



Serial No. N374

NAFO/FC Doc. 81/VI/7

FISHERIES COMMISSION

Report of the

THIRD SPECIAL MEETING - JUNE, 1981
MONTREAL, QUEBEC, CANADA

Thursday, 25 June, 1030 hrs and 1830 hrs
Friday, 26 June, 0955 hrs and 1030 hrs

1. The Third Special Meeting of the Fisheries Commission of NAFO was declared open by the Chairman, Mr. J. B. P. Farnell (EEC). Delegations from all members of the Commission were present with the exception of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, and Romania.
2. Under Agenda Item 2, Appointment of Rapporteur, Capt. J. C. E. Cardoso, Executive Secretary, was appointed rapporteur.
3. Under Agenda Item 3, Adoption of Agenda, the Provisional Agenda was adopted without change, as the Agenda of the Meeting (Appendix I).
4. Under Agenda Item 4, Admission of Observers, the Chairman welcomed the observer from Spain.
5. Under Agenda Item 5, Publicity, it was agreed that the usual practice would be followed whereby the Chairman of the Fisheries Commission, together with the Executive Secretary of NAFO, would agree upon a press release at the close of the meeting.
6. Under Agenda Item 6, Approval of Report of the Second Special Meeting, March/April 1981, the report as contained in NAFO/FC Doc. 81/IV/4 (Revised) was approved subject to revision of the titles of the paragraphs by the Executive Secretary.
7. Under Agenda Item 7, Review of Commission Membership, it was noted that there had been no change in the Commission membership since the Second Special Meeting of the Fisheries Commission held in March/April 1981. The List of Participants is attached as Appendix II.
8. Under Agenda Item 8, Management Measures for Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area - Cod in Div. 3M, the Chairman explained that all Delegations had been advised that Portugal had objected to the allocation of cod quotas in Division 3M and he reminded the Delegates that the recommendation that had been objected to had replaced a previous interim decision taken in September 1980 for the year of 1981 and one could wonder if the Commission should not revert to that previous decision if no agreement could be found at the present Meeting. He then invited the Portuguese Delegate to explain Portugal's reasons for objecting. The Portuguese Delegate explained that it was impossible for Portugal to work with an allocation smaller than that of the previous year. This had been clearly explained at the Second Special Meeting and in the terms of the objection presented by Portugal. The Delegate of Canada pointed out that the agreement of September 1980 had been replaced by the agreement reached at the last Meeting. However, an objection had been presented by one country against this last agreement and other objections could now still be presented. He reminded the Commission that Canada at the last Meeting had immediately warned that it would ask for a Special Meeting if any objection would be received. It was disturbing to realize that the use of the objection procedure was becoming much more frequent in NAFO than it had been in ICNAF and that although Canada recognized the right of any Contracting Party to lodge an objection one would have to conclude that if objections would become routine, as a solution to any economical or social difficulty, they would finish by defeating the purpose and objectives of the Fisheries Commission. He also pointed out that although 3M cod was considered by Canada a very important stock and Canada felt that TACs must be set in accordance with scientific advice nevertheless Canada had always been flexible in dealing with short term difficulties. Following this line Canada had been prepared to accept a TAC of 10,000 tons because it felt that it was better to have a slightly higher TAC universally accepted and implemented than to have a lower TAC which was neither. The Delegate of Canada believed that the Commission should reopen the discussion of the situation in the Flemish Cap and see if it could come to a universally acceptable allocation scheme. The Delegate of the EEC stressed that it was a proposal of the Community that had been adopted at the last Meeting and he reminded the Commission that the TAC even on that proposal was above the level that the scientists had recommended as required by

caution. The EEC was always reluctant to propose TACs that would exceed those recommended by scientists and certainly would not be willing to recommend TACs in excess of 100-200% of those. The EEC preference therefore would be to stick to the recommendation as it had been adopted even if that would entail one or two objections. The Delegate of the Faroe Islands felt that their fishery interests were best served by the recommendations adopted through international organizations as the result of cooperation and give and take among the interested parties. They felt that in that manner most times genuine special interests were recognized. They had to state that at the last meeting NAFO had not recognized that the Faroese use very selective ways of fishing. In fact it had been seen that there were three countries with special problems, Norway, the Faroe Islands and Portugal, but only Norway had succeeded in having its problem attended to. As a result of this Portugal had then objected to the resulting recommendation and obviously the Faroese would have to now consider if they too had to object. They had come to the meeting hoping however that a solution would be found to avoid that. The Delegate of the USSR stated that although they had expressed at the last Meeting opinions that differed from the scientific advice given to the Commission and the allocation resulting from the adopted recommendation did not satisfy the interests of the USSR, they certainly were of the opinion now that it was unwise to reconsider those allocations. The Chairman then clarified that the problem was to know the position of every Commission member in relation to the following question: -To what extent should the Commission's allocations satisfy the different needs of every member country or to what extent that satisfaction should be sacrificed in order to follow the scientific advice given to the Commission in relation to the stock in question? The Faroese Delegate in trying to answer this question, which he considered a very difficult one, said that their desire was that the selectivity of the fishing methods used should be taken into consideration along with all the other factors that are now considered. The Delegate of Poland stated that, in agreement with the Delegate of the USSR, they would rather stay with the recommendation adopted at the last Meeting. The Chairman asked the Delegate of Portugal if he had a proposal for a new TAC for the 3M cod. In reply the Delegate of Portugal reminded the Commission of all the factors that made this stock so important for Portugal and stated that, although with great sacrifice, Portugal was prepared to limit its catch of 3M cod to 3500 tons as it had done in 1980. The Delegate of the USSR considered that it could be a bad precedent to instigate a special meeting of the Commission anytime a country would object to a Commission recommendation. He considered that the solution to such a problem could hardly be to reconsider the whole matter in the middle of the fishing season. Technical difficulties, in his view, would always make it inadvisable to change recommendations then. The Delegate of Canada asked the Commission to consider that 3M cod was a very special case and that, in fact, organizing a special meeting in this occasion might result exactly in discouraging the repetition of either further objections or other special meetings similar to the present one in the future. One would have to consider that, if no one else would object, a catch of some 9820 tons would result and that could probably be acceptable. On the other hand if no discussion would have taken place and no agreement would have been reached, why would the problem not repeat itself year after year and the resulting catch grow up to say 15,000 tons or even 30,000 tons? He would insist that it was better to fix an acceptable TAC, as long as everybody would accept to leave it at that level until such time as the Commission could agree to a real management regime. One would have to agree that while some members were bound and some were not, there was no management regime. In fact it was foolish to expect Canada to go on sacrificing her interests in this stock accepting a quota of some 100 tons instead of objecting as well. The Delegate of the EEC accepted the advantage of having an element of certainty in the behaviour of every member of the Commission in relation to this stock but called attention to the fact that the Commission certainly seemed unlikely to agree on a TAC of less than 13,000 tons and that level had been shown by the scientists at the last meeting to bring a very small recovery of the stock, if at all. The Delegate of the Faroe Islands stated that they were certainly in favour of a long-term policy in order to stick to a certain level of catch for several years as was obvious from their intervention and proposals at the last meeting.

9. At the suggestion of the Chairman that, in order to give time to consider these difficult matters, the Commission should now discuss Agenda Item 9, Management Measures for Fish Stocks Overlapping National Fishing Limits - Cod in Div. 3NO, the Delegate of Canada explained that in their opinion there was a serious problem of adherence to the conditions set down by the Commission as a prerequisite to the allocation of cod in 3NO and Canada would propose, with, he hoped, the concurrence of other Delegates, to have informal intergovernmental consultations before the Commission would discuss the problem. As no one objected this was agreed and the meeting adjourned at 1230 hrs.
10. The Commission reconvened at 1830 hrs 25 June 1981.
11. Returning to Management Measures for Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area-Cod in Division 3M, Agenda Item 8, the Delegate of the Faroe Islands, after explaining that in his view the situation was very difficult not only for some of the countries involved but also for NAFO itself if the Meeting would not be able to come up with a solution, decided to put forward what had been the Portuguese proposal at the last Meeting of the Commission, since that proposal had never been voted and it appeared that it solved all the special problems already explained, without threatening to deplete the stock. In fact, in that proposal, the TAC was set at 13,000 tons and it could be said that its only disadvantage was that it would only allow very slow recovery of the stock. The allocations per country were the same as in 1980. The Delegate of Norway declared that his country could support the proposal the

Delegate of the Faroe Islands had just presented and stressed that in his view what was important was that every member country should respect the limits of its own allocation. Every fishing vessel should act in a very responsible manner. This was more important than the fact that the TAC was slightly higher than it had been recommended by the scientific advice. The Delegate of Canada explained that as indicated earlier Canada was prepared to support this proposal but would like to propose immediately a small amendment to it:--The amount reserved for Spain should be kept at 345 tons and the amount for Others should be only 50 tons bringing the TAC down to 12,750 instead of 13,000. The difference in the total catch was not important but in his view the principle underlying the conservation of these two quotas, as they were in the recommendation as it had been adopted at the last meeting, was indeed important. Furthermore they would like to ask all the members of the Fisheries Commission if it were possible to keep this proposal not only for 1981 but also for 1982. The Delegate of the USSR stated that he could accept the Faroese-Portugal proposal with the Canadian amendment. The Delegate of Norway declared that he was not prepared to discuss the TAC and allocation for this stock for 1982 at the present meeting. In fact he would remind the Commission that it had already practically agreed to discuss that at the next Annual Meeting. The Delegate of Canada agreed with the intervention of the Delegate of Norway and consequently the Commission agreed to discuss the 1982 TAC and allocation at the next Annual Meeting. The Delegate of Portugal supported the proposal from the Faroese as amended by Canada. The Delegate of the Faroe Islands supported the Canadian amendment. The Delegate of Canada suggested that the Commission take note that the proposal is as attached in Appendix III and that its consideration should take place tomorrow 26 June so that all the Delegates would have time to study the proposal. This was agreed.

Dealing once again with Management Measures for Fish Stocks Overlapping National Fishing Limits - Cod in Division 3NO, Agenda Item 9, the Delegate of Canada introduced the draft of a proposal for a Resolution of the Fisheries Commission of NAFO dealing with the problem of the compliance by Spanish vessels with all NAFO conservation and enforcement regulations (Appendix IV). After a brief introduction and the reading of the proposal the Delegate of Canada suggested that, in order to give time for the study of the proposed Resolution, the later should be considered on the next day, 26 June 1981. The Delegate of EEC thanked the Delegate of Canada for the draft presentation which in his opinion reflected the observations that had been made in the informal discussions that had taken place before. The EEC would study the proposal further but thought it could probably support such a proposal. The Delegate of the USSR felt that his attitude towards the proposal would not change in spite of the efforts made and, in any case, would like to propose that instead of the expression "rational utilization" the expression "optimum utilization" should be used since that was the one used in the NAFO Convention and in the last compromise text of the Third Law of the Sea Conference.

The Chairman then adjourned the meeting at 1900 hrs to be reconvened at 0930 hrs 26 June 1981.

The Commission reconvened at 0955 hrs 26 June 1981.

The Chairman decided to open the Meeting continuing the discussion of Management Measures for Fish Stocks Overlapping National Fishing Limits-Cod in Div. 3NO, Agenda Item 9 and, noting that so far only two Delegates had addressed themselves to this subject, invited all the other Delegates to comment on the draft of the Resolution proposed by Canada. The Delegate of Canada introduced a minor amendment to his own proposal by replacing the word "indicated" in the last but one line of the preamble of the Resolution by the words "would suggest". He also announced that a detailed list of the vessels that had been found in violation by the inspectors would be available very soon in the Delegates' boxes. The Chairman commented that it was assumed that the corresponding inspection reports would soon be sent to the NAFO Secretariat and the Flag State of the vessels. After allowing some time for comments, as none were forthcoming, the Chairman considered that it appeared that there were no objections to the draft of the Resolution with the minor amendment introduced by the proposing country.

In order to give more time for consideration of the draft Resolution the Chairman passed on to the final study of Management Measures for Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area-Cod in Div. 3M, Agenda Item 8. The Delegate of the EEC while noting that a consensus was about to be established nevertheless would like to state for the record that the EEC regretted that it was not possible to obtain agreement on a TAC more in line with the scientific advice received. He also would like to make clear that they accepted the new allocation in the expectation that at the next Annual Meeting the TAC for the stock in question would be fixed on a long-term basis. The Delegate of Canada stated that he was prepared to accept the new proposal as it appeared to be universally acceptable but he would like to make clear that his acceptance was under the understanding that the measures for 3M formed one single package with the Resolution concerning the stocks in 3NO. After this intervention the Chairman decided to adjourn the Meeting for a while in order to make sure that everybody was in agreement with both the measures applicable in Division 3M and the Resolution. The meeting adjourned at 1010 hrs.

The Commission reconvened at 1030 hrs 26 June 1981.

18. The Chairman concluded that no adverse comments having been received by the Chair it was now evident that a complete consensus existed on the decisions taken relative to items 8 and 9 of the Agenda. He made clear that everybody understood that the Commission had adopted a new allocation for cod in 3M and the Resolution regarding the Spanish problem and had waived the normal Rules of Procedure because it was understood that this was an emergency special meeting and there were no emergency meeting procedure rules for the Commission. In fact, it would be wise to study a set of such rules and conclude what agenda items, if any, would be appropriate for those emergency meetings.
19. On Agenda Item 10, Time and Place of Next Meeting, the Chairman informed the Commission that this had been decided at the last meeting to be in Halifax from 8 September - 11 September, 1981.
20. On Agenda Item 11, Other Business, the Delegate of Canada informed the Commission that at the next Annual Meeting they might wish to revise the status of the observers studying that question under two points of view: (a) Should their presence be acceptable in the future without the fulfilment of certain conditions? (b) Should they always be allowed to participate in the discussions and to put forward their point of view?

The Chairman called the attention of the Delegates to the fact that the report of the sessions of the day before was already to hand and that it was expected that the Delegates would leave with the Secretary any comments they might desire to make. He also suggested that the report of the sessions of that day was certainly short and simple and therefore it would be more practical to have it sent to the Delegates by post with any comments received in the same manner.

21. As to Agenda Item 12, Press Statement, it would be drafted by the Chairman with the assistance of the Executive Secretary as it was usually done and then sent to the Delegates. (See Appendix V)
22. The Meeting finally adjourned at 1100 hrs, 26 June 1981.

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

FISHERIES COMMISSION

THIRD SPECIAL MEETING - 25 and 26 JUNE 1981

Agenda

OPENING PROCEDURES:

1. Opening by the Chairman, Mr. J. B. P. Farnell (EEC)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Admission of Observers
5. Publicity

ADMINISTRATION:

6. Approval of Report of the Second Special Meeting, March/April 1981 (NAFO/FC Doc
81/IV/4, Revised)
7. Review of Commission Membership

CONSERVATION:

8. Management Measures for Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area - Cod in Div. 3M
9. Management Measures for Fish Stocks Overlapping National Fishing Limits -Cod in
Div. 3NO

CLOSING PROCEDURES:

10. Time and Place of Next Meeting
11. Other Business
12. Press Statement
13. Adjournment

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

FISHERIES COMMISSION

THIRD SPECIAL MEETING

MONTREAL, CANADA, 25 JUNE-26 JUNE 1981

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Chairman of the Fisheries Commission: Mr. J. B. P. Farnell, Directorate General for Fisheries, Commission of the European Communities, 120 Rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels, Belgium.

CANADA

Head of Delegation: Dr. A. W. May, Assistant Deputy Minister, Atlantic Fisheries, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

Mr. C. J. Allen, International Directorate, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario
Mr. B. Applebaum, Director, International Fisheries Relations Branch, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 235 Queen Street, Ottawa, Ontario
Mr. S. W. Bartlett, Atlantic Operations, Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario
Mr. R. Beaulieu, Min. Affaires Exterieures (GEB), Ottawa, Ontario
Mr. D. M. Brown, Intergovernmental Affairs Analyst, Ground Floor, Confederation Bldg., St. John's, Newfoundland
Mr. E. B. Dunne, A/Regional Director-General Nfld. Region, Fisheries & Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland
Mr. P. Fontaine, Directeur de la Recherche par interim, Direction de la Recherche Scientifique & Technique D.G.P.M. Ministere de l'Agriculture, des Pecheries, de l'Alimentation Complexe Scientifique, 2700 Einstein-Ste. Foy, P.Q.
Mr. G. Godin, A.P.P.N.E. , C.P. 750, Lamegue, New Brunswick
Mr. C. L. Jones, Quota Management Coordinator, Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia
Mr. R. Kingsley, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister Development Branch, Dept. of Fisheries, Box 4750, St. John's, Newfoundland
Mr. J. E. H. Legare, Director General, Dept. Fisheries & Oceans, P. O. Box 6000, Fredericton, New Brunswick
Mr. A. A. Longard, Director, Marine Resources, N.S. Dept. of Fisheries, Box 2223, Halifax, Nova Scotia
Dr. W. M. Murphy, P. O. Box 1290, Liverpool, Nova Scotia
Mr. L. S. Parsons, Director General, Atlantic Operations, Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario
Mr. R. J. Prier, Chief, Conservation and Protection Branch, Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia
Mr. L. G. Riche, Vice-President, Fishery Products Ltd., P. O. Box 550, St. John's, Newfoundland
Mr. R. J. Rochon, Deputy Director, Legal Operations Division, Dept. of External Affairs, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario
Mr. R. Stirling, Executive Director, SPANS, P. O. Box 991, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
Mr. D. Tobin, Commerce Officer, Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans, 235 Queen St., Ottawa, Ontario
Mr. G. R. Traverse, Head, Offshore Management, Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland

CUBA

Head of Delegation: Mr. N. M. Gomez, Cuban Fishing Fleet Representative, c/o Pickford & Black Ltd., P. O. Box 1117, Halifax, Nova Scotia

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Head of Delegation: Mr. M. Leigh, Administrator, Directorate-General for Fisheries,
Commission of the European Communities, Rue de la Loi 120,
Brussels 1049, Belgium

Mr. J.B.P. Farnell, Chairman of Fisheries Commission, Commission of the European
Communities, 120 Rue de la Loi, Brussels 1049, Belgium

FAROE ISLANDS

Head of Delegation: Mr. P. Ellefsem, Head of Government, Tinganes, 3800
Torshavn, Faroe Islands

Mr. A. Olafsson, Director, Foroya Landsstyri, Tinganes, DK-3800 Torshavn,
Faroe Islands

JAPAN

Head of Delegation: Mr. M. Osada, Consul, General Consulate of Japan, 1155
Dorchester West, Suite 2701, Montreal, Quebec

Mr. P. Goldring, Interpreter, 1155 Dorchester West, Suite 2701, Montreal, Quebec

NORWAY

Head of Delegation: Mr. H. Rasmussen, Director General, P. O. Box 185, 5001
Bergen, Norway

POLAND

Head of Delegation: Mr. W. Polaczek, 3501 Ave de Musee, Montreal, Quebec

PORTUGAL

Head of Delegation: Mr. J. Miranda Mendes, Director General, Av. 24 de Julho
80-4º, Lisbon, Portugal

Commander M. Cunha, P. O. Box 5249, St. John's, Newfoundland

Mr. A.F.P. Pontes, General Secretary of ADAPLA, Praca Duque da Terceira 24-1,
1200 Lisbon, Portugal

Mr. A. A. Rodrigues, President, Shipowners Association, Avenida Infante Santo,
23-5ºB, Lisbon, Portugal

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Head of Delegation: Mr. A. A. Volkov, Commissioner, 2074 Robie Street,
Apt. 2002-03, Halifax, Nova Scotia

OBSERVERS - SPAIN

Mr. A. Collado, Embassy of Spain, 350 Sparks St., #802, Ottawa, Ontario

SECRETARIAT

Capt. J. C. E. Cardoso, Executive Secretary, NAFO

Mr. F. D. Keating, Finance and Publications Clerk-Steno, NAFO

Mrs. B. J. Cruikshank, Senior Secretary, NAFO

SECRETARIAT ASSISTANCE

Mr. T. Widiyaratne, Conference Admin. Officer, Conference Secretariat, Dept. of
Fisheries & Oceans, 240 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ontario

Replace during 1981 Column II of Schedule I of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures in NAFO Regulatory Area by the following Column II:

Column I	II
Contracting Party	Cod Div. 3M
1. Bulgaria	-
2. Canada	100
3. Cuba	480
4. European Economic Community	2405
5. Faroe Islands (Denmark)	2900
6. German Democratic Republic	-
7. Iceland	-
8. Japan	-
9. Norway	1200 ⁷
10. Poland	500
11. Portugal	3500
12. Romania	-
13. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1270
14. Others	50
15. Special Reservation ²	345 ⁵
16. Total Allowable Catch	12,750

²Reserved for Spain.

⁵Reserved for Spain on the understanding that Spain will act in conformity with all NAFO conservation and enforcement regulations, and will participate in the NAFO Scientific Observer Scheme.

⁷465 tons of this allocation represent a supplementary allocation to ensure participation by two Norwegian vessels in this fishery. This supplementary allocation shall not be taken into account in allocations for future years.

RESOLUTION OF THE FISHERIES COMMISSION OF THE
NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION (NAFO)

Whereas the Fisheries Commission has provided special reservations for Spain in 1981 on the understanding that Spanish vessels would act in conformity with all NAFO conservation and enforcement regulations, and would participate in the NAFO Scientific Observer Scheme;

Whereas NAFO inspectors have reported recurrent violations by Spanish vessels of NAFO regulations by, inter alia, maintaining log records which do not correspond with the amounts of fish on board or refusing to allow full inspections of vessels to compare the amount of fish on board with log records of catches;

Whereas Spain has not implemented the NAFO Scientific Observer Scheme;

Whereas the number of Spanish vessels fishing in NAFO Divisions 3M and 3NO and the catches taken by vessels inspected would suggest that the special reservations allocated to Spain have been exhausted;

THE FISHERIES COMMISSION OF THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION:

CALLS UPON the Government of Spain to ensure that Spanish vessels cease fishing for cod in NAFO Divisions 3M and 3NO immediately;

DRAWNS THE ATTENTION of the Government of Spain to the fact that any future allocation for Spain will be dependent upon a formal commitment from Spain to conform with all NAFO conservation and enforcement regulations and to implement the NAFO Scientific Observer Scheme;

INVITES the Government of Spain to take steps to become party to the NAFO Convention as soon as possible in order to participate fully in the conservation and in the rational utilization of the stocks in the NAFO Regulatory Area.

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization



FISHERIES COMMISSION

THIRD SPECIAL MEETING - JUNE, 1981

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

PRESS NOTICE

1. The Third Special Meeting of the Fisheries Commission of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) was held at the Queen Elizabeth Hotel, Montreal, Quebec on Thursday 25th and Friday 26th June 1981.
2. Attending the meeting were delegates from the following Contracting Parties: Canada, Cuba, European Economic Community, Faroe Islands, Japan, Norway, Poland, Portugal and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. An Observer from Spain was also present.
3. The Commission reviewed its previous proposal for conservation measures for the cod stock in Division 3M and agreed on a new proposal (See attached table).
4. The Fisheries Commission also adopted a Resolution expressing its serious concern at the activities of Spanish fishing vessels in the Regulatory Area in breach of NAFO regulations and inviting the Government of Spain to take the necessary steps to become party to the NAFO Convention as soon as possible.

26 June 1981

Office of the Secretariat of NAFO
Queen Elizabeth Hotel, Montreal,
Quebec, Canada

TABLE OF ALLOCATIONS

Replace during 1981 Column II of Schedule I of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures in NAFO Regulatory Area by the following Column II:

Column I	II
Contracting Party	Cod Div. 3M
1. Bulgaria	-
2. Canada	100
3. Cuba	480
4. European Economic Community	2405
5. Faroe Islands (Denmark)	2900
6. German Democratic Republic	-
7. Iceland	-
8. Japan	-
9. Norway	1200 ⁷
10. Poland	500
11. Portugal	3500
12. Romania	-
13. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1270
14. Others	50
15. Special Reservation ²	345 ⁵
16. Total Allowable Catch	12,750

²Reserved for Spain.

⁵Reserved for Spain on the understanding that Spain will act in conformity with all NAFO conservation and enforcement regulations, and will participate in the NAFO Scientific Observer Scheme.

⁷465 tons of this allocation represent a supplementary allocation to ensure participation by two Norwegian vessels in this fishery. This supplementary allocation shall not be taken into account in allocations for future years.

