

Northwest Atlantic  Fisheries Organization

Serial No. N769

NAFO/FC Doc 83/IX/4

FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1983

(Revised)

Report of the Fisheries Commission of NAFO

Wednesday, 21 September 1010 and 1645 hrs
Thursday, 22 September 1030, 1520 and 2245
hrs

1. The Fifth Annual Meeting of NAFO was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. W. M. Murphy (Canada), at 1010 hrs, 21 September, in the Pribaltiyskaya Hotel, Leningrad, USSR, with the presence of representatives from all Commission members. (See Appendix I)
2. Under Agenda item 2, Rapporteur, Chris J. Allen (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Under Agenda item 3, Adoption of Agenda, the Chairman pointed out that under Rules of Procedure 4.1 and 4.2 of the Fisheries Commission, the Draft Provisional Agenda and the Provisional Agenda, which are sent out to members, must be prepared by the Executive Secretary "in accordance with instructions from the Chairman". He further stated that because of a difficulty which arose in communication with the Executive Secretary, the Provisional Agenda still contained Agenda item 8, concerning the FAO World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development. His instructions to eliminate that item only reached the Executive Secretary after the Agenda had already been circulated in accordance with Rule of Procedure 4.2. As such the Chairman stated that it was his decision that if that item was to be considered by the Organization, the appropriate forum would be the General Council, which deals with financial matters and external relations of the Organization. The Chairman therefore removed that item from the Agenda of the Fisheries Commission, and stated that if any Member State wished that subject to be discussed during the 5th Annual Meeting they should propose it as an agenda item for the General Council.

The USSR delegate suggested that Agenda item 17, Minimum mesh size for regulated groundfish species in the Regulatory Area, be changed to read "Minimum mesh size for regulated groundfish species in the Regulatory Area which are fished in accordance with Schedule I of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures of NAFO".

The Agenda (Appendix 6 of Circular Letter 83/55) was approved with those two changes. (See Appendix II)

4. Under Agenda item 4, Admission of Observers, the Chairman noted that there were no observers present.
5. Under Agenda item 5, Publicity, it was agreed that the usual practice be followed whereby the Chairman of the Fisheries Commission, the General Council, the Scientific Council and the Executive Secretary would agree upon a press release for issuance at the close of the meeting. (See Appendix III)
6. Under Agenda item 6, Approval of the Report of the 4th Annual Meeting (FC Doc 82/IX/10, Revised), no errors or omissions were noted and the Report was approved.
7. Under Agenda item 7, Review of Commission Membership, the Chairman welcomed Spain as a member of the Fisheries Commission and noted that the Commission was now composed of 13 Parties.

The delegate of Bulgaria requested that the statement he was about to make be recorded in the proceedings.

He stated that first of all he wished to apologize for not attending the last two meetings of the Fisheries Commission. Nevertheless the Bulgarian authorities had watched very carefully the work of the Commission and were in constant financial contact with it. The main reasons for the absence of their representatives from those meetings were:

- (1) They were really disappointed in the work of the Commission and especially in the Rules of Procedure, which were interpreted in such a way that the Bulgarian interests were fully ignored while other Parties were favoured;
- (2) the impossibility of fishing in the Regulatory Area.

The only allocation for Bulgaria continued to be 300 m.t of redfish in Div. 3M. Who would cross the ocean for only 300 tons of fish? At the same time vessels of non-member countries operated freely

within the Area. Special quantities were in fact being reserved for certain countries even though they were not members of NAFO.

In view of the above, he believed the time had come (or if not immediately, then next year) to discuss the question of establishing a minimum allocation of several thousand tons in the area, for Parties like Bulgaria and others; such an allocation would somehow justify Bulgaria's membership in the Organization.

The delegate of Bulgaria suggested that the request for such a minimum allocation be included in the Agenda for the next Annual Meeting.

The delegate of Romania issued a statement and requested that it be recorded in the proceedings. (See Appendix IV)

The Chairman thanked the delegates of Bulgaria and Romania for their statements.

8. Under Agenda item 8, Status of Proposals, the status as reported in Circular Letter 83/49 was accepted.
9. The Chairman noted that Agenda items 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 would be covered by STACTIC. The Chairman of STACTIC pointed out that the STACTIC Report should be available the following day.
10. Under Agenda items 15, Management Measures for Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area, and 16, Management Measures for Fish Stocks Overlapping National Fishing Limits, the Chairman of the Scientific Council presented a brief summary of the scientific advice for those stocks as reported in SCS Doc 83/VI/21.

The delegate of Spain pointed out that Spain did not have a chance to put forth its views at the Scientific Council Meeting and wished to note that the Report of the Scientific Council pointed to an increase in abundance of 3NO cod and that the estimates for 3NO cod were considered to be conservative. The delegate of the USSR asked why the Scientific Council had not been providing advice on the 2+3K redfish stock, and the Chairman of the Scientific Council pointed out that that stock had not been referred to the Scientific Council for consideration. The delegate of the USSR further pointed out that, regarding capelin, the Scientific Council had adhered to the tradition of using a 10% exploitation rate but possibly that could be raised to 15% or 20%. The Chairman of the Scientific Council pointed out that the 10% exploitation rate might be considered conservative but that experience had shown that when the capelin stock was quite low, its inshore migration was low as well and so was the inshore migration of cod. Although they had not been able to prove a direct connection between those two stocks, some members of the Scientific Council believed there was a connection.

In referring to the statement of Spain, the Chairman of the Scientific Council explained that the Norwegian catch rates for 3M cod increased in 1981 but that, although it was difficult to interpret the data, such data were still consistent with the depressed state of the stock. The scientific report indicated an increase of abundance in 1983; however the abundance there meant numbers of fish. There were large numbers of the 1981 year-class and the increase in abundance was entirely due to the 1 and 2-year old fish. The Scientific Council felt that they should be left for another year or two in order to provide for a more profitable commercial fishery. Regarding the 3NO cod stock, the Chairman of the Scientific Council noted that the stock was still at a low level although it had improved above the critical level. He reiterated the caveat attached to the 3NO cod TAC decision made at the 1981 and 1982 Annual Meetings, i.e., the "TAC shall not be increased until such time as the Scientific Council reports that age 3+ annual mean biomass has reached 200,000 m. tons." He further pointed out that without that caveat, if the stock were fished at the $F_{0.1}$ level the biomass would have to be about 200,000 m. tons in order to provide for a catch above 26,000 m. tons.

The delegate of the Faroe Islands, referring to the caveat attached to the previous TAC decisions for 3M cod, i.e., "the TAC will not be increased beyond 12,405 m.t until the Scientific Council advises that the age 3+ mean biomass has reached a level approximately equal to one-half the mean age 3+ equilibrium biomass associated with fishing at F_{max} , and assuming long-term average recruitment levels", asked if that level would be reached in 1984. The Chairman of the Scientific Council responded negatively and pointed out that biomass levels based on present data would indicate a level of biomass of 30,000 to 35,000 m.t and that the MSY was calculated to be in the order of 35,000 to 40,000 m. tons. The maximum yield would be 35,000 m. tons and the biomass would be in the same order as that. Therefore not even one-half the biomass level referred to in the caveat would be reached in 1984. The delegate of the Faroe Islands asked, if the TAC were to stay at the same level as in 1983, whether the Scientific Council could indicate when it would expect the biomass level referred to in the caveat to be fulfilled. The Chairman of the Scientific Council pointed out that calculations had not been conducted to provide such a projection but that he was quite sure that, if no cod fishery took place in 1984, the 1981 year class and perhaps the 1982 class would give a much greater yield in future years.

11. Under Agenda item 16(a), Cod in Div. 3M, the delegate of the Faroe Islands, suggested that the Commission stick to the long-term strategy that was proposed for the last two years with one change: that Spain be given an allocation of 560 tons, which was the level that had been reserved for the Spanish fleet in previous years. The TAC would therefore be 12,965 m. tons.

The delegate of Spain pointed out that their 3M cod catch in 1981 was 4,100 m.t and in 1982 was 4,550 m.t and the TAC was still not surpassed in either of those years. He further stated that the decision on a TAC should take into account the social and economic aspects and he felt that the TAC should be higher than that envisaged in 1981 and be around 17,000 m.t, which would be the existing TAC plus the recent average Spanish catch. The delegate of the EEC pointed out that the state of that cod stock was not good and that the Commission should follow the advice given by the scientists and therefore the TAC should be zero. The delegate of Canada also drew attention to the scientific advice that there be no directed fishery in 1984. He realized the need for a TAC of approximately 13,000 m. tons; however, for the Commission to accept that TAC once again, hampered the rapid recovery of the stock. He further pointed out that, although Spain had caught 4,500 m. tons in 1982, that had been because other countries had had no fishery there.

The delegates of Portugal and Norway supported the statement made by the delegate of the Faroe Islands and expressed their desire to maintain the present TAC.

The delegate of Spain then proposed that the 3M cod TAC for 1984 be 17,000 m. tons. There was no seconder for that proposal. The delegate of the Faroe Islands then suggested that the TAC be 12,965 m.t with 560 m.t allocated to Spain, with the same caveat attached as in 1983. The delegate of Spain pointed out that if such a proposal were adopted Spain wished to be on record as opposing the decision. The Faroe Island suggestion was adopted with a reservation by Spain.

The meeting was adjourned at 1230 hrs.

12. The meeting reconvened at 1645 hrs, and the Chairman, returning to Agenda item 15, Management measures for fish stocks in the Regulatory Area, reminded the delegates that a decision had already been rendered on item 15(a), Cod in Div. 3M. He reiterated the scientific advice for items 15(b), Redfish in Div. 3M, and 15(c), American plaice in Div. 3M. The delegate of Cuba proposed that the scientific advice be followed, i.e., he supported a TAC of 20,000 m.t for redfish in Div. 3M, and a TAC of 2,000 m.t for American plaice in Div. 3M. The proposal was seconded by the delegate of the USSR and adopted.

The delegate of Spain pointed out that the Commission had only dealt with the TAC's for the fish stocks in item 15 and not the individual quotas. The Chairman agreed with him and pointed out that the quotas would be dealt with later on.

13. Under Agenda item 16, Management measures for fish stocks overlapping national fishing limits, the Chairman reiterated the scientific advice for the stocks listed in that item.

14. Under Agenda item 16(a), Cod in Div. 3NO, the delegate of Spain reminded the Commission members that the scientific report said that that stock was showing continual improvement. As well, Spanish research tabled at the June Meeting of the Scientific Council gave solid evidence that conditions had definitely improved and that a TAC of more than 40,000 m.t could be acceptable. The delegate of Spain therefore proposed a TAC of 35,000 m. tons.

The delegate of Canada questioned whether the level of biomass associated with the previous TAC of that stock (footnote 2 to table 1 of Appendix III of FC Doc 82/IX/10, Revised) had been reached. The Chairman of the Scientific Council stated that calculations had put the level of age 3+ annual mean biomass at slightly below the 200,000 m.t level. However, he pointed out that the Scientific Council had had problems coming to an exact figure for the level of biomass and it could be slightly lower or slightly higher. He indicated that the biomass would have to be considerably higher for fishing at the $F_{0.1}$ level to produce catches of 26,000 m. tons. He further explained that if the biomass was at the 200,000 m.t level then the $F_{0.1}$ level would still dictate a TAC of 26,000 m. tons. The delegate of Spain pointed out that he understood the biomass to be only 2,000 m.t below the 200,000 m.t level. The Chairman of the Scientific Council stated that when calculating TAC's the Council always assumed the TAC set by the Fisheries Commission in the previous years would be taken in total. As well, if the catch exceeded the TAC the biomass would be reduced by an approximate corresponding amount. In calculating the scientific advice for 1984, the Scientific Council used the figure 32,000 m.t as a basis, as the 1982 catches were in the vicinity of that amount. If the 1983 catches were approximately the same, i.e., 32,000 m.t, then the biomass would be more like 193,000 m.t in 1984.

The delegate of Canada stated that a TAC at the 26,000 m.t level was the correct level and that if in future years it was shown that the biomass had increased then the Fisheries Commission could increase the TAC.

15. The Chairman pointed out that there were now two proposals, one from Spain for a TAC of 35,000 m.t and one from Canada for 26,000 m. tons. The delegate of Portugal proposed a compromise TAC of 30,000 m. tons. The delegate of Romania supported the Canadian Proposal. As there was no support for the Spanish proposal for a TAC of 35,000 m.t, that proposal was dropped. The delegate of Portugal then withdrew his proposal for a TAC of 30,000 m. tons. The delegate of Norway stated his support for the Canadian proposal of 26,000 m.t for cod in Div. 3NO. The delegate of Spain stated that he was against the Canadian proposal. The Chairman concluded that there was some support for the Canadian proposal although it was less than overwhelming, and unless the Commission members wished a formal vote, then the Canadian proposal would be considered as accepted which it subsequently was.
16. Under Agenda items 16(d) to 16(g), Management measures for fish stocks overlapping national fishing limits, the Chairman suggested that these be presented as a single unit for decision on the TAC's and the Commission decide on the matter as a single block.

The delegate of the USSR supported the Chairman's suggestion and proposed that the Commission accept the recommendation of the Scientific Council for TAC's for Redfish in Div. 3LN, American plaice in Div. 3LNO, Yellowtail Flounder in Div. 3LNO, Witch flounder in Div. 3NO, Capelin, and Squid in Subareas 3 and 4.

The delegate of Canada supported the proposal and reminded the Commission that at the last Annual Meeting a detailed discussion on 3NO capelin and 3L capelin had taken place with the decision that the 3L fishery took place inside the Canadian zone and therefore would be managed by Canada. The Soviet proposal was accepted.

17. The delegate of the USSR requested that the Scientific Council provide scientific advice for 2+3K Redfish in 1984 for the 1985 fishery. The delegate of Canada suggested that that item be discussed bilaterally as the stock in question was fished entirely inside the Canadian zone and therefore came under Canadian management. The delegate of the USSR pointed out that it had only made a request. The item was left for Canada and the USSR to discuss bilaterally.
18. The delegate of Canada announced that Canada would provide a written proposal the next morning regarding the quotas for fish stocks under item 16, Management measures for fish stocks overlapping national fishing limits.

The meeting adjourned at 1805 hrs.

19. The meeting reconvened at 1030 hrs, 22 September 1983 to discuss Agenda item 18, Review of the International Scientific Observer Program. The delegate of Canada informed the Commission members that Canada by then had bilateral arrangements with most other NAFO members for the placement of scientific observers on board fishing vessels operating within the Regulatory Area. Further, in 1984 Canada expected to increase the implementation of those arrangements. The delegate of the USSR also pointed out that the USSR had bilateral arrangements regarding the exchange of NAFO scientific observers and hoped to extend the program bilaterally with other NAFO members. The delegate of Cuba pointed out that it had an agreement with Canada for the placement of scientific observers and hoped to fully implement the program in 1984.
20. Returning to Agenda item 15, Management measures for fish stocks in the Regulatory Area, and Agenda item 16, Management measures for fish stocks overlapping national fishing limits, the Chairman referred to a written proposal (See Appendix V) put forth by Canada for the various Contracting Parties allocations of the TAC's previously decided under those two agenda items. The delegate of Canada stated that the figures shown in the table were based on historical allocations although some changes had been introduced as a result of bilateral agreements between the Parties involved. A procedural discussion followed concerning whether or not the Commission should discuss the table on a stock by stock basis or the table in its entirety. It was decided to deal with the Canadian proposal on a stock by stock basis. The delegate of Portugal requested that no decisions be taken on the allocations of those stocks until after 1500 hrs as he was awaiting instructions from his authorities. The delegate of Cuba proposed that the Commission listen to the various Parties' views on specific stocks and then after Members had had time to consider those positions, decisions could be taken at a later stage in the afternoon.
21. Under Agenda item 15(a), Cod in Div. 3M, the delegate of Spain pointed out that he had difficulty in accepting the quota allocated to Spain.
22. Under Agenda item 16(a), Management Measures for fish stocks overlapping national fishing limits, the delegate of Portugal proposed that the quota allocated to "Others" in the Canadian proposal be reduced from 700 m.t to 200 m.t with the EEC and Portugal being allocated the 500 m.t difference. The delegate of the Faroe Islands pointed out that the idea might be a good one if the "Others" quota was not being caught by anyone but according to NAFO statistics other people had been fishing that quota and therefore he could not accept the Portuguese proposed amendment to the Canadian proposal. The delegate of Spain pointed out that he could not support the Canadian proposal as the

Spanish allocation found therein was only 9,000 m. tons. The delegate of Canada pointed out that the 3NO cod stock was historically the foundation of the fishery of Canada and if there would be any reallocations, as proposed by the delegate of Portugal, then Canada would have no choice but to request part of the reallocation. The delegate of the USSR pointed out that its fishing vessels had also a traditional fishery in that area and consequently the USSR should also be considered for additional allocations. Further, he agreed with the views of the delegate of the Faroe Islands.

23. Under Agenda item 15(b), Redfish in Div. 3M, the delegate of Bulgaria reminded the Commission members that at the 1980 meeting a long discussion of the stock took place at which time the EEC was given a quota of 1200 m.t based primarily on arguments that such a quota was vital for its fishing interests. He went on to request that the EEC explain how it had utilized that quota since that 1980 meeting. The delegate of the EEC explained that its allocation of 3M redfish had not been caught in the last few years as it had no agreement with Canada thus making it uneconomical for vessels to come and fish that stock. However, the EEC still maintained an interest in that fishery. The delegate of Spain pointed out that the TAC of that stock in recent years had not been fully utilized and felt that Spain, as a new member state, should have access to the stock and, further, proposed a 1500 m.t allocation to Spain.

The Chairman reminded the Commission members that the TAC for all the stocks contained in the proposal had already been decided so that to accommodate any extra requests for allocations, as amendments to the Canadian proposal, would require exchanges of quotas between the Parties. The delegate of Bulgaria proposed an amendment to the Canadian proposal whereby the quotas assigned to the EEC, Bulgaria, Japan and others be redistributed between Bulgaria, GDR, Japan, Spain and the EEC, with 400 m.t going to each. The delegate of Romania noted that his country was also interested in an allocation of that stock. The delegate of Portugal supported the Canadian proposal for that stock. The delegate of Japan stated that Japan had an interest in the 3M Redfish stock so if the consensus was that the Commission redistribute any part of the TAC then Japan would like to be considered. However, Japan was not in favour of reducing the "Others" category by reallocations because such a move would make the operations of some countries harder as it would be difficult not to overshoot the limit imposed by any small amounts left remaining in the "Others" quota.

24. Under Agenda item 15(c), American plaice in Div. 3M, the delegate of Portugal proposed an amendment to the Canadian proposal whereby the "Others" category would be reduced to 150 m.t, the USSR would receive 1,150 m.t, Portugal 500 m.t, and Canada 200 m. tons. The delegate of Spain proposed an amendment to the Canadian proposal allocating 450 m.t to Spain. The Chairman reminded Commission members that in the directed fisheries for cod and redfish there were by-catches of American plaice and to change the "Others" category to more directed fisheries would almost assuredly result in over-fishing.
25. Under Agenda item 16(c), American plaice in Div. 3LNO, the delegate of Spain proposed an amendment to the Canadian proposal for Spain to obtain a quota of 450 m. tons.
26. Under Agenda item 16(d), Yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO, the delegate of Spain noted that statistics indicated an under-utilization of the stock and therefore proposed an amendment to the Canadian proposal for an allocation to Spain of 250 m. tons.
27. Under Agenda item 16(e), Witch flounder in Div. 3NO, the delegate of Spain proposed an amendment whereby Spain would be allocated 250 m. tons.
28. Under Agenda item 16(f), Capelin, the Chairman pointed out that the Commission had already accepted the scientific advice that there be no directed fishery for that stock.
29. Under Agenda item 16(g), Squid (Illex) in Subareas 3 and 4, the delegate of Romania stated the interest of his country in having a quota of that stock. The delegate of Spain, referring once again to the under-utilization of the stock, requested an amendment for an allocation to Spain of 8,000 m. tons.
30. The delegate of Poland requested an amendment so that Poland would receive a 5,000 m.t quota and for that purpose made a statement which he requested be recorded in the proceedings. (See Appendix VI)

The delegate of Canada pointed out that statistics indicated that the catches of squid in Subareas 3+4 had been very low in the last few years and requested that if any delegate could inform the Commission on how to increase the catch levels of that species Canada would be happy to make the information available to all interested Parties.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 1235 hrs.

31. The meeting reconvened at 1520 hrs and the Chairman reminded the Commission that the delegates of the Faroe Islands, Norway and EEC had indicated earlier they would support the Canadian proposal in its entirety for allocation of the stocks under discussion. As well, the delegates of Spain, Bulgaria and Portugal had wished to discuss the proposal on a stock by stock basis. The delegate of Romania re-emphasized his point made the previous day and stated that he could not accept the Canadian proposal in its entirety and that he reserved the position of his country.

The delegate of Portugal stated that he wished to withdraw his earlier amendment regarding the quotas for 3NO cod and 3LNO redfish and that instead favoured the original Canadian proposal with the following amendment regarding American plaice in Div. 3M: Canada-200 m.t, Portugal-500 m.t, USSR-1,150 m.t, Others-150 m. tons. The proposal was supported by the delegate of Canada. The delegate of Cuba was against the Portuguese proposal and stated that he saw no reason for an increase in quotas to the three countries that were then more involved in the fishery. If greater amounts of the stock were available it should be distributed among other members who were interested in entering the fishery and not just the countries then involved. The delegate of Spain supported the Cuban position. In support of his proposal, the delegate of Portugal referred to Article XI, paragraph 4, of the Convention and reminded the members that Portugal had traditionally fished within that area and therefore he felt that his proposal was in accordance with that Article.

32. The Chairman announced that the Commission would now consider the Canadian proposal as well as the subsequent proposed amendments to that proposal on a stock by stock basis.
33. Under Agenda item 15(a), Cod in Div. 3M, the Chairman reiterated the previous Spanish position requesting a higher allocation of the stock and asked the delegate of Spain if he had a specific amount in mind. The delegate of Spain proposed that his country's quota of cod in Div. 3M be increased to 3,000 m. tons. There was no support for the Spanish proposal and the Canadian proposal was accepted.
34. Under Agenda item 16(a), Cod in Div. 3NO, the Chairman noted that the delegate of Portugal had withdrawn his amendment to the Canadian proposal. The delegate of Spain stated that he was not satisfied with the quota to Spain contained in the Canadian proposal but he would not propose an amendment to that proposal. The Canadian proposal was subsequently accepted.
35. Under Agenda item 15(d), Redfish in Div. 3M, the Chairman reiterated the Spanish and Bulgarian proposals of amendments. There was no support for the Spanish amendment. Regarding the Bulgarian amendment, the delegate of the EEC pointed out that the fishery was very important for the EEC which planned to resume in 1984 its active participation and insisted on the maintenance of its quota. There was no support for the Bulgarian amendment and subsequently the Canadian proposal was accepted. The delegate of Bulgaria then proposed that the 2,000 m.t involved in his previous amendment be placed totally within the "Others" category thereby providing no direct allocation to Bulgaria, EEC or Japan. There was no support for that proposal either.
36. Under Agenda item 16(b), Redfish in Div. 3LN, there was no support for the earlier Spanish amendment for a quota of 1,500 m. tons. The Canadian proposal was accepted. The delegate of Spain pointed out that the zero quotas for Redfish in Div. 3LN and 3M caused him great distress and wished the Commission members to know that he would have difficulty recommending to his Government their acceptance of that decision.
37. Under Agenda item 15(c), American plaice in Div. 3M, there was no support for the previous Spanish proposal. The proposed amendment to the original Canadian proposal put forth by the delegate of Portugal was supported by Canada. As well, the delegate of Cuba withdrew his earlier objection to that Portuguese amendment. The delegate of Spain objected to the Portuguese proposal. The delegate of Japan stated that he found it difficult to accept the Portuguese proposal as it would reduce the "Others" category to a low level and he felt that not too small an amount should be left to be fished by other countries which were not receiving nominal allocations. He further stated that Japan was interested in receiving an allocation in the fishery and that although its vessels only caught about 60 m.t a year, they would feel uneasy about having only 150 m.t left in the "Others" quota. The delegate of the Faroe Islands stated that he had difficulty in understanding the Portuguese proposal as the statistics showed that there had been no Portuguese catches of that species in 1981 and 1982. The delegate of Portugal reminded Commission members that the Portuguese fleet had been fishing in the area for centuries and informed the Commission that last year the situation of the Portuguese fleet was not good with the low catches being recorded. Furthermore, for the past three or four years it had been the policy of the Fisheries Commission to in effect freeze TAC's and that subjected the Portuguese fleet to great hardship. His request was only to get 150 m.t more quota and it was a matter of great importance to his Country. However, in order to avoid embarrassment to certain delegations, the delegate of Portugal wished to withdraw his proposed amendment. The Canadian proposal was subsequently accepted.
38. Under Agenda item 16(c), American plaice in Div. 3LNO, the delegate of Portugal opposed the earlier Spanish amendment for an allocation of 450 m. tons. There was no support for that Spanish proposal

and subsequently the Canadian proposal was accepted.

39. Under Agenda item 16(d), Yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO, there was no support for the Spanish proposed amendment and the Canadian proposal was accepted.
40. Under Agenda item 16(e), Witch flounder in Div. 3NO, there was no support for the Spanish amendment and the Canadian proposal was accepted.
41. Under Agenda item 16(g), Squid (*Illex*) in Subareas 3 and 4, there was no support for the previous proposals of the delegates of Poland and Spain. The Chairman noted that the delegate of Romania disagreed with the procedure the Commission was using to discuss the decisions on allocations for the stock. He noted that there were three Countries - Poland, Spain and Romania - that were interested in having allocations of the stock and that rather than deal with each of the Parties' proposals separately the stock should be dealt with as a whole. The delegate of Romania therefore proposed that the following allocations be given: Romania-5,000 m.t, Spain-8,000 m.t, Poland-5,000 m.tons. The proposal of Romania was supported by the delegate of Spain.

The delegate of Canada reminded the Commission that virtually all of the squid fished from that stock was taken within the Canadian 200-mile zone which meant that Canada allowed countries to fish that stock inside its jurisdiction. Some years ago the matter had been discussed at length in the Commission and at that time it was made clear that the quotas available from the stock were practically to be caught entirely within the Canadian zone. That was a rational agreement and Canada indicated its willingness to allow a certain amount of entry into its zone as the Commission recognized the position of Canada as a Coastal State. He further stated that he did not know how that compromise position could be changed and indicated that Canada was still willing to allow the existing level of entry into the Canadian jurisdiction to fish allocations of that particular stock at their present level as proposed in the Canadian proposal. The delegate of Poland supported the Romanian proposal. The delegate of Spain noted that in 1978 Spain had catches of that stock and felt that it had a right to have a quota now that it had become a member of NAFO. He stated that Spanish vessels were willing to fish their quota outside the Canadian jurisdiction.

After a brief break, the delegate of Poland withdrew his support for the Romanian proposal and stated his support for the Canadian proposal.

The meeting adjourned at 1745 hrs.

42. The meeting reconvened at 2245 hrs, 22 September and the delegate of Cuba reminded the members of the past experiences in treating the item under discussion and pointed out that the NAFO Convention states that the coastal states should receive a special consideration. In the case of the Canadian proposal, there were 12,000 m.t to be distributed among member Countries and he presumed that the difference to the TAC of 150,000 m.t was reserved for Canada and the EEC. The Romanian proposal added up to a further 18,000 m.t and if the 5,000 m.t suggested for Poland in that proposal were deducted, that would mean only a further 13,000 m.t remaining in the Romanian proposal for Romania and Spain. The 13,000 m.t plus the 12,000 m.t contained in the Canadian proposal would add up to 25,000 m. tons. The delegate of Cuba wished to know what was the Canadian position, i.e, if the Canadian position was to only allow member countries to fish 12,000 m.t within the Canadian zone then Cuba would support the Canadian proposal. On the other hand, if more squid was to be available to be fished inside the Canadian zone, then Cuba would ask for a proportional increase in its existing share. He further stated that before taking a final stand he would request that Canada clarify its position on the matter. The delegate of the USSR asked a similar question.

In response to those questions, the delegate of Canada stated that Canada had no intention of increasing the fishery of other member countries inside the Canadian zone over the 12,000 m.t limit as found in the Canadian proposal. He pointed out that the delegate of Cuba had raised an interesting and important question concerning the distribution between the existing recipients, as well as the other countries represented in the Romanian proposal, if the Romanian proposal were accepted. The Commission would have to decide what part of the total amount they would have to reallocate amongst themselves.

In response to questions from the delegate of the Faroe Islands, the delegate of Canada pointed out that until now licenses to fish inside the Canadian zone had been issued to the other parties receiving allocations within the 12,000 m.t amount. Also, in accordance with footnote 3 to the Canadian proposal, there had been amounts of squid additional to the 12,000 m.t negotiated bilaterally with other members of NAFO and those members had been issued licenses to fish those extra amounts within the Canadian zone. The delegate of Canada re-emphasized the Canadian position that Parties receiving any amounts exceeding the 12,000 m.t would not necessarily be given the right to fish those extra amounts in the Canadian zone; that would have to be agreed bilaterally between Canada and each of the other Parties concerned.

The delegate of Canada then pointed out that there had been a typographical mistake in the original proposal for allocations of squid in Subareas 3+4. In the recent past a special allocation of 2,250 m.t had been set aside for allocation to Spain. Through an oversight that amount was not part of the Canadian proposal. The delegate of Canada proposed to amend the original Canadian proposal to include 2,250 m.t for Spain which would mean the total amount for distribution among the member parties would now be 14,500 m. tons. The delegate of Spain asked if the 2,250 m.t proposed quota was to be fished inside or outside the Canadian zone. The delegate of Canada pointed out that as the coastal state in question, Canada reserved the right not to issue licenses to Parties that were not maintaining satisfactory fishery relations with Canada.

In order to clear up some apparent misunderstanding by some Parties, the delegate of Canada explained that if Canada did not issue any licenses to fish a NAFO managed stock within the Canadian zone, then the fishery could take place outside the Canadian zone.

The delegate of the Faroe Islands, in referring to the Canadian amendment, pointed out that the Commission would now be treating Spain as Spain was treated as regards to cod in Div. 3NO and 3M, and the delegate of the Faroe Islands supported that amendment to the Canadian proposal.

As no other comments were forthcoming, the Chairman called for a vote on the Canadian amended proposal following the normal procedure that the last proposal put forth would be voted on first. The Canadian proposal in its entirety was subsequently adopted with affirmative votes being cast by Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, EEC, Faroe Islands, GDR, Japan, Norway, Poland, Portugal, USSR, and negative votes being cast by Romania and Spain.

43. The delegate of the USSR made a statement to the effect that there seemed to be room for improvement in the general principles by which the Fisheries Commission allocated TAC's. He noted however that he was not putting forth a proposal to change the existing procedures but suggested that, before the next annual meeting, each delegation could prepare its own set of proposals so that the distribution of the TAC's would adhere to Article II and Article XI of the Convention, thereby perhaps streamlining the operations of the Commission. He further noted that he was especially concerned that in some cases allocations given to some Parties were being under-utilized and in that regard, disagreed with a previous statement from the delegate of the EEC to the effect that under-utilization was the best way for the conservation of a stock. Furthermore, he indicated his intention to prepare the relative proposals of the USSR in time for the next annual meeting.
44. The delegate of Romania indicated his disappointment in the results of the vote on squid in Subareas 3+4 and pointed out that a very serious vital problem for the Romanian fishing fleet was not taken into consideration. He repeated his objection to the Canadian proposal and reserved the general position of the Romanian Government.
45. The Chairman of STACTIC presented the Report of STACTIC which covered Fisheries Commission Agenda items 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14. In referring to Agenda item 9, Conservation and Enforcement Measures, he indicated that NAFO/FC Doc 81/VI/2 (Revised), entitled New Proposals and Studies recommended by the Working Group on Conservation and Enforcement Measures, was dealt with, with the exception of items 1, 2 and 9 of that document, which were referred to the Commission. The Report of STACTIC was adopted as presented. (See Appendix VII)
46. The Chairman noted that the mandate of STACTIC did not permit it to deal with any changes to the Conservation and Enforcement Measures. He therefore suggested that the Executive Secretary set up a Group to deal with the matter of Regulations in order to provide advice to the Commission and suggested that the Executive Secretary invite participation from interested members to form such a Group to deal with such matters and report back at the next annual meeting including the three items referred back to the Commission by STACTIC. He further asked Commission Members to advise the Executive Secretary of the name of the nominees for that technical group.
47. Under Agenda item 20, Time and Place of Next Meeting, it was agreed that the next meeting of the Fisheries Commission would coincide with the time and place of the next annual meeting of the General Council.
48. Under Agenda item 19, Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman, the delegate of Romania proposed that Dr. W. M. Murphy (Canada) be re-elected Chairman for another two-year term. That proposal was seconded by the delegate of the USSR who, in referring to Article XIII, Section 4 of the Convention, proposed that J. A. Varea (Cuba) also be re-elected as Vice-Chairman. The delegate of Portugal agreed with both proposals, which were subsequently adopted.

49. Under Agenda item 17(a), Minimum Mesh Size for regulated groundfish species in the Regulatory Area which are fished in accordance with Schedule I of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures of NAFO, the delegate of Canada noted that the Report of STACTIC included a recommendation to the Commission to maintain essentially the old regulation on minimum mesh size for groundfish species in the Regulatory Area. He noted that Canada had on several occasions in the past proposed a new regulation to provide a single minimum mesh size of 130 mm in the Regulatory Area to correspond with the Regulations enforced within the Canadian 200-mile zone. He further pointed out that, while Canada did not want to debate the matter, he would point out that Canada still believed that, as a practical matter, vessels fishing in the Regulatory Area should be limited to a 130 mm mesh size to facilitate the scientific analysis of catch rates of fleets fishing overlapping stocks on both sides of the Canadian 200-mile limit and to facilitate enforcement of the NAFO Regulations and to avoid the possibility of using the wrong size mesh in Canadian waters. The Chairman indicated that the item seemed to be a regulation item and perhaps should be referred to the new group to be set up by the Executive Secretary to deal with matters such as that. The suggestion was acceptable to the delegate of Canada. The delegate of the USSR noted that in principle he had no objections to referring the item to that Group but requested that the relative scientific grounds for such proposals on mesh size be submitted to the same Group to be discussed there.
50. Under Agenda item 21, Other Business, there were no other matters to raise.
51. Under Agenda item 22, Adjournment, the Chairman thanked all members of the Commission and adjourned the meeting at 0015 hrs, 23 September 1983.

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1983

Fisheries Commission

List of Participants

BULGARIA

Head of Delegation: L. Yanev, Director General
Ribno Stopanstvo
3 Industrialna Str.
Bourgas, Bulgaria

Representatives

P. Kolarov, Institute of Fisheries, Boul. Chervenoarmeisky 4, 9000 Varna, Bulgaria
L. Yanev (see address above)

Advisers

G. I. Karakadiev, Ribno Stopanstvo, 3 Industrialna Str., Bourgas, Bulgaria

CANADA

Head of Delegation: V. Rabinovitch
Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans
240 Sparks Street
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1A 0E6

Representatives

W. M. Murphy (Chairman of the Fisheries Commission), Mersey Sea Foods, P. O. Box 1290, Liverpool, Nova Scotia
V. Rabinovitch (see address above)

Advisers

C. J. Allen, International Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
R. Andrews, Deputy Minister, Newfoundland Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 4750, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5T7
B. Applebaum, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 235 Queen Street, Ottawa, Ontario
N. A. Bellefontaine, Resource Allocations Br., Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
E. Feldman, Legal Operations Div., Dept. of External Affairs, Lester Pearson Bldg., 125 Sussex Dr., Ottawa, Ontario
E. McCurdy, Newfoundland Fisherman, Food and Allied Workers Union, P. O. Box 880, 2 Steer's Cove, St. John's, Newfoundland
R. J. Prier, Conservation and Protection Br., Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
G. H. Rendell, Area Manager, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5182, St. John's, Newfoundland
L. G. Riche, Vice-President, Fishery Product Ltd., P. O. Box 550, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5L1

CUBA

Head of Delegation: E. Oltuski
Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera
Ensenada de Potes y Atares
Habana, Cuba

Representatives

E. Oltuski (see address above)
J. A. Varea, Direccion de Relaciones Internacionales, Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera, Ensenada de Potes y Atares, Habana, Cuba

Advisers

M. B. Hernandel, Direccion de Relaciones Internacionales, Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera, Ensenada de Potes y Atares, Habana, Cuba
R. R. Tarin Zayas, Cuban Embassy, Gorki Street, No. 36/1, Moscow 125047, USSR

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (EEC)

Head of Delegation: L. E. Andreasen
Directorate General for Fisheries
Commission of the European Communities
200 rue de la Loi
1049 Brussels, Belgium

Representatives

L. E. Andreasen (see address above)
M. Leigh, Directorate General For Fisheries Commission of the European Communities, 200 rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels, Belgium

Advisers

A. Bo'rdes, Direction des Peches Maritimes et des Cultures Marines, 3 Place Fontenoy, F-75700 Paris, France
J. T. Contargyris, Secretariat General of the Council of the European Communities, 170 rue de la Loi, 1040 Brussels, Belgium
N. Couniniotis, Counsellor, Embassy of Greece, Moscow, USSR
H. Kleeschulte, Bundesministerium fur Ernährung Landwirtschaft und Forsten, Postfach 14 02 70, D-5300 Bonn 1, Federal Republic of Germany
M. LeBolloch, Administration des Affaires Maritimes, B.P. 1240, F-97500 Saint Pierre, St. Pierre et Miquelon
A. J. Parres, Union des Armateurs a la Peche, 59 rue des Mathurins, F-75008 Paris, France
G. Tonino, Italian Delegation to EEC, 74 rue de la Loi, 1040 Brussels, Belgium

Head of Delegation: A. Olafsson, Director
Foroya Landsstyri
Tinganes
DK-3800 Torshavn
Faroe Islands

Representatives

A. Olafsson (see address above)
M. B. Pedersen, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Asiatisk Plads 2, DK-1448 Copenhagen K, Denmark

Advisers

H. E. Olsen, Klaksvik

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Head of Delegation: K. Plagemann
Fischkombinat Rostock
2510 Rostock-Marienehe 5
German Democratic Republic

Representatives

K. Plagemann (see address above)

Advisers

W. Mahnke, Institut für Hochseefischerei und Fischverarbeitung, 251 Rostock-Marienehe, (Haus 2), German Democratic Republic
B. Risch, VEB Fischkombinat Rostock, 2510 Rostock-Marienehe 5, German Democratic Republic

JAPAN

Head of Delegation: K. Yonezawa
c/o Fishery Division
Economic Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo, Japan 104

Representatives

K. Yonezawa (see address above)

Advisers

S. Kawahara, Far Seas Fisheries Research Laboratory, 7-1 Orido 5-Chome, Shimizu 424, Japan
H. Tsubata, International Affairs Division Fishery Agency, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan

NORWAY

Head of Delegation: H. Rasmussen, Director
Directorate of Fisheries
P. O. Box 185
N-5001 Bergen
Norway

Representatives

H. Rasmussen (see address above)

Advisers

L. Gronnevet, Norwegian Fisheries Association, N-6170 Vartdal, Norway

POLAND

Head of Delegation: L. Bartoszewicz
Zrzeszenie Gospodarki Rybnej
1 Odrowaza Street
70-952 Szczecin
Poland

Representatives

L. Bartoszewicz (see address above)

Advisers

A. Paciorkowski, Morski Instytut Rybacki, 1 Al. Zjednoczenia, 81-345 Gdynia, Poland

PORTUGAL

Head of Delegation: J. G. Boavida
Gabinete das Relacoes Externas das Pescas
Rua Antonio Candido No. 9-1
1000 Lisbon, Portugal

Representatives

J. G. Boavida (see address above)

ROMANIA

Head of Delegation: F. Marculescu
Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry
Walter Maracineanu Place 1-3
Bucharest, Romania

Representatives

F. Marculescu (see address above)

SPAIN

Head of Delegation: L. J. Casanova Fernandez
Director General de Relaciones Pesqueras
Internacionales
Direccion General de Pesca Maritima
Ruiz de Alarcon 1
Madrid 14, Spain

Representatives

L. J. Casanova Fernandez (see address above)
J. L. Meseguer, Servicio Juridico Internacional, Direccion General de Pesca Maritima, Ruiz de Alarcon 1, Madrid 14, Spain
P. M. Sanchez-Teran, Director of General Affairs, Dept. of International Economic Relations, Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores, Plaza de La Provincia 1, Madrid, Spain

Advisers

J. J. Chao, Direccion General de Pesca Maritima, Ruiz de Alarcon 1, Madrid 14, Spain
A. R. Gordejuela, Anavar Soc Edad Coop Arm. Buq. Pesq., Puerto Pesquero, Vigo, Spain
M. G. Larraneta, Instituto Investigaciones Pesqueras, Muelle de Bouzas, Vigo, Spain
E. C. Lopez Veiga, Anavair y Agarba, Puerto Pesquero, Edif Vendedures, Vigo, Spain
A. Martin-Mateo, Shipowners Association of Pasajes, P. O. Box 62, Pasajes San Pedro, Guipuzea, Spain
A. Urbietta, Shipowners Association of Pasajes, P. O. Box 62, Pasajes San Pedro, Guipuzea, Spain

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Head of Delegation: V. K. Zilanov
Ministry of Fisheries
12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-45, 103045
USSR

Representatives

A. A. Volkov, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-45, 103045 USSR
V. K. Zilanov (see address above)

Advisers

M. F. Burmagin, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-45, 103045 USSR
B. Graiver, Archipova 4, Moscow, USSR
V. Roumyantsev, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-45, 103031 USSR
E. Slavsky, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-45, 103045 USSR
L. Shepel, Welsford Place, Suite 2202-3, 2074 Robie Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3K 5L3
V. Solodovnik, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-45, 103031 USSR

SECRETARIAT

Capt. J. C. E. Cardoso, Executive Secretary, NAFO
 V. M. Hodder, Assistant Executive Secretary, NAFO
 W. H. Champion, Administrative Assistant, NAFO
 F. D. Keating, Finance and Publications Clerk-Steno, NAFO
 B. J. Cruikshank, Senior Secretary, NAFO
 D. C. A. Auby, Clerk-Typist, NAFO

SECRETARIAT ASSISTANCE

V. V. Donskaya, All-Union Research Institute of Marine Fisheries & Oceanography (VNIRO), 17 V. Krasnoselskaya, Moscow, USSR
 M. L. Dreizina " " " " " " " " " " " " "
 M. Ya. Kazarnorsky " " " " " " " " " " " " "
 Yu. B. Riazantsev " " " " " " " " " " " " "
 V. V. Afanasjeva, Gprorybflot, 18-20 Gogol Str. Leningrad, USSR
 G. A. Golubeva " " " " " " " " " " " " "
 M. V. Khokhlova " " " " " " " " " " " " "
 T. V. Lesyucherskaya " " " " " " " " " " " " "
 V. V. Rigin " " " " " " " " " " " " "
 G. V. Sizova " " " " " " " " " " " " "
 L. A. Vorontsova " " " " " " " " " " " " "
 L. A. Zaslarskaya " " " " " " " " " " " " "
 V. K. Vasiliev, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-45, 103031
 A. Oleinikova, Central Telegraph, Leningrad, USSR
 M. Mishina " " " " " " " " " " " " "

5th ANNUAL MEETING OF NAFO

Leningrad, USSR - 14-23 September 1983

Fisheries Commission

Agenda

OPENING PROCEDURES

1. Opening by the Chairman, Dr. W. Murphy (Canada)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Admission of Observers
5. Publicity

ADMINISTRATION

6. Approval of the Report of the Fourth Annual Meeting, September 1982 (FC Doc 82/IX/10, Revised)
7. Review of Commission Membership (See FC Doc 83/IX/2)

COMMISSION PROPOSALS

8. Status of Proposals
9. Conservation and Enforcement Measures

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL

10. Annual Return of Infringements and review of corresponding forms (FC Doc 83/IX/1)
11. Fishing Vessel Registration
12. Enforcement in the Regulatory Area
13. Communications with non-Members of NAFO
14. Report of STACTIC

CONSERVATION

15. Management Measures for fish stocks in the Regulatory Area
 - (a) Cod in Div. 3M
 - (b) Redfish in Div. 3M
 - (c) American plaice in Div. 3M
16. Management Measures for fish stocks overlapping national fishing limits
 - (a) Cod in Div. 3NO
 - (b) Redfish in Div. 3LN
 - (c) American plaice in Div. 3LNO
 - (d) Yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO
 - (e) Witch flounder in Div. 3NO
 - (f) Capelin
 - (g) Squid (*Illex*) in Subareas 3 and 4
17. Minimum mesh size for regulated groundfish species in the Regulatory Area which are fished in accordance with Schedule I of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures of NAFO (See Section 31 of FC Doc 82/IX/10, Revised, page 4)

OTHER MATTERS

18. Review of the International Scientific Observer Program (See Section 32 of the above-mentioned FC Doc.)
19. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman

ADJOURNMENT

20. Time and Place of Next Meeting
21. Other Business
22. Adjournment

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1983

PRESS NOTICE

1. The Fifth Annual Meeting of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO), was held in Leningrad, USSR, during 14-23 September 1983, under the chairmanship of Dr V. K. Zilanov, President of NAFO and Head of the USSR Delegation. The sessions of the General Council and Fisheries Commission were held 19-23 September and the sessions of the Scientific Council from 14-23 September.
2. Attending the meeting were delegates from the following Contracting Parties: Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, European Economic Community (EEC), Denmark for the Faroe Islands, German Democratic Republic, Japan, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Spain acceded to the Convention basic to NAFO on the 31 August 1983 and became member of all the constituent bodies of NAFO.

No observers were present at the meeting.
3. Mr V. Kamentsev, Minister of the Fisheries of the USSR opened the meeting of the General Council and addressed the delegates then and at a brilliant reception, later the same day, also held at the magnificent Congress Hall of the Pribaltiyskaya Hotel in Leningrad.
4. The Scientific Council met to consider matters of scientific interest including a symposium on trophic relationships among marine species of the Northwest Atlantic. It also provided scientific advice to the Fisheries Commission for the management of certain fish stocks.
5. The Scientific Council elected the following officers for 1984-85: Chairman of the Scientific Council - V. A. Rikhter (USSR); Vice-Chairman of the Scientific Council - J. Messtorff - European Economic Community; Chairman of STACFIS - J. Carscadden (Canada); Chairman of STACPUB - J. Messtorff (*ex officio*).
6. On the basis of the scientific advice provided by the Scientific Council from its meeting in June 1983, agreement was reached on conservation and management measures for 1984 regarding total allowable catches (TAC's) and allocations for certain fish stocks, three of which are entirely outside the Canadian 200 mile fishing zone, in NAFO Division 3M, and six overlap the 200 mile fishing zone in Divisions 3L, 3N and 3O (Table 1). Allocations were also made for the 1984 TAC for the short-finned squid (*Illex illecebrosus*) in Subareas 3 and 4.
7. The Fisheries Commission re-elected both Dr W. M. Murphy (Canada) as Chairman and J. A. Varea (Cuba) as Vice-Chairman for the next two years.
8. The Fisheries Commission proceeded further with the revision of details of forms and schedules related to the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures.
9. The Rules of Procedure of the General Council were studied but a final decision was still not possible.
10. The General Council re-elected Dr V. K. Zilanov (USSR), President of NAFO and Chairman of the Council for another two-year period and elected Mr L. E. Andreasen (EEC) Vice-Chairman of the Council during the same period.

23 September 1983

Office of the NAFO Secretariat
Pribaltiyskaya Hotel, Leningrad,
USSR

SCHEDULE I
Quota Table¹ for Year 1984-87

Column I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI
Contracting Party	Cod	Cod	Redfish	Redfish	American plaice	American plaice	Yellowtail	Witch	Capelin	Squid (I/2ex)
	Div. 3M	Div. 3NO	Div. 3M	Div. 3LN	Div. 3M	Div. 3LNO	Div. 3LNO	Div. 3NO	Div. 3NO	Subareas 3+4 3&4
1. Bulgaria	-	-	300	-	-	-	-	-	-	500
2. Canada	100	11,650	700	12,850	150	54,200	16,584	3,000	-	N.S. ⁶
3. Cuba	480	-	1,550	2,250	-	-	-	-	-	2,250
4. European Economic Community	2,405	210	1,200	-	-	700	340	-	-	N.S. ⁶
5. Faroe Islands (Denmark)	2,900	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. German Democratic Republic	-	-	-	850	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Japan	-	-	400	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,250
9. Norway	1,200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. Poland	500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,000
11. Portugal	3,500	1,100	1,900	-	350	-	-	-	-	500
12. Romania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	500
13. Spain	560	9,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,250
14. USSR	1,270	3,340	13,850	8,900	1,000	-	-	1,950	-	5,000
15. Others	50	700	100	150	500	100	76	50	-	-
16. Special Reservation ²	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17. Total Allowable Catch	12,965 ⁵	26,000 ⁷	20,000	25,000	2,000	55,000	17,000	5,000	0	150,000

¹ Quotas are in metric tons.

² There are no Special Reservations for 1984.

³ The opening date for the squid (I/2ex) fishery is 1 July.

⁴ Any quota listed for squid may be increased by a transfer from any "coastal state" as defined in Article 1, para. 3 of the NAFO Convention, provided that the TAC for squid is not exceeded. Transfers made to Contracting Parties conducting fisheries for squid in the Regulatory Area shall be reported to the Executive Secretary, and the report shall be made as promptly as possible.

⁵ The TAC will not be increased beyond 12,965 m.t until the Scientific Council advises that the age 3+ mean biomass has reached a level approximately equal to one-half the mean age 3+ equilibrium biomass associated with fishing at F_{max}, and assuming long term average recruitment levels.

⁶ Not Specified because the allocations to these Contracting Parties are as yet undetermined, although their sum shall not exceed the difference between the total of allocations to other Contracting Parties and the TAC.

⁷ TAC shall not be increased until such time as the Scientific Council reports that age 3+ annual mean biomass has reached 200,000 metric tons.

5th ANNUAL MEETING OF NAFO

Leningrad, USSR - 14-23 September 1983

Fisheries Commission

Statement of the Delegate of Romania

"I should like to explain the reasons for the absence of my Country from the past two NAFO meetings. First of all, I would like to point out that Romania attaches a real interest to our Organization and to the international cooperation with the view to ensure the conservation and optimum utilization of the fishery resources in the area to which our Convention applies.

Unfortunately, because of small quotas my Country was obliged to stop, on a temporary basis, its fishing activities in the NAFO Area. As a matter of fact it is just impossible to organize any fishery operation with a 500 ton quota which represents the total Romanian allocation for the year. I do not know if in this particular case the word "quota" is the appropriate one.

I also should like to point out that Romania is geographically disadvantaged by being coastal to a semi-enclosed sea which is poor in biological resources and situated in a sub-region also lacking in such resources. I refer here to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean Region. The average annual catch in the Black Sea is totally insufficient to cover the requirements of a population of 22 million inhabitants. In order to secure the quantities of protein needed by its population, Romania has developed its fishery fleet.

I furnished all these details in order to facilitate the understanding of our position concerning national quotas.

Starting from an economical point of view, we consider it is absolutely necessary to have a minimum allocation of six to seven thousand tons per year, otherwise it is not possible to cover the general expenses of the fishing activity. I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that during this session, in the spirit of close cooperation we will be able to form an appropriate solution which will permit the operations of the Romanian fishing vessels in the area of our Convention, this problem being vital for my Country."

5th ANNUAL MEETING OF NAFO

Leningrad, USSR - 14-23 September 1983

Fisheries Commission

Canadian Proposal of quota allocations

TOTAL ALLOWABLE CATCHES AND QUOTAS (METRIC TONS) FOR 1984.

Contracting Party	Cod		Redfish		American plaice		Yellowtail		Witch		Capelin		Squid	
	3M	3NO	3M	3LN	3M	3LNO	3LNO	3LNO	3NO	3NO	3NO	3+4	3+4	
Bulgaria	-	-	300	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	500	-	
Canada	100	11,650	700	12,850	150	54,200	16,584	3,000	-	-	-	-	5	
Cuba	480	-	1,550	2,250	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,250	-	
European Economic Community	2,405	210	1,200	-	-	700	340	-	-	-	-	-	5	
Faroe Islands (Denmark)	2,900	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
German Democratic Republic	-	-	-	850	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Japan	-	-	400	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,250	-	
Norway	1,200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Poland	500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,000	-	
Portugal	3,500	1,100	1,900	-	350	-	-	-	-	-	-	500	-	
Romania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	500	-	
Spain	560	9,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,250	-	
Union of Soviet Socialist Republic	1,270	3,340	13,850	8,900	1,000	-	-	1,950	-	-	-	5,000	-	
Others	50	700	100	150	500	100	76	50	-	-	-	-	-	
TOTAL	12,965 ¹	26,000 ²	20,000	25,000	2,000	55,000	17,000	5,000	0	150,000 ³	4	-	-	

1 The TAC will not be increased beyond 12,965 M.T. until the Scientific Council advises that the age 3+ mean biomass has reached a level approximately equal to one-half the mean age 3+ equilibrium biomass associated with fishing at F_{max}, and assuming long term average recruitment levels.

2 TAC shall not be increased until such time as the Scientific Council reports that age 3+ annual mean biomass has reached 200,000 metric tons.

3 Any quota listed for squid may be increased by a transfer from any "coastal state" as defined in Article 1, para. 3 of the NAFO Convention, provided that the TAC for squid is not exceeded. Transfers made to Contracting Parties conducting fisheries for squid in the Regulatory Area shall be reported to the Executive Secretary, and the report shall be made as promptly as possible.

4 The opening date for the squid (Illex) fishery is 1 July

5 The dashes which appear in the place of allocations to Canada and the EEC do not signify zero allocations. Allocations to these Contracting Parties, as yet undetermined, shall not exceed the difference between the total of allocations to other Contracting Parties and the TAC.

5th ANNUAL MEETING OF NAFO

Leningrad, USSR - 14-23 September 1983

Fisheries Commission

Statement of the delegate of Poland

Referring to the question of squid quotas I would like to describe briefly the squid consumption change in the internal Polish fish market which took place during the last few years. In spite of the fact that squid cannot be regarded as a traditional fish product of Poland, the implementation of 200 mile exclusive fishing zones negatively affected, to a large extent, the magnitude and diversity of fish products available in our market today to meet the minimum needs of our society. In terms of fish protein and consumption per capita, we have no other way but to popularize fish products relatively new to our consumers, such as squid. We have managed to succeed in that respect during the last few years, bearing in mind the general shortage of fish products in my Country. To be more specific, I can present you with a few figures regarding the squid consumption increase in Poland: In 1980, 3,000 m.t of squid products were consumed; in 1981 it rose to 5,000 m.t; and in 1982, about 6,500 m.t were sold.

The demand for squid products during the first half of this year has increased and in 1983 it may reach about 10,000 m.t. The bulk of squid is supplied to the market in a frozen state, as round fish, tubes, or separate arms (tentacles). Increasing amounts are sold as ready-made products of different types for immediate consumption.

Taking into account the previous much higher level of our squid catches in the ICNAF/NAFO Area (i.e., in 1979, 10,500 m.t) and the presently observed decline of fish protein supplies in Poland, I would like to request a reasonable, and I hope acceptable, increase of our squid quota for 1984 to 5,000 m.t. The catch taken in that fishery will be used entirely for consumption within the Polish internal market and therefore in no way will be competing with Canadian squid products on the international market.

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATIONFIFTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1983

Preliminary
Report of the
Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)

Monday, 19 September, 1100 hrs-1300
 Wednesday, 21 September, 0915 hrs-0945
 Thursday, 22 September, 0910 hrs-1000

1. The Fifth Annual Meeting of STACTIC was opened by the Chairman, Mr. A. A. Volkov (USSR). Delegates from Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Denmark for the Faroes, European Economic Community, German Democratic Republic, Japan, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain and USSR were present.
2. Appointment of Rapporteur - The Executive Secretary was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Adoption of Agenda - The provisional agenda was accepted as circulated. (See Attachment 1)
4. Consideration of Conservation and Enforcement Measures - The study of FC Doc 82/VI/2 Revised, except for items 8 and 10 which had already been effected, was carried out with the following results:

The Committee agreed to recommend to the Fisheries Commission items 1, 2 and 9, without forming an opinion because of their complexity.

As to item 3, the Committee actually recommended the alteration proposed as important to the enforcement of the corresponding Rule.

Regarding item 4, the Committee would recommend that the Fisheries Commission request its Members to provide the data as suggested by the Working Group.

Regarding item 5, the Cuban delegate supplied immediately the Committee with some pertinent drawings and the USSR delegation promised to supply some more as soon as possible.

As concerned item 6, the Committee was of the opinion that the Polish-type chafer should be allowed to cover the whole length of the codend inclusive of any lengthener or lengtheners and that therefore, for proper clearness of the measures and clarity of their enforcement, that should be made clear from the text of Schedule VI.

The Committee also agreed with the proposal contained in item 7 and the Canadian delegate further added that the Fisheries Commission should also consider the addition of a new item (h) reading: "Division to be fished".

The Committee also agreed to recommend to the Commission that under item 11 the date on Rules 11 and 12 of Part IV be changed to 1st of July.

The Committee wished to emphasize the importance of item 12 as relating to enforcement and consequently unanimously recommended its study by the Fisheries Commission.

The situation regarding item 13 should remain as it was until such time as a Contracting Party decided to bring a new proposal to the Commission.

The Committee agreed to recommend to the Fisheries Commission that Schedule III of Part V should include the definition of "round fresh weight" - as it was defined in the ATLANTIC forms.

5. Item 5 of the Agenda comprised two main considerations:

- 5a) Review of Annual Return of Infringements
- 5b) Review of Corresponding Reporting forms

Under 5a) an extensive exchange of information took place but the main points were that the EEC and Portugal showed that they had posted Returns some time before the meeting and provided the Secretariat with copies of those returns which were circulated among the representatives. The Faroes stated that they had nothing to report and Romania that, as communicated previously to the Commission, they had not fished during 1983.

Under 5b) it was agreed: 1) on form STACTIC 1, to insert the word "Apparent" always before "infringement", to write "vessels" for "ships" and to write "Contracting Party Reporting" for "Reported by".

2) on form STACTIC 2A to write "Conservation and Enforcement Measures" in the title, to insert the word "Apparent" always before "infringement" and to write "Contracting Party Reporting" for "Reported by".

3) on form STACTIC 2B to write "Conservation and Enforcement Measures" in the title and "Contracting Party Reporting" for "Reported by". In form 2B there was no call for the word "apparent" before "infringement".

6. STACTIC form 3 was reviewed and approved. It was understood however that the designation of "Which division" was dependent on the approval by the Fisheries Commission of the proposed changes to the Rule III B.2.

7. Arrangements for Enforcement in the Regulatory Area during 1983 were reported by the Contracting Parties.

The USSR reported that UMBRINA had served for 110 days and BERIX for 91 days in 1983. 47 foreign vessels had been boarded and inspected, as follows:

- 17 Spanish
- 5 Canadian
- 14 Portuguese
- 2 Faroes
- 2 Japanese
- 7 Cuban

The IKARVS had started inspection duty on 9 September 1983 and in 1984 two fishing vessels should carry on those duties. Copies of the Reports of the Inspections carried out in 1983 were to be delivered as soon as possible.

Poland confirmed that the inspector communicated by the Polish authorities had been active as per NAFO Circular Letter 83/33. Portugal reported that during 1983 it had not been possible to carry out any inspecting duties and that the Portuguese authorities were hoping to carry out inspections during 1984 from 2 fishing vessels. The Faroes reported no inspections had been possible during 1983 although the inspector which had been communicated by NAFO Circular Letter 83/24 had been active on board a Canadian surveying vessel during 1983. Romania confirmed that there had been no fishing by Romanian vessels during 1983 and no inspecting duties. For notice of apparent infringements they asked that Circular Letter 83/17 be corrected to read:

Department of Food Industry
 by post: Piata Walter Maracineanu 1-3
 Bucharest, Romania
 by telex: 11192-Bucharest, Romania
 Attn. Mr. Vintila Rotaru, Deputy Minister

Cuba confirmed its previous notices. It had had inspectors on board fishing vessels and Canadian inspection vessels, but their activities had been limited as explained previously.

Canada discriminated in detail its enforcement effort in NAFO waters in 1982 and 1983:

(January 1 - August 31)

Sea Days	1982	79
	1983	89 - Planned to achieve 125 to end of year
Inspections	1982	98
	1983	88
Air Surveillance	1982	377 hours
	1983	145 hours - Planned to reach 375 to end of year
Vessel Sightings	1982	3M - 597 3LNO -2270 (included sightings inside Canadian zone in 3LNO)
	1983	3M - 279 3LNO - 839 (inside Canadian zone included)

Apparent Violations 1982 1 Mesh Size
 1983 3 Mesh Size, Closed Area, Chafer

Included in the above figures were reported activities of vessels of non-member nations as follows:

<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>SIGHTINGS</u>	<u># DIFFERENT VESSELS</u>	<u>INSPECTIONS</u>
Spain	1982	953	61	67
	1983	398	51	41
Panama	1982	6	1 pair	2
	1983	35	5	2
Korea	1982	6	1	0
	1983	6	1	2
Mexico	1982	99	4 pairs	0
	1983	45	4 pairs	0
Venezuela	1982	7	2	0
	1983	0	0	0
U.S.A.	1982	3	2	3
	1983	4	3	0
Chile	1982	0	0	0
	1983	8	1	0

The delegate of Canada also informed that in due time Canada would inform the Committee regarding the Canadian representative on the future Enforcement Planning Working Group (See FC Doc 82/IX/10, Rev., App. V, item 16, pg. 21).

8. The Chairman gave the floor to the Executive Secretary who explained that he had written not only to the Foreign Departments of Mexico, Chile and Panama as reported in Attachment 1 to Appendix 4 of Circular Letter 83/48 repeated in Attachment 1 to Appendix 6 of Circular Letter 83/55 but also communicated with the Foreign Department of Venezuela and repeated his contacts with Mexico, Chile and Panama.

The Chilean vessel seemed to be the one more in order relative to NAFO regulations, although obviously not abiding by them. The Venezuelan and Mexican Governments have appeared to be those most interested in learning about NAFO regulations. Panama has shown an absolute indifference to the whole process not having even acknowledged the Executive Secretary's letters.

9. It was agreed that the next meeting of STACTIC would coincide with the time and place of the next annual meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 1300 hrs.

10. The meeting was reconvened at 0915 of 21 September, and the Chairman gave the floor to the delegate of Canada who introduced the need to consider Schedule IV of Part V in order that the Fisheries Commission would be quite aware of its definitive final form.

He suggested that STACTIC could recommend that the mesh size now applying to Redfish in 3M should also apply in 3L and that all the notes 1, 2 and 3 should be mentioned at the top of the column headed Mesh Size. Nobody objected to either suggestion although it was agreed that some editing might have to be introduced either in the Schedule or in the Rule II B.2 as the reason for the lack of mention of Note 3 was the fact that it referred to seine nets where Rule II B.2 at the moment only referred to trawl nets. This was agreed.

11. The delegate of Canada then referred to the importance of the timely submission of provisional statistics for enforcement and control. The Executive Secretary had constantly reminded Contracting Parties of their obligation to keep up-to-date statistics but the situation for some of them was still not improved.
12. The Executive Secretary elucidated the Committee that the communication with the Venezuelan authorities had been recent and not in consequence of any boarding but simply as a result of an enquiry from their Embassy.
13. The Canadian delegate informed that their inspectors had recently boarded a South Korean vessel and the corresponding report was on its way to the Executive Secretary.

The meeting was adjourned at 0945.

14. The meeting was reconvened at 0910 on 22 September. The Chairman gave the floor to the Canadian delegate who had an important matter on control and conservation of resources to bring to the attention of the Committee.
15. The Canadian delegate made the attached report. (See Attachment 2)
16. The Portuguese delegate in reply also made a report. (See Attachment 3)
17. The Executive Secretary confirmed that he had informed the Portuguese Government of the letter received from the Canadian authorities on the subject and that it had not yet received copy of any reports of boardings related to the matter.
18. The Chairman stated that he would inform the Fisheries Commission accordingly.
19. Some small corrections were introduced in the text of the 2nd Draft of the STACTIC Report and the Canadian delegate profitted from the occasion to call the attention to the relationship between the paragraphs 2.2 and 6 of FC Doc 82/VI/2 Revised which had been previously studied by the Committee. This was noted.
20. The Executive Secretary proposed that, in order to maintain, in Schedule VI of Part V (see Attachment 4) of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures, as the Canadian delegation had proposed, the reference to all notes 1 to 3 at the head of the column entitled "Mesh Size", he proposed to eliminate the word "trawl" on the second line of Rule II B.2 of the Measures. This was agreed. (See NAFO/FC Doc 82/IX/13 Corrigendum-Revised.)

The meeting was adjourned at 1000.

5th Annual Meeting of NAFO
Leningrad, USSR - 14-23 September 1983

Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)

Agenda

1. Opening by the Chairman, Mr. A. A. Volkov (USSR)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Consideration of Conservation and Enforcement Measures
5. Review of Annual Return of Infringements and of corresponding reporting forms (FC Doc 83/IX/1)
6. Review of Registration of Vessels fishing in the Regulatory Area
7. Enforcement in the Regulatory Area
8. Communications with non-Members of NAFO
9. Time and Place of Next Meeting
10. Other Business
11. Adjournment

Report by the delegate of Canada

The delegation of Canada reported to STACTIC its Government's grave concern regarding the over-fishing of Redfish by one of NAFO's regulatory members, namely Portugal, in the Divisions 3LN and 3M of the Regulatory Area. It was reported that as of August 8th, Portugal had caught according to information recorded in boarding reports of Canadian Inspection Officers, the following amounts:

<u>Redfish</u>	<u>Allocations</u>	<u>Catch</u>
3LN	850 mt	1,552.7 mt
3M	600 mt	4,479.4 mt

These catches include information from both Inspectors boarding reports within the NAFO Regulatory Area and the Canadian 200-mile fishing zone, which will be forwarded to the NAFO Secretariat and the Government of Portugal by Canada. However, the Canadian representative noted that the above catch information had been transmitted in separate reports outlining their concerns relative to this overfishing.

Report by the delegate of Portugal

The Portuguese delegate, after quoting a number of rules of the Scheme of Joint International Enforcement which were relative to reporting, declared that his Government had not received until then, either directly from the Canadian Government, or from the Executive Secretary of NAFO, any one of the inspection reports required by the Scheme, in which any infraction for fishery beyond the quotas allocated to Portugal had been cited.

As he had understood from the statement of the Canadian delegate the data put forward would be totals given out by the Canadian computers, but he had heard no specification of places, dates, vessels and other information necessary to a serious inquiry.

He would profit from the occasion to inform that he had knowledge of this matter through a note recently sent to his Government by the Canadian Government and a Commission of Inquiry was immediately established to investigate it thoroughly with a view to apply the necessary sanctions if the conclusions furnish the information for successful trials.

SCHEDULE IV
Authorized Mesh Size of Nets

Area	Regulated Species	Mesh Size (see Notes 1, 2 and 3 below)
a) Regulatory Area	Atlantic cod, <i>Gadus morhua</i> L. Atlantic haddock, <i>Melanogrammus aeglefinus</i> (L.) Atlantic halibut, <i>Hippoglossus hippoglossus</i> (L.) Witch, <i>Glyptocephalus cynoglossus</i> (L.) Yellowtail flounder, <i>Limanda ferruginea</i> (Storer) American plaice, <i>Hippoglossoides platessoides</i> (Fab.) Greenland halibut, <i>Reinhardtius hippoglossoides</i> (Walb.) Pollock (saithe), <i>Pollachius virens</i> (L.) White hake, <i>Urophycis tenuis</i> (Mitch.) Short-finned squid, <i>Illex illecebrosus</i> (LeSueur)	130 mm 60 mm
b) Division 3L and 3M	Redfish, <i>Sebastes</i> sp.	130 mm

- NOTES:
1. Other than for short-finned squid, *Illex illecebrosus*, for which mesh sizes are irrespective of the material, these mesh sizes relate to manila twine netting.
 2. When trawl nets or parts thereof made of materials other than manila are used, the appropriate mesh size shall be as shown below:

(a) such part of any trawl net made of hemp, polyamide fibres, or polyester fibres	_____ 120 mm
(b) such part of any trawl net made of any other materials	_____ 130 mm
 3. When seine nets are used _____ 110 mm

