsibility, and there are not the resources available to collect data on every concern expressed, until and unless there is some sort of information supporting the view that a problem actually exists which can be managed.

You say there is no loop hole with regards to beach seining and say I am proceeding from a premise that all exploitation of fish stocks should be banned or controlled.

My answer to that is quite simply, In this day and age to have a certain type of fishing method with no control is absolute madness, and yes I am also saying that if a fishery is not sustainable or not enough science has been done to prove sustainability then at the very least it should be restricted and monitored. On that premise, every single fishery would have to be regulated, including various recreational fisheries.

You go on to mention again how this practice has gone on for centuries with no demise of stocks. I would like to know how you can arrive at this conclusion without any data on mullet numbers to go by? The fact still remains that just because big catches are still being made does not mean stocks are healthy, and when you ask 'so why the difference now' I assume you mean the difference between now and the last few centuries, I would have thought it was quite obvious, there are far less fish and far too many people trying to catch them. Where are the data that there are fewer fish and more people??? It is all very well making a statement like that, but can it be backed up and produced in a court of law if necessary? . I would also be very interested to know how great you think the impact of recreational angling has on mullet as a species, As I can tell you that the Cornish Federation of Sea Anglers had 56 Thick lipped Mullet brought to the scales in 2009 along with 39 Golden Grey Mullet (a figure that has been in decline for the last 10 years) to which I am sure you will agree even if we doubled or trebled it to allow for non club members it is quite literally a drop in the ocean compared to even one small catch with a beach seine.

I would finally like to point out that although you seem very quick to disregard any points that I put forward That is my point, they are just "points" that you raise and although interesting they provide me with nothing to act on. and to defend commercial interests I also actively defend the rights of anglers in discussions with the commercial sector. I do not discriminate between the two sectors. Remember, that the majority of our restrictions and measures affect commercial fisheries only and so does our enforcement activity, so I would hazard a guess that commercial fishermen will not agree with your view that we defend them. , that you are in fact the custodians of a public resource not just a commercial one. Not once in your previous correspondence have you even mentioned or taken into account the needs of the tax paying recreational angler even though there are tens of thousands of us in Cornwall compared to only maybe a thousand commercial fisherman, which obviously equates to a far greater proportion of CSFC costs actually being paid for by recreational anglers than commercial fishermen And yet even with this in mind at the moment we seem to have no say in the management or future of our fishery. I would like to think this may change when you become the Inshore Fisheries & Conservation Authorities (IFCAs) and that recreational anglers may finally be given a chance to voice their opinions on the future of fish stocks, instead of this

constant disregard of the fact that what you are responsible for is a public fishery resource, and not something that is solely the property of the commercial fishing industry. I refer you to my comments above and to my previous emails. It will be interesting to see if IFCA's materialise in the form originally envisaged, given the recent change in Government and the pressure on the public purse.

As I have mentioned in a previous message that we are not poles apart in what we are trying to achieve, but I have restrictions placed upon me by law on how I go about that. If you are unable, or refuse to recognise that fact then I feel our 'discussion' is to no avail and we are destined to be on opposite sides of the same coin. To that end and given my comments above on the pressures we face regarding time, if you wish to take this further, I suggest you phone this office at some time for a chat (or arrange to meet up) so that perhaps I can get across to you what I am evidently failing to do by email, and similarly, you can do the same for me. Discussion by email sometimes is not the best or most efficient medium and certainly complaining to Councillors or other people will not get us anywhere.

Regards

Edwin Derriman
Chief Fishery Officer
Cornwall Sea Fisheries
Old Bonded Warehouse
Quay Street
Penzance
Cornwall TR18 4BD

phone: ++ 44 (0)1736 369817

Fax: ++ 44 (0)1736 331020

email: ederriman.seafisheries@cornwall.gov.uk

From: Chris Wills [<mailto:chris.wills@cornishcoffee.co.uk>]
Sent: 24 June 2010 16:13
To: Derriman Eddy
Cc: davigden@aol.com; Kaczmarek Mark CC;
simon.toms@environment-agency.gov.uk; bob.healeas@totalise.co.uk;
malcolm@nancefarm.co.uk
Subject: RE: Mullet netting

Dear Mr Derriman

Firstly although I feel 3 months is an unacceptable length of time to wait for a reply I would like to thank you for dropping all other work in order to respond.

I would like to take this opportunity to reply to the points in your letter and ask a few supplementary questions.

Again I would like to take issue with the fact that because large catches of mullet are still being made you seem to equate this with a healthy fishery. I assume that because you have given no statistics in your letter regarding these regular big catches that you have not researched this statement and are merely assuming the stock is healthy without checking back over the years to see if there has actually been a decline. The most popular opinion is that most of these shoals are not even from our waters but are fish simply over wintering, which makes the real impact of this netting even less certain. Surely you must agree that without this information you are in no position to assume anything especially as you admit that there is very little data regarding mullet stocks.

With this in mind I find it difficult to understand why you do not feel the need to support a restriction or ban on beach seining especially when you state yourself that you do not like the idea of 'species of any fish being caught while they are in roe (by commercial fishermen, or anglers)'. Surely this would be the perfect opportunity to show that the CSF is serious about protecting fish stocks by targeting a fishery that has very few links with the commercial fishing industry and obviously has little or no economical effect on any commercial fisherman when we read things in the press like, "There is no big financial gain but everyone ends up in the pub after the fish have gone to be sold at Newlyn fish market" (Cornish Fish Auctioneer Robin Turner as published on 6th February 2007 in The Cornishman). That certainly has the air of recreational rather than commercial about it!

With regards to the foul hooking of fish it is something that I and any other civilised person also detests, In fact it is deemed so barbaric that it is actually against the law for this practise to be carried out in fresh water. Which leads me to the question as to who this other person was that spoke with such knowledge (or lack of) on the subject. I say 'lack of knowledge' as I find it extraordinary that you are trying to compare the foul hooking of fish to hooking a fish in the mouth, and I find it even more extraordinary that you would concede that it was a fair point without finding out some basic information. Firstly it has nothing to do with it being 'sportsmanlike' I would of thought that it was common sense, the fact is fish have very few if any pain receptacles around the mouth as opposed to the rest of the body, so the pain they would suffer when foul hooked would be far greater, plus a foul hooked fish that rips itself free will almost certainly die a slow and painful death, while a lost fish hooked in the mouth would suffer no ill affect.

I would also like to point out that the majority of anglers now practise catch and release and not only with mullet but with most species. You go on to say that unless there is 'evidence that the activity is having a detrimental effect or evidence that stopping it would have a beneficial effect' no byelaw can be made, surely it is your responsibility to collect this evidence to evaluate whether a byelaw is justified or not!

You say there is no loop hole with regards to beach seining and say I am proceeding from a premise that all exploitation of fish stocks should be banned or controlled.

My answer to that is quite simply, In this day and age to have a certain type of fishing method with no control is absolute madness, and yes I am also saying that if a fishery is not sustainable or not enough science has been done to prove sustainability then at the very least it should be restricted and monitored.

You go on to mention again how this practice has gone on for centuries with no demise of stocks. I would like to know how you can arrive at this conclusion without any data on mullet numbers to go by? The fact still remains that just because big catches are still being made does not mean stocks are healthy, and when you ask 'so why the difference now' I assume you mean the difference between now and the last few centuries, I would have thought it was quite obvious, there are far less fish and far to many people trying catch them. I would also be very interested to know how great you think the impact of recreational angling has on mullet as a species, As I can tell you that Cornish Federation of Sea Anglers had 56 Thick lipped Mullet brought to the scales in 2009 along with 39 Golden Grey Mullet (a figure that has been in decline for the last 10 years) to which I am sure you will agree even if we doubled or trebled it to allow for non club members it is quite literally a drop in the ocean compared to even one small catch with a beach seine.

I would finally like to point out that although you seem very quick to disregard any points that I put forward and to defend commercial interests, that you are in fact the custodians of a public resource not just a commercial one. Not once in your previous correspondence have you even mentioned or taken into account the needs of the tax paying recreational angler even though there are tens of thousands of us in Cornwall compared to only maybe a thousand commercial fisherman, which obviously equates to a far greater proportion of CSFC costs actually being paid for by recreational anglers than commercial fishermen. And yet even with this in mind at the moment we seem to have no say in the management or future of our fishery. I would like to think this may change when you become the Inshore Fisheries & Conservation Authorities (IFCAs) and that recreational anglers may finally be given a chance to voice there opinions on the future of fish stocks, instead of this

constant disregard of the fact that what you are responsible for is a public fishery resource, and not something that is solely the property of the commercial fishing industry.

I look forward to your reply

Kind regards

Chris Wills

From: Derriman Eddy [<mailto:ederriman.seafisheries@cornwall.gov.uk>]
Sent: Mon 14/06/2010 16:08
To: Chris Wills
Cc: Simon.Toms@environment-agency.gov.uk; kevin
Subject: RE: Mullet netting

Dear Mr Wills

Thank you for your gentle reminder, it is fortunate that I happen to be in the office today (I was out for most of last week and am out for the rest of this week). You are right, I am very busy (an understatement of fact), but have dropped all other work in order to respond to you. I have spent the last half an hour or so on the phone to Cefas in Lowestoft, to gather the scientific view on the state of the mullet stocks around our coast and feedback from them regarding the incidents you report in your previous message.

In a nutshell, there is very little data regarding mullet stocks but there have been no concerns expressed over the years from the regular groundfish surveys that have gone on for many years, of which mullet will be a small component. The examples of catches you quote (Sennen and Mounts Bay) actually back up the scientist's view that the stock is healthy, because if it wasn't, the large hits would not regularly occur.

I do not like fish of any species being caught when they are in roe (by commercial fishermen, or anglers), but my personal view is not sufficient to create laws banning the activity, unless there is a demonstrable link between the activity and a negative impact on the health of the stock, and/or, banning or controlling the activity will have a beneficial impact on the stocks. It is a fact of life that Government will not confirm any byelaw which is not fully supported by scientific evidence, and as far as I am aware there is no evidence to back up some form of restriction for beach seining or netting for mullet, any more than there is to control the numbers of anglers catching the species.

You may know that we have successfully introduced a ban on the landing of berried lobsters in Cornwall, because the many years of scientific work on that subject (done by Cefas, universities and independents) supported the submission that to balance all the other downward

pressures on the species, there would be a demonstrable benefit to introduce a control. However, when the same arguments were used to support a ban on the landing of berried lobsters nationally, surprisingly the figures did not stack up so well and therefore a national ban was not introduced. I only mention this to demonstrate that what may appear to be logical and obvious to you, I and other persons, is not always necessarily the case.

Turning to the issue of foul hooking, again it is an anathema to me, but that is not sufficient reason to ban the activity. When I mentioned this to another person, I found it interesting that he came back to me with "what is the difference between foul-hooking and someone mouth-hooking a fish; it may not be 'sportsmanlike', but for the fish the stress is the same?". I had to concede it was a fair point to which I had no answer. Again, unless there is evidence that the activity is having a detrimental effect or evidence that stopping it would have a beneficial effect, no byelaw can be made by the CSFC, or confirmed by Defra.

One point that Cefas did mention to me that I had not thought of, but which may warrant further consideration, is that the EA is already well down the path of gathering data for the Water Framework Directive (WFD) in the estuaries and out to one nautical mile around the coast. As part of the ongoing monitoring for WFD, mullet may be seen as an indicator species of good ecological condition and if so, large amounts of data are likely to be gathered from which management measures could possibly be assessed, considered or driven.

Assuming we become an IFCA next year as planned (by no means a given with the new Government's attention to public finances), one of the evidence streams we will be able to use to argue for management measures will be social/economic factors, which we are not able to take into consideration at the moment. However, scientific data/information will still be main requirement for justification of any law.

Finally, in your penultimate paragraph regarding the free use of beach seines you say you find it "quite amazing in this day and age a loophole of this size has not been recognised and changed". There is no "loophole" unless you are proceeding from the premise that all exploitation of fish stocks should be banned or controlled. This activity has gone on for literally centuries and during that time there has probably been a fair smattering of "unscrupulous individuals" trying to take advantage, but the "free for all" has not resulted in the demise of the stocks, despite the addition of the relatively new pressure that has materialised from the recreational anglers, so why the difference

now? It has to be appreciated, a beach seine will cost a serious amount of money to buy (hence why traditionally they were owned by coastal communities), it has to be worked by several people, and no small amount of knowledge and skill is needed if the fishing activity is to be successful. Any person trying to jump on the 'band-wagon' and make a quick buck, will likely be sorely disappointed.

Regards

Edwin Derriman
Chief Fishery Officer
Cornwall Sea Fisheries
Old Bonded Warehouse
Quay Street
Penzance
Cornwall TR18 4BD

phone: ++ 44 (0)1736 369817

Fax: ++ 44 (0)1736 331020

email: ederriman.seafisheries@cornwall.gov.uk

Dear Mr Toms

As a life long member, one time chairman of Redruth Sea Angling Assosiation and a keen mullet angler I was absolutely disgusted to hear of the mass slaughter of mullet that took place at Watergate bay on the 3rd January 2010. It was brought to my attention by a friend who witnessed the whole sad episode; he reliably informed me that a team of seine netters who had spotted the shoal from the cliff top then proceeded to net the fish at the top end of Watergate bay. The netters estimated that they had between 7 and 8 tons of fish in the net, the majority of these fish were golden grey mullet in the 1-2lb range and as you can appreciate this equates to tens of thousands of fish taken, which incidentally were strewn pretty much the length of the beach to the disgust of people out for a pleasant walk (a great advert for sustainable fishing).

Not only is this done with no regard of sustainability or long term damage to fish stocks, it is also just an excuse to make a quick buck, the sad thing is, I have been told that more often than not hits of this size fetch next to nothing with a large part of the catch being used as pig feed, absolutely ridiculous.

The worrying thing is that this will now carry on weather permitting until the fish move off in early spring, how can this be a justified fishery with no regulation or policing taking place, and how can a few greedy individuals be allowed to wreak havoc with fish stocks that they know little or nothing about. I would also like to bring to your attention that the same group of netters are also responsible for decimating the bass stocks on most of the beaches in Newquay bay throughout the summer months again with no thought to the damage they cause.

I would very much like an explanation as to why this is allowed to go on.

I look forward to your reply.

Kind regards

Chris Wills

P.S. Perhaps somebody should also check the legalities of taking a motor vehicle onto Watergate beach as they apparently had a convoy of vehicles taking the fish back to Newquay.

Dear Mr Wills

I have been copied into the email that you sent to Mr Simon Toms and Mr Kevin Bennetts regarding alleged bad fishing practices at Watergate Bay on the 3rd of January.

My officers have spoken at length with one of the fishermen concerned and have ascertained the following.

The shoal was golden grey mullet, 2 tonnes were retained; the average size of the fish was around 1kg. The total amount of fish seined was estimated at 4-5tonnes, 2 tonnes were slipped alive and there was an estimated 300-500kg left on the beach after the slipping. The fish on the beach were cleared up immediately after the remainder of fish was slipped and the net was recovered, so none were left lying around, as they were of size and therefore having value. The fish were sold on Plymouth market and made £1/kg so would have gone for human consumption and not pig feed as surmised. The fisherman who was spoken to by my officers apparently knows the person who is likely to have made the initial complaint to you and he saw him on the beach on the day. Apparently the person only witnessed around 10 minutes of the netting before leaving and certainly he didn't see the entire operation through to the final clear up, so the accusation that they were left on the beach to the disgust of people out for a walk, appears to be unfounded.

You question why this activity is permitted to be carried on. As you will be aware, beach seining has been carried on in Cornwall for centuries and before a legal activity can be stopped under English law, there has to be quite robust evidence to support the banning of it. I am not aware of any evidence to suggest the stock is at risk from this activity. The fact that the shoals appear along the coast each year suggests perhaps that they are in a healthy state and that this activity carried out (at this level of effort) by commercial fishermen is having little or no effect on the overall biomass.

Finally, you state that this is the same group of netters that are "responsible for decimating" the bass stocks on the north coast during the summer. Are you convinced of that? Because although I am aware the team does fish on rare occasions during the summer, there are far more "teams" from the Midlands, Plymouth and elsewhere that come to Cornwall unannounced and allegedly take everything with fins and a head (potentially illegally), and return home the same night before any reports can be got back to us. Because the MFA, EA and ourselves are unable to monitor every beach and road in Cornwall throughout the year, the likelihood of a fishery officer happening on one of these incidents is regrettably relatively small.

Regards
Edwin Derriman
Chief Fishery Officer
Cornwall Sea Fisheries
Old Bonded Warehouse
Quay Street
Penzance
Cornwall TR18 4BD

Dear Mr Derriman

Having just received your email I would like to take issue with several points you have mentioned, firstly the comment that the person who witnessed the netting was allegedly only there for 10 minutes is quite frankly irrelevant, the fact is that fish were strewn across the beach and regardless of the length of time they were left does not alter that fact, I can also assure you that there were many members of the public on the beach that day that were disgusted with what they saw.

With regards to your explanation of the legalities of beach seining and producing robust evidence to ban it under English law, surely some sort of study must be undertaken into the sustainability of both Golden Grey and Thick lipped mullet stocks before even the most qualified person could possibly comment on this practise having little or no affect on the 'overall biomass' of either species, perhaps if this evidence was gathered you would at least be in a position to challenge the current law if stocks were found to be under threat. The fact that it has been carried out for centuries does not mean that it is sustainable; as I am sure you will agree this has been proven time and again with many fisheries over the years, with the same sort of comment being made.

As for the same net only being used on the rare occasion during the summer, I can only say that it has been in operation for many years (and we do hear of it being used regularly) during which time bass stocks in Newquay bay have reduced drastically compared to other areas in Cornwall, if there are as you say several other teams of netters coming into Cornwall 'beach seining' and taking anything with 'fins and a head (probably illegally)' with no record of how much damage is being caused, does this not add to the argument for all beach seining to be banned. If there was to be an outright ban this would surely be far easier for Cornwall Sea Fisheries the MFA and the EA to police as from what you have said at the moment it seems to be a free for all for any body who wants to buy a net and have ago.

I will be copying this email to the Cornish Federation of Sea Anglers the National Mullet Club and my local councillors Graham Hicks and Mark Kaczmarec

I look forward to your reply!

Regards

Chris Wills

Having attended the CFSA Annual General Meeting on the 23rd of January this year I feel I should say how disappointing it was to see only 14 member clubs represented. This is less than 50% of the affiliated clubs of the CFSA. The Federation hold only two General meetings and an Annual General Meeting each year and I don't think it is too much to ask that each club send one or two delegates to these meetings. In total it would mean someone giving up around 6 hours per year, surely not too much to ask of any individual or member club.

The Executive Committee plus other members who regularly attend these meetings must wonder what they have to do to get these clubs to show some interest in the Federation that they are members of. A lot of work goes on behind the scenes of the CFSA and there is nothing more disillusioning than to have an half empty room when these meetings come around.

It is hard enough to get people to stand for positions on a committee but when things like this happen it can only make it harder. Remember it is your Federation so come along have your say, have your vote and try to make the Cornish Federation of Sea Anglers a better organisation.

I also feel that members who take up these positions on a Federation Committee should show an example by turning up for these meetings.

That's the moans and groans out of the way the next thing is competitions and junior anglers.

First competitions please look at the dates that are already taken by the Federation and other clubs before you choose a date for your own club open. We have seen the entries drop alarmingly over the past few years for all competitions so anything we can do to make sure just one competition is held on a given date can only help after all it may secure a few more anglers entering your own competition. Perhaps the time has come for maybe two clubs to get together and hold one large competition and split any money that is made. This is just an idea but it may work in the future.

The only other thing is junior anglers, yes we have some very good ones in the Federation but the problem is numbers. The junior membership's at an all time low and it is not just the CFSA that needs to do something about it, the member clubs and members need to play their part. Would it be a lot to ask for the clubs to hold some kind of open day once a year to try and gain new junior members. This may take the shape of a fish-in where youngsters can come along and learn about the club and sea angling. There could other be benefits for these clubs also with parents of these juniors taking up membership of their club.

I hope to see many more of you at the next CFSA General Meeting.

Bob Healeas

Hannah Prisk

Dear sir, madam

Hi my name is Hannah Prisk aged 11 from saltash cornwall.

I am writing to you in the hope that you may publish this letter as I know lots of anglers in cornwall buy your magazine, as my Dad does I like lots of other people really enjoy fishing and being part of a club, I belong to Lushead and District angling club which is also a member of the CFSA, (Cornish Federation of Sea Angler's) 2009 was the 50th Anniversary of the club, So to mark this event they had extra competitions and extra events through out the year.

The CFSA has 30 affiliated clubs, this means that the federation represents 90% of ~~Sea~~ angling clubs in the county.

The federation promotes boat and shore angling for adults and Juniors they have over 80 trophies which are awarded every year. Plus specimen and county record certificates, To promote Junior angling they run a shore and boat festival every year through out August which is sponsored by Shakespeare fishing

tackle who donate several hundreds of pounds worth of fishing tackle prizes,

But 2009 being the 50th Anniversary of the CFSA with extra events and competitions all local tackle shops donated extra prizes worth thousands of pounds which made the anniversary one to be very proud of and proved to be very rewarding to all anglers who took part and also lots of money being raised for the RNLI in the raffles.

I feel if it wasn't for those tackle shops and all at the CFSA for donating prizes and giving up so much free time us anglers in Cornwall would not get to see and meet each other and give us something to try for every year

I would like to thank all those people involved in the 50th anniversary for making it one to remember and I feel every member of the CFSA feels the same way and are very proud to be part of the club

A BIG thumbs up to all at the CFSA

from Hannah Prisk
aged 11

Letters Received from CFSA Members

Subject: hannah prisk

From: "terry prisk" <terryprisk@googlemail.com>

Date: Sun, August 23, 2009 1:11 pm

To: recorder@thecfsa.com

dear sir

here is a picture of my pullock which i caught this mounth of 2lb 7oz my uncil adrian is sending you a pic of my shore rocklin,i really look forward

to this compation every year as my dad takes me to lots of places and try

for differant fish its been hard work this year as the weather and winds have not been very good and my favorite fish is a mullet which i could not

seem to get due to the wind even my dad could not get one which made me feel

better THANK YOU for all your hard work and for organizing this compation

MANY THANKS HANNAH PRISK liskeard club