

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR



THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

PROCEEDINGS

of the

14TH ANNUAL MEETING

of the

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

1964

CONTENTS

- Proceedings No. 1 - Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, with Appendices (published as 1964 Redbook, Part I, and not included hereunder).
- Proceedings No. 2 - Report of Meeting of Panel 1, with Appendix
- Proceedings No. 3 - Report of Meeting of Panel 4, with Appendix
- Proceedings No. 4 - Report of Meeting of Panel 2, with Appendix
- Proceedings No. 5 - Report of Meeting of Panel 5, with Appendix
- Proceedings No. 6 - Report of Meeting of Panel 3, with Appendix
- Proceedings No. 7 - Report of First Meeting of Commissioners
- Proceedings No. 8 - Report of First Plenary Session
- Proceedings No. 9 - Report of Second Meeting of Commissioners
- Proceedings No. 10 - Report of First Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration
- Proceedings No. 11 - Report of Third Meeting of Commissioners
- Proceedings No. 12 - Report of Second Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, with Appendix
- Proceedings No. 13 - Report of Second Plenary Session
- Proceedings No. 14 - Report of Opening Meeting
- Proceedings No. 15 - Report of the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations, with Appendices
- Proceedings No. 16 - Report of Joint Meeting of Panels
- Proceedings No. 17 - Report of Third Plenary Session
- Proceedings No. 18 - Report of Third Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, with Appendices
- Proceedings No. 19 - Report of Final Plenary Session



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964

Report of Meeting of Panel 1

Tuesday, 2 June, 2:30 p.m.

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Mr. Möcklinghoff (Germany).
2. Rapporteur. Mr. Steinar Olsen (Norway) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda was adopted.
4. Panel Memberships. There were no changes in panel memberships.
5. Meeting of Scientific Advisers.

The Report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers was presented by Dr. Paul Hansen (Denmark). The report, attached as Appendix I, was approved and the Panel agreed to

recommend (1)

that all countries having carried out tagging experiments in the Greenland areas in post-war years should, as soon as possible, analyze their data for the purpose of assessing the magnitude of interchange of cod stocks between the areas mentioned, and report their findings, giving all particulars required for such a study, to the Secretariat in good time prior to the next ICNAF meeting.

It further

recommends (2)

that a small working group be established, which during the next meeting of the R & S Committee is to review and combine the material supplied, and, if possible, to give an overall estimate of the rate of emigration from the ICNAF Subarea P to the East Greenland and Iceland areas, and whether there has been any trend in recent years.

6. Review of Conservation Measures.

There were no suggestions for new regulation measures, but in reply to a question by U. K. all panel countries reported that they would have no great difficulties in accepting a 120 mm cod-end mesh size in the panel area, for the purpose of establishing a uniform mesh size in all North Atlantic waters. The meeting felt, however, that this question requires consideration by other panels too, and, hence, no specific recommendation was made.

7. Future Research

Taking into account the information contained in the Report of the Meeting of the Scientific Advisers, and the conclusions to be drawn from this, the panel meeting expressed its concern about the possibilities of long-term changes in the marine climate in Greenland waters, and their subsequent impact on the fisheries.

The panel therefore wish to draw the attention of the R&S Committee to the need for more environmental investigations (hydrography, meteorology and ice conditions) and speedy reporting and pooling of the available biological data, with the aim of facilitating forecasts about the future of these fisheries.

8. Date and Place of Next Meeting.

The next meeting of Panel 1 will be held during the 15th Annual Meeting of ICNAF.

9. Other Business.

Dr. Paul Hansen (Denmark) was re-elected Chairman of the Scientific Advisers to Panel 1.

10. Panel Report.

It was agreed that the Chairman and the Rapporteur prepare the Panel Report.

11. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 1Saturday, 30 May, 9:00 a.m.

1. Introduction. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr. Paul Hansen (Denmark) with Dr. C. E. Lucas (U. K.) as Rapporteur. Representatives of all member countries other than Spain attended the meetings and received from the Chairman a valuable review of research undertaken in the area by member countries during 1963. In addition the Chairman referred to the three extensive Northwest surveys made by co-operative effort during the spring and early summer and to the Continuous Plankton Recorder Surveys, both of which are reviewed in the Report of the Environmental Subcommittee (Proceedings No. 1, Appendix VI).

2. Conditions in 1963.

Points of especial interest in the Chairman's Report concerned the evidence that

- (a) 1963, like 1962, was colder than in recent years.
- (b) zooplankton development, particularly of Calanus, was later than usual.
- (c) despite a good spawning, cod larvae were unusually few, as also redfish larvae, perhaps in relation to the scarcity of their food.
- (d) the inshore cod fishery operated by the Greenlanders has been a poor one.
- (e) while Germany, Iceland and the United Kingdom had increased cod landings, those of Portugal, the USSR, Norway, France and Spain diminished.
- (f) total cod landings decreased from about 450,000 tons to 380,000 tons.
- (g) the total landings of redfish decreased from some 60,000 tons to 43,000.
- (h) catches of cod in 1964 are likely to depend principally on the 1956 and 1957 year-classes.
- (i) among the young cod the year-classes 1960 and 1961 appear to be good ones.
- (j) while increases in the catches of Gadus ogac and Greenland halibut might suggest some evidence of generally cooler conditions, the increasing stock of haddock off Southern Greenland and its good growth rate, and the first captures of plaice off Greenland, provide contrary evidence.
- (k) recent cod-tagging experiments promise to provide an unusually high proportion of returns from the Icelandic fisheries.
- (l) increased catches of salmon by the Greenlanders are providing interesting returns from salmon tagged on both sides of the Atlantic.

3. Discussion

An intensive discussion centred on three main points: (a) the status of the main fisheries, (b) cod migrations and (c) the salmon fishery.

(a) Reference was made to changes in the commercial fisheries and the fact that good year-classes do not appear to last as long as they once did. Evidence was also given that unusually good cod fishing off Iceland tends to coincide with unusually good Greenland year-classes. The importance of hydrographical and meteorological conditions was noted and the need for more research in these fields stressed.

Reference was made repeatedly to evidence provided in the Report of the Assessment Subcommittee, and the attention of the Panel is drawn particularly to Tables 1 and 2 in that report and Figs. 1A and 3. The first table reviews landings over the period 1957-63, and catches per day's absence as illustrated in Fig. 1A, together with estimates of fishing activity. Fig. 3 is provided there to relate yield to fishing intensity, and in Table 2 the Subcommittee has provided its best estimates of the positions occupied by the principal subarea fisheries on the curves of Fig. 3.

After reviewing the principal changes in the fisheries (page 3) the Subcommittee points out (page 3) how a rapidly developed fishery on a previously unexploited accumulation of a long-lived species of fish can over a year or so provide a much bigger catch than could ever be obtained on a sustained yield. They go on to say that for nearly all the stocks which are or were of major importance the fishing intensity is around that giving the maximum yield. Further increases can at best increase the yield only slightly and sustained increases are likely to reduce the long-term catch per unit of effort almost in proportion. Expansion in the northern areas (page 7) has evidently resulted from the exploitation of new grounds and the increased effectiveness of the search and selectivity of fishing. Few major areas remain where fishing has not been attempted. Prospects for continued expansion are therefore more limited than in the south, although the Subcommittee go on to consider the possibility that fisheries might be developed on other species.

(b) Following the discussions on cod migrations between Greenland and Iceland, reference was made to an earlier recommendation about the pooling of tagging results and the group of advisers decided to propose to the Panel that the available information on such migrations, especially from Greenland to Iceland, should be assembled and reviewed for the information of the Assessment Subcommittee, as soon as possible; it is expected that a specific recommendation will be introduced at the Panel Meeting.

(c) The new information regarding migrations of salmon from Eastern Canada and Western Europe to West Greenland was discussed with interest and it is expected that discussions will be held between Greenland and the United Kingdom about the possibilities of a joint research programme. It was decided to recommend

that Dr. Hansen be requested to assemble all the available information about relevant taggings and returns and report at the next meeting. Scientists of member countries are urged to assist Dr. Hansen in this important task in every way they can.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Report of Meeting of Panel 4Wednesday, 3 June, 2:35 p.m.

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Captain Tavares de Almeida (Portugal).
2. Rapporteur. Dr. W. Templeman (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda was adopted without change.
4. Panel Memberships. All member countries were represented. There were no new requests for membership and no resignations.
5. Report of Chairman of Scientific Advisers. Mr. R. H. Letaconnoux (France) reviewed the Report of the Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel 4 (Document No. 105). The Report was approved.
6. Report on Meeting of Scientific Advisers. Mr. Letaconnoux also presented the Report of the Meeting of the Scientific Advisers to Panel 4 (Proceedings No. 3, Appendix I). It was agreed that this report be attached as an Appendix to the Panel Report.
7. Future research required. It was agreed that this subject had been adequately dealt with in the Meeting of Scientific Advisers.
8. Date and place of next meeting. It was agreed that the Scientific Advisers to the Panel will meet in the week preceding the 1965 Annual Meeting.
9. Other business. Mr. MacKenzie (Canada) gave notice to the Panel that proposals would be advanced by Canada, in time to be included in the Agenda for the 1965 Annual Meeting, on the subject of changing the 10% exemption clause for regulated species taken incidentally to the fishery for non-regulated species.
10. Approval of Panel Report. It was agreed that the Chairman and Rapporteur prepare the Panel Report.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964

Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 4

Saturday, 30 May, 4:00 p.m.

1. The Scientific Advisers met under the Chairmanship of Mr. Letaconnoux (France) with Y. Jean (Canada) as Rapporteur. Other participants were G. Cannone and F. Mazzeo (Italy), R. Monteiro (Portugal), W. R. Martin, W. C. MacKenzie, P. P. Russell, W. Templeman, J. C. Medcof, F. D. McCracken, L. M. Dickie and E. J. Sandeman (Canada), H. W. Graham, D. R. McKernan, B. E. Skud, J. B. Skerry and R. C. Hennemuth (USA), A. S. Bogdanov, S. A. Studenetsky and V. Nikolaev (USSR).
2. The Chairman gave a summary of his Report on Researches and Status of the Fisheries in Subarea 4 (Document No. 105). The Report was discussed and a few amendments were made by the Advisers. The Report was then approved in its amended form.
3. The Chairman asked for comments on Item 6 of the agenda for Panel 4 Meeting: "Review of Conservation Measures and Requirements". Dr. Dickie, Chairman of the Assessment Subcommittee, presented a summary of assessment of Subarea 4 resources. Redfish is the only species for which additional mesh assessment information has been obtained beyond the 1961 Assessment Report (Supplement to Annual Proceedings Vol. 11, 1962). The use of any mesh larger than 4 inches would result in immediate and probably also long-term losses.

The use of 5 inch mesh in the fisheries for regulated species would have only minor long-term effects, ranging from small losses to small benefits. The anticipated effects on 4T cod and 4VW haddock are not clear. More data on mortality rates, recruitment and growth are needed.

It is felt that most stocks in Subarea 4 have reached or passed the maximum in the yield-fishing intensity curve and that an increase in fishing activity would give a marked reduction in the catch per unit-fishing intensity, though not necessarily a reduction in total catch. Changes in these fisheries have taken place through the addition of new species. Possible changes in the balance of species complex should be evaluated. More research in this field is needed.

Mr. Hennemuth (USA) pointed out that US catch-effort data on redfish, although preliminary, indicate that fishing effort on the Nova Scotia Banks stock is below that which should give the maximum yield.

4. Dr. Martin (Canada) raised the question of by-catches of regulated species in fisheries for non-regulated species with small-mesh nets. Dr. Medcof (Canada) noted from Document No. 105 that about 8% of total haddock and 5% of total cod landings in Subarea 4 came from these fisheries. Dr. Graham (USA), Dr. Bogdanov (USSR) and Dr. McCracken (Canada) agreed on the need for information on regulated species caught and landed as by-catch. However, Dr. Graham (USA) and Dr. Bogdanov (USSR) pointed out that it is difficult to obtain such information since it involves sampling at sea. Both USA and USSR, however, will make every effort to obtain information on quantities and sizes of regulated species caught (including discards) in fisheries for non-regulated species in Subarea 4.

5. At the Chairman's request, the representatives outlined the programs of research in Subarea 4 for the ensuing year. Hydrographic surveys are planned by USSR, USA and Canada. Groundfish surveys will be conducted by Canada in 4T, 4W and 4X and by USA in 4X. Biological studies on haddock, redfish, herring, benthic communities and food of fish will be continued in 4X by USA. Research on cod, haddock and other groundfish, swordfish, tuna and herring will be continued, and a study of species associations will be initiated by Canada. Observations on distribution, stocks, ages and mortality rates of silver hake and herring will be continued by USSR. Tagging of silver hake and herring by USSR and of cod by Canada are planned for the ensuing year.
6. The Scientific Advisers agreed that there was no need for further meeting before the next Annual Meeting.
7. Mr. Letaconnoux (France) was elected Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel 4 for the coming year.
8. The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Report of Meeting of Panel 2Tuesday, 2 June, 11:45 a. m.

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Mr. H. Gardner (United Kingdom).
2. Rapporteur. Dr. W. Templeman (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The Agenda was adopted without change.
4. Panel Memberships. All member countries were represented. There were no new requests for membership and no resignations.
5. Report of Chairman of Scientific Advisers. Dr. A. S. Bogdanov (USSR) presented the Report of the Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel 2 (Document No. 109). This report was approved.
6. Report on Meeting of Scientific Advisers. Dr. Bogdanov also presented the Report of the Meeting of the Scientific Advisers to Panel 2 (Proceedings No. 4, Appendix I). It was agreed that this Report be attached as an Appendix to the Panel Report.
7. Review of conservation measures and requirements. The Chairman noted that the Scientific Advisers had no recommendations for further conservation measures; but thought the Panel might helpfully discuss whether, in due course, it would be acceptable on administrative grounds to consider altering the Subarea 2 mesh regulation (4 1/2 inches) presently recommended, but not yet approved by all member countries, to conform with that adopted for the North-East Atlantic Convention Area. No doubt this possibility would also come forward for discussion on other panels.
 - (a) Portugal. (Captain de Almeida) was prepared to accept a mesh size of 120 mm for the subarea if a similar size were to be adopted for all of the Convention Area.
 - (b) Canada. (Mr. MacKenzie) explained that a larger mesh would be disadvantageous if applied in southern subareas and, therefore, reserved his country's position.
 - (c) USSR (Mr. Kamentsev) would agree to a 120 mm mesh for this subarea.
 - (d) Germany (Mr. M^ocklinghoff) agreed that in principle it would be useful to have the same mesh size as in the Northeast Atlantic.
 - (e) Spain (Dr. Rodriguez-Martin) said that it would be useful to have the same mesh throughout the area but this could involve difficulties in more southern panels and would need to be discussed in the meetings of the full Commission.
 - (f) France (Mr. Letaconnoux) would be agreeable to 120 mm.
 - (g) Poland. No comments.

The Chairman said it would be premature for Panel 2 to reach a conclusion on this subject; but the course of the discussion would be reported to the Commission, which could, at the same time, take into account discussions on other Panels. He would also report the matter to the ad hoc Committee, which was considering the possibilities of assimilating practices in the two Convention Areas.

8. Future research required. It was agreed that this subject had been adequately dealt with in the Meeting of Scientific Advisers.
9. Date and place of next meeting. It was agreed that the Scientific Advisers to the Panel will meet in the week preceding the 1965 Annual Meeting.
10. Other business. Nil.
11. Approval of Panel Report. It was agreed that the Chairman and Rapporteur prepare the Panel Report.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964

Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 2

Saturday, 30 May, 11:00 a.m.

1. The Chairman, Dr. Bogdanov (USSR), presided at the meeting, and representatives were present from the following countries: Canada, France, Germany, Poland, Portugal, USSR, UK. Representatives of Iceland, Norway and Denmark attended as observers.
2. Mr. E. J. Sandeman (Canada) agreed to act as Rapporteur.
3. The Chairman drew the attention of the committee to his summary report of the research work carried out in the area and remarks on the status of the fisheries (Document No. 109). A brief summary of this document was presented by the Rapporteur and following discussion of the report by the group it was adopted subject to minor editorial amendments.
4. The advisers agreed that, in the light of the data available to them, no further measures of regulation were justified at this time.
5. The Chairman of the Gear and Selectivity Subcommittee reported to the advisers concerning the desirability of further information on gear selectivity in the subarea. Although some data are available concerning trawl selectivity of cod in the subarea, the advisers agreed that emphasis should be placed on the recommendation of the Gear and Selectivity Subcommittee that further data are required, particularly on the selection of the nets of the large stern trawlers and especially during the period of the spring cod fishery. The advisers agreed that it was important that countries should continue to collect girth, weight and length data in their fisheries. (See Recommendations of Gear and Selectivity Subcommittee).
6. The advisers took note of several points included in the report of the Assessment Subcommittee and it was noted that the total landings have decreased rather sharply from 1961 through 1962 to 1963. Furthermore, as the fishery in this area is not in an equilibrium condition, there is only scanty knowledge of long-term yields. At present it appears that most of the major stocks are now exploited and unless new resources are found the catch per unit effort might be expected to decline rather sharply if the effort continues to increase.
7. It was agreed that the otolith photograph exchange program was a valuable exercise and that investigations should continue attempts at reaching standardisation of the methods of age estimation. The group also endorsed the recommendation of the Ageing Subcommittee that studies of validation of otolith age-reading methods in all species of fish be vigorously pursued by all member countries.
8. The advisers agreed that it was desirable that exchanges of information on tagging programs should not be unduly delayed. In general it was apparent that at present the cod tagging programs of USSR and Canada were complementary and that whereas the main USSR effort towards the tagging of cod occurred in the offshore area, that of Canada occurred inshore.
9. Plans for research in the subarea were discussed.

10. The advisers emphasized how, in this area where a large part of the total landings are from fisheries on the spring concentrations of cod and redfish, the presence of ice could exert a considerable effect on the fishery, and they urged countries fishing in the area during this season to report on the ice conditions and the effects that these may have on the fishery.
11. Dr. Bogdanov was re-elected Chairman of the Scientific Advisers to Panel 2.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Report of Meeting of Panel 5Tuesday, 2 June, 2:30 p.m.

Participants: USA: H. W. Graham, A. W. Anderson, D. L. McKernan, J. A. Slater, F. P. Briggs, R. W. Green, W. L. Sullivan, Thomas Fulham, Commdr. Hagan, Raymond Kershaw, Jake Dykstra, Richard Hennemuth, Jack Skerry; USSR: S. A. Studenetsky, V. M. Nikolaev; Canada: W. Templeman, J. H. LeBreton, L. M. Dickie, Yves Jean, F. D. McCracken, Jack B. Estey, W. R. Martin, Paul P. Russell, J. C. Medcof, J. H. MacKichan, W. C. MacKenzie; Guest: W. M. Chapman.

1. The Chairman, Mr. W. C. MacKenzie (Canada), opened the meeting.
 2. Dr. H. W. Graham (USA) agreed to act as Rapporteur.
 3. The agenda was adopted without change.
 4. Review of Panel membership. No changes were suggested.
 5. Dr. C. Medcof (Canada), who substituted for Dr. J. L. Hart (Canada), as Chairman of the Scientific Advisers to Panel 5, read the Chairman's report of the status of the fisheries and research carried out in the subarea during 1963 (Document No. 106, revised) and the report of the meeting of scientific advisers held on 30 May, 1964, in Hamburg (Proceedings No. 5, Appendix I).
- The Panel accepted the Scientific Advisers' report and agreed it should be attached to the Panel report as an appendix.
6. Dr. Graham (USA) reviewed the report of ad hoc group on herring and other pelagic species (Proceedings No. 1, Appendix I).
 7. The Panel noted that cod had been landed from the subarea by Japan during the last year although only in very small quantity.
 8. The USSR reported that the statements regarding mortality of silver hake in Subarea 5 contained in their research report are only provisional. Since research on this species has been carried out only for two or three years, it is too early to draw definite conclusions regarding them.
 9. In discussing the question of extending mesh regulations to include yellowtail flounder, Mr. Hennemuth (USA) referred to a paper by Mr. Lux (USA) which will appear in the first issue of the ICNAF Research Bulletin. This report relates the fishing effort to the yield of yellowtail flounder over a 14-year period. It was concluded that the long-term variations in abundance of yellowtails could not be related to fishing intensity, and, hence, were probably due to natural causes and not to the effects of fishing at levels of intensity thus far experienced. The US also reported that it is completing studies of validation of age readings in this species.

The Panel agreed that there should not be any changes in the existing mesh regulations in Subarea 5 at this time.

10. Dr. Graham (USA) reviewed the working of the 10% annual exemption in the US. The Panel agreed that their annual reporting on this subject should be continued although perhaps in modified form and that the US should make every effort to provide information on the sizes of regulated species taken by the vessels operating under the annual exemption.
11. The Panel noted that scientists from Canada and the US plan to hold an informal mid-year meeting to discuss sea scallop research pertinent to possible regulation of this fishery. A discussion of sea scallop problems generally followed that as reported in the meeting of scientific advisers.
12. Mr. Fulham (USA) raised the question of studying the parasites of red-fish which are such a nuisance in this fishery. Dr. Templeman (Canada) advocated a study of this problem in the Gulf of Maine stating that another pocket of infection occurs in Hamilton Inlet but that there, due to the weather, it is not possible to study it year round.
13. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Panel should be held during the next Annual Meeting.
14. The Panel agreed to have the Chairman and Rapporteur prepare the report of their meeting for circulation to individual countries for approval.
15. The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 5Saturday, 30 May, 9:00 a. m.1. Participants:-Chairman: J. C. MedcofRapporteur: H. W. GrahamCanada: W. R. Martin, F. D. McCracken, L. M. Dickie, Y. Jean, W. Templeman, P. P. Russell, W. C. MacKenzieNorway: S. OlsenUSSR: A. S. Bogdanov, S. A. Studenetsky, V. NikolaevUSA: D. McKernan, R. Hennemuth, B. E. Skud, J. B. Skerry

2. The Chairman opened the meeting at 9:00 a. m. by stating that there was a conflict in meeting times and that the USSR participants would like to be excused as soon as possible in order to attend the meeting of scientific advisers to Panel 1. Accordingly the Chairman suggested and the group agreed that items of interest to the USSR would be dealt with first.
3. The Chairman presented his summary report of the status of the fisheries and research conducted in the subarea in 1963 distributed as Document No. 106. A number of suggestions were made regarding minor changes in this document and the Chairman agreed to incorporate these into his revision of the document before submission to the Panel at its meeting the following week. With this proviso the advisers approved the report.
4. Silver Hake
- The group took note of the increased catch of silver hake in the subarea and expressed its pleasure with the research reports of the USSR which presented statistics on catch, effort, age-composition, mortality rates and other biological parameters. Reference was made to the consideration of these reports by the Assessment Subcommittee and to its suggestion that the studies of mortality rates be intensified and reported in more detail next year.
5. In this connection it was agreed that silver hake otoliths should be exchanged between Canada, USSR and USA, to compare methods of ageing in this species. Dr. Studenetsky was designated liaison officer for USSR for this exchange. The Woods Hole Laboratory of the USA agreed to coordinate this exchange.
6. Canada reported that she took no silver hake from Subarea 5 in 1963 but that she would conduct studies of species association and mortality rates and expected to report on these studies at the next annual meeting.
7. Herring
- The reports on this species were previously considered by the ad hoc group on herring and other pelagic species which met the previous week (Proceedings No. 1, Appendix I). Dr. Graham agreed to review their report at the Panel meeting.

8. Minimum Mesh Sizes

A general discussion was held on the effect of mesh size on a number of species of fish and of how the group could advise the panel on questions that might arise regarding mesh sizes.

8.1 Mesh Regulation for Flounders. The yellowtail flounder is the principal species of flounder taken in the subarea. It is fished by the USA primarily with 4 1/2"-5" mesh but a small amount is taken in the mixed yellowtail-industrial fishery with small mesh nets. The USA reported considerable discards of small fish at mid-season because recruitment was high (Document No. 75). The mortality rates of this population are not known but are under study. The effects of past fishing on these stocks have not been assessed. However it was the view of the meeting that at present there is no need for including flounder among the regulated species and that regulation of this species would pose complicated exemption problems.

8.2 Mesh size for regulated species. Referring to an item in the proceedings of last year's meeting, the question of the effect of increasing mesh size to conform with the eastern North Atlantic was raised. Reference was then made to the Assessment Report which indicates that increasing mesh size to 5 inches in Subarea 5 would result in immediate losses of 5% and no long-term gains for cod, and 14% immediate losses with 1% long-term gains for haddock.

9. 10% Annual Exemptions

The U. S. presented its annual report on the operation of their exemptions in the subarea (Document No. 11). The possibility of discontinuing these reports was discussed. It was pointed out that such reporting is no longer required by the Commission but that it does provide useful information. The value to the Commission's scientists is limited as they do not report the landings under the trip exemption. The group noted that there has been a slight increase in the amount of haddock landed under the annual exemption, amounting to 5.9 million pounds in 1963. Canada indicated the importance of obtaining information on the size of fish landed by exempted vessels. This led to a general discussion of the importance of getting size-composition of by-catches of regulated species.

10. By-Catches

There is a need for knowing the sizes of regulated species taken by the herring fishery, the whiting fishery, the industrial fishery, and the fisheries for other unregulated species. Both the USSR and the USA reported that this information is difficult to obtain because it requires sampling at sea. However, both countries agreed to make every effort to obtain such information.

11. Sea Scallops

The advisers agreed that the decrease in landings in 1963 probably stemmed from decreases in recruitment from the high level reached in 1959. It noted the probable value of increasing the age at first capture and the failure, so far, of efforts to develop an effective savings gear simply by enlarging the metal rings that form the mesh of the dredge. Alternative conservation methods were discussed including a minimum legal size limit based either on the size of the shell or the size of the shucked meat (adductor muscle) or both. It was agreed that these and other possibilities should be studied.

Both Canada and USA have information on the subject and it was agreed that investigators should digest their data and meet about December 1964,

- (1) to review and integrate results and make them available to the Commission.
- (2) to plan further studies of (a) Scallop biology, (b) log book records of the changing fishery, and (c) the possibilities of developing "savings" characteristics in the dredges themselves and on methods of handling (screening) scallops after they reach the deck.

12. Tagging

A review of current and planned fish tagging programs in the subarea showed that there was no overlapping and no need so far for special co-ordination. It was agreed to continue the card system of reporting to the Secretariat and to review results at the regular annual meetings.

13. Time and Place of Next Meeting

It was agreed that no meeting of this group would be required before the next Annual Meeting of the Commission.

14. Election of Chairman

Both Canada and the US agreed that the next Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel 5 should be a member of the USSR delegation and the USSR delegation designated Dr. Studenetsky. This was approved unanimously.

15. The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Report of Meeting of Panel 3Wednesday, 3 June, 9:00 a.m.

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Mr. V. M. Kamentsev (USSR).
2. Rapporteur. Mr. E. J. Sandeman (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda was adopted.
4. Panel Membership. There were no changes in panel memberships.
5. Review of Fisheries and Research. The Chairman of the Scientific Advisers to Panel 3, Dr. Templeman (Canada), reviewed his report on the status of fisheries and researches in Subarea 3 during 1963 (Document No. 108). As it was the wish of the meeting to consider agenda items 6 and 7 in conjunction with item 5, this item was not discussed at this time.
6. Review of conservation measures and requirements. The Chairman of the Scientific Advisers to Panel 3, Dr. Templeman (Canada), read the report of the meeting of these advisers and the report was adopted (Appendix I). It was unanimously agreed that the members of Panel 3 were deeply appreciative of the invaluable service which Dr. Templeman has rendered to the Panel for so many years.
7. Future Research Requirements. These were dealt with under item 6 above.
8. Next meeting. The next meeting of Panel 3 will be held during the 15th Annual Meeting in 1965.
9. Other business. Mr. Russell (Canada) gave notice that Canada would like to have introduced to Subarea 3, Divisions N, O and P, an annual exemption regulation similar to that now in effect for Subarea 5, with an amendment to Section D, subsection 1, of these regulations, to read as follows:

"...or so long as such a person does not catch, in any period of twelve months, regulated species in total quantities for all regulated species in excess of 10% of all the trawl caught fish taken by such persons in that period of twelve months."
- It was decided that this matter should be referred to the ad hoc Committee for Trawl Regulations and to the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics.
10. Approval of Panel Report. It was agreed that the draft report would be submitted to each delegation for approval.
11. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 a.m.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964

Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 3

Saturday, 30 May, 2:30 p.m.

1. The Chairman, Dr. W. Templeman (Canada), presided at the meeting, and representatives were present from the following countries: Canada, France, Italy, Poland, Portugal, USSR, UK and USA. A representative of Japan was present as an observer.
2. Mr. E. J. Sandeman (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The Chairman summarised the report on research and the status of the fishery in Subarea 3 (Document No. 108) and this was approved subject to minor additions and editorial amendments.
4. The attention of the Scientific Advisers was drawn to the valuable graphic and tabular summaries contained in the figures and tables of the report of the Assessment Subcommittee.
5. Dr. L. M. Dickie (Canada) spoke on the work of the Assessment Subcommittee. He emphasized that the changes in the fish stocks of Subarea 3 are more complex than in the other subareas and thus it is difficult to make general statements regarding them. However, taking cognizance of this it seems likely that most of the major fisheries of the subarea are in the neighbourhood of their maximum sustained yield. In view of the possibility that changes in the relative production of the different fish species may be considerably influenced by interactions between these and/or other species, the Scientific Advisers noted that it was most important to obtain as much information as possible, and endorsed this point as recorded in the report of the Assessment Subcommittee.
6. In introducing the discussion on the co-ordination of tagging programs, the Chairman read Recommendation 31 of the 1963 meetings of the Research and Statistics Committee (Redbook 1963, Part I, p. 55). The advisers endorsed this and agreed that it was desirable that exchanges of information on tagging programs should not be unduly delayed. Furthermore they agreed that more information was required on the time, location and purposes of the various tagging programs and that this should be reported by including a statement in the national reviews of forthcoming research.
7. The Chairman reiterated a plea for co-operation of all ICNAF countries in returning tags and urged that ICNAF scientists take an interest in improving tag returns by their own countries. The advisers were unanimous in their support of this extremely important subject.
8. Scientists of member countries reviewed their research programs for the ensuing year.

Canada. Market sampling of inshore and offshore fisheries, research vessel sampling of all major commercial species, usual hydrographic work, cod tagging in various inshore and offshore areas.

France. No special biological research work, although some hydrographic observations will be made as usual.

Italy. No Italian vessels will fish in this subarea in 1964 and no research will be carried out.

Poland. Sampling of major commercial species will continue during three commercial trips to the Convention Area.

Portugal. As in previous years, the major species will be sampled on commercial vessels.

Spain. Although no scientific adviser was present at the meeting, it is indicated that sampling will continue with emphasis on cod and haddock (ICNAF Serial No. 1271).

USSR. Will continue to investigate many phases of the fishery including hydrography, plankton and the distribution of fish by area and depth. Work will be carried out on research and scouting vessels as well as on commercial vessels.

United Kingdom. No special research except for the Continuous Plankton Recorder program.

United States. US Coast Guard vessels working for the International Ice Patrol will do their usual hydrographic work in the subarea.

The observer from Japan told the Group of his country's intentions to obtain some data on their commercial vessels and stated that if possible this would be presented to the Secretariat.

9. The next meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 3 will be held in 1965 in conjunction with the Annual Meeting.
10. Dr. H. W. Graham (US) was elected Chairman of the Scientific Advisers to Panel 3 for the ensuing year.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964

Report of First Meeting of Commissioners

Monday, 1 June, 4:15 p. m.

1. The Chairman, Mr. Sunnanaa, opened the meeting. Representatives from all countries were then asked to consider Items 13, 14, 15 and 18 of the Plenary Agenda. These items were referred to the Meeting of Commissioners by the First Plenary.
2. Mr. Briggs (USA) expressed the concern of the US delegation at the trends in fishing activity and landings as presented in the Provisional Report presented by the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics at the First Plenary session. He stressed the importance of the need for the Commission to take steps to decide courses of action which might be taken to ensure maintenance of the maximum sustained yield from the fisheries in the Convention Area. He also expressed concern at the considerable time lapse before adoption of the Commission's proposals for amendments to the Convention and for international regulation of the trawl fisheries (Item 15 "Consideration of procedures for bringing into effect proposals adopted by the Commission" of the Plenary Agenda) and moved that the problem be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration. This proposal was agreed to by the Commissioners.
3. Attention of the Commissioners was drawn to Plenary Agenda Item 14 "Status of recommendations adopted by the Commission". The 1964 Meeting Document No. 5 on this subject was then referred to the Commissioners for information.
4. Mr. Möcklinghoff (Federal Republic of Germany), the ICNAF observer at the May 1964 meeting of NEAFC, in speaking to Item 13 "Joint Enforcement System for ICNAF Trawl Regulations" of the Plenary Agenda, reported that NEAFC had set up a special committee to study the practical problems involved in the establishment of international measures of control and present suggestions at its next meeting. Mr. Fulham (USA) suggested that the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations be asked to study the problem and recommend the next step to be taken towards establishing possible international measures of control. The meeting agreed to this proposal.
5. Item 18 "Adequacy of present measures for conservation of fisheries in the Convention Area", with the agreement of the meeting, was deferred to a later Meeting of Commissioners.
6. The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p. m.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964

Report of First Plenary Session

Monday, 1 June, 11:30 a. m.

- Item 1. Opening. The First Plenary Session was convened by the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. K. Sunnanaa (Norway). All member countries as well as observers from FAO and Japan were present.
- Item 2. Agenda. The agenda was adopted as presented.
- Item 3. Publicity. It was agreed that the Chairman of the Commission and the Chairman of the Standing Committees on Research and Statistics and Finance and Administration and Mr. Möcklinghoff (Federal Republic of Germany) would constitute a committee to control policy regarding publicity.
- Item 4. Panel Membership. No applications were received for panel membership which remains at 37.
- Items 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. Finance and Administration. These Items were referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration to consider and report upon at a later Plenary Session.
- Items 10, 11 and 12. Trawl Regulations. These Items were referred to an ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations which was set up by the Plenary with Mr. Gardner (UK) as Chairman; the Committee to consist of one delegate from each of the 13 member countries.
- Items 13, Joint Enforcement, 14, Status of Commission Proposals, and 15, Effecting Commission Proposals. These Items were referred to a meeting of Commissioners.
- Item 16. Conservation of Seals. This Item was considered and reference made by the Executive Secretary to 1964 Meeting Document No. 5 on the status of ICNAF proposals. Since all member countries had not deposited letters of ratification or adherence, no formal action regarding the establishment of a panel for harp and hood seals could be taken. The Executive Secretary drew attention to the Canadian information paper, 1964 Meeting Document No. 101, which reviews the fishery and research on seals in the Northwestern Atlantic.
- Item 23. Report of Standing Committee on Research and Statistics. The Plenary recessed at 12:01 p. m. for lunch and reconvened at 2:40 p. m. to hear Mr. Beverton, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, make a provisional verbal report on results of studies and recommendations of the Committee and its Subcommittees. The Provisional Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics with 8 Subcommittee reports as appendices (1964 Meeting Proceedings No. 1 with Appendices I-VIII) formed the basis for Mr. Beverton's presentation. The Chairman commended Mr. Beverton and the Research and Statistics Committee workers, on behalf of the Commission, for the report and its presentation and asked the meeting for comments. Mr. MacKenzie (Canada) proposed and the meeting agreed that the Provisional Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics should be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration for consideration of those recommendations involving additional expenditures.

- Item 17. Conservation Requirements. The Plenary noted that a report on this item was included in the Provisional Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics and that no major revision of assessments for the fisheries referred to in this item of the agenda was offered, beyond those given in the 1963 Redbook (p. 37) for redfish in Division 3NO and for redfish and other species in Subareas 4 and 5 given in the 1961 Mesh Assessment Report.
- Item 18. Adequacy of Conservation Measures. After hearing Mr. Beverton report on this item from the Provisional Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, the Plenary agreed that this item be referred for consideration to a meeting of Commissioners.
- Items 19, Fishing and Navigational Practices, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27. The Plenary agreed that these items should be dealt with at a later meeting of the Plenary.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Report of Second Meeting of CommissionersTuesday, 2 June, 4:30 p. m.

1. The Chairman, Mr. Sunnanaa, opened the meeting. It was agreed that there should be no changes made in the timetable for all meetings except the Final Plenary session which should take place at 10 a. m. instead of 11 a. m. on Saturday, 6 June.
2. The meeting approved the Report of the First Meeting of Commissioners (Proceedings No. 7) held on 1 June.
3. The Chairman called for consideration of Plenary Agenda Item 18 "Adequacy of present measures for conservation of fisheries in the Convention Area". He drew attention to paragraph 9(b) of the Provisional Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (Proceedings No. 1) which states

"Research and Statistics respectfully submit that to judge whether or not regulations are 'adequate' in the wider sense involves major questions of policy which are outside its competence. The attempt has, however, been made at this meeting to give the kind of scientific advice which the Commission would need to decide whether or not the existing regulations are adequate, and what other kinds of regulations, if any, might need to be considered."

and asked Mr. Beverton, as Chairman of R&S, to expand on this statement. Mr. Beverton referred to the first part of the Report (paragraph 2(d)). He pointed out that the Committee's analysis and interpretation of trends in the Convention Area showed that in most major fisheries (e. g. cod and haddock) landings have not increased as much as fishing activity and as a consequence the overall catch per unit fishing activity has dropped by about 40% since 1957. Analyses further show that mesh size regulations, while helping to keep up total yield, are not "adequate" to offset the expected sharp downward trend in catch per unit effort if fishing activity continues to increase.

Mr. MacKenzie (Canada) was acknowledged by the Chairman and said that the increasing intensity of fishing referred to by Mr. Beverton reflected the activity of private enterprises, serving a market and trying to maximize profit, and of state enterprises serving a budget or target and trying to maximize some similar net economic yield. He pointed out that no one was trying to maximize a sustainable yield of fish in physical terms - which seemed to be assumed as the objective of ICNAF - and in any event, that would be an inappropriate objective of the Commission which was concerned with the management of fishery resources that include a range of species among which there are inter-relationships of a competitive nature. He understood that the maxima mentioned by Mr. Beverton referred to yield per recruit and not to sustained yields in the traditional sense.

Mr. MacKenzie pointed out that the question handed by the Commission last year to Mr. Beverton's committee had been handed back in effect with the suggestion that it was essentially a policy question and must be dealt with by Commissioners themselves. He stated that if the Commissioners could formulate policy objectives, their scientific advisers might advise how these objectives are to be achieved. What the scientific advisers needed from the Commissioners was direction for their work in the future.

He pointed out that the direction of a research program was relatively simple for national purposes and in Canada, for example, it seemed to him (as an economist) that the fisheries might be divided broadly into two main categories. On the one hand were those based on stocks in limited supply (salmon, lobster, etc.). As demand grew for the products of these fisheries it tended to exert a continuous upward pressure on prices and at some points it might become practicable to extend the supply by cultivation. In the case of the other category of fisheries, e. g. those for groundfish and herring, products were comparatively substitutable. As demand grew for these, therefore, industry was encouraged to use more distant or less abundant stocks and new species.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that in the field of international resource management, however, the problem became vastly more complex because nations differed in their price structures, demand patterns and so on, but that Commissioners could not escape the responsibility in this field.

Mr. Fulham (USA) agreed with Mr. MacKenzie and suggested that the Commission was reaching the point where there is a question of what happens when fishing effort gets too great. Since mesh regulations did not appear to meet the conservation needs, something should be done to find out what other methods might be used.

The Chairman agreed with the Canadian and U. S. Commissioners that mesh regulations were not sufficient to preserve the fish stocks in the Convention Area and that other means must be considered as soon as possible. He felt that consideration must be given to the regulation of the intensity of fishing, and that, if possible, specific terms of reference should be given to R&S.

Mr. Beverton (U. K.) stated that the R&S could assess other possible actions and their consequence for the Commission.

Mr. MacKenzie asked if the problem could be dealt with by the biological sciences alone or should the research program of the Commission be extended beyond present disciplines.

Mr. Beverton replied that the answers are not wholly biological and that there were social and economic questions involved. He pointed out that some other international commissions included other disciplines, and that ICNAF could gain information through review and summary.

Dr. Lucas pointed out that the biologist could say what might happen if certain policies were laid down.

The Chairman read from paragraph 2(d) of the Provisional Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics regarding the state of the stocks in subareas and proposed that the Executive Secretary, Mr. Beverton and he prepare draft terms of reference for the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics and place the draft before a meeting of Commissioners to be held 3 June. This proposal was accepted unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned by the Chairman at 5:30 p. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Report of the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and AdministrationTuesday, 2 June, 9:00 a. m.

- Item 1. The Chairman, Dr. H. MacKichan, welcomed official representatives and advisers from all 13 member countries: Canada - MacKenzie, Denmark - Skibsted, France - Lagarde, Federal Republic of Germany - Mücklinghoff, Iceland - Jonsson, Italy - Cannone, Norway - Olsen, Poland - Chrzan, Portugal - Almeida, Spain - Rodriguez Martin, USSR - Volkov, UK - Gardner, USA - Green.
- Item 2. Rapporteur. The Executive Secretary was appointed rapporteur for the meeting.
- Item 3. Agenda. The agenda was adopted without change.
- Item 4. Audit. The Auditor's Report as published in the 1963 Annual Proceedings Vol. 13 was tabled. The Committee
- recommends (1)
- that the Auditor's Report for 1962/63 be accepted by the Commission.
- Item 5. Finance and Administration Report for 1963/64. The Report and its provisional financial statements (1964 Meeting Document No. 70) was reviewed by the Executive Secretary. The Committee having found the report in order
- recommends (2)
- that the Finance and Administration Report for 1963/64 be accepted by the Commission.
- Item 6. Panel Membership. The Committee's attention was drawn to 1964 Meeting Document No. 1 which showed panel memberships unchanged at 37. No applications for membership were received in 1963/64.
- Item 7. Budget for 1964/65 and Item 8, Estimates for 1965/66. These items were deferred to a later meeting of F&A.
- Item 9. Secretariat office accommodation.— The Committee was informed that office space in the Bedford Institute of Oceanography was guaranteed for three years only from 1 August 1963. The Committee agreed that no action was necessary and that the matter should be reviewed at the next Annual Meeting.
- Item 10. Circulation of Agenda estimates. The Committee, after consideration, agreed that draft agenda and budget estimates and forecasts should be circulated to member countries in January of each year.
- Item 11. Publications. This item was deferred to a later meeting of the Committee.

- Item 12. Billing. The Committee agreed that date of billing member countries in the next fiscal year should be 1 August 1964.
- Item 13. Next Meeting. This item was deferred to a later meeting of the Committee.
- Item 14. Invitations to 1965 Annual Meeting. The Committee agreed that the Commission should continue to invite FAO, ICES, NEAFC, IOC and seek to establish and maintain working arrangements with other public international organizations with related objectives of management of marine fishery resources in the North Atlantic.
- Item 15. Other Business. The Committee then considered
- (a) The question of procedures for bringing into effect proposals adopted by the Commission (Item 15 of the Plenary Agenda), which item was referred to the Committee by the First Meeting of Commissioners. The Committee agreed that the item would be deferred, while a proposal from the U.S. delegation relating to the item was prepared and circulated for consideration before discussion at the next meeting of F&A.
 - (b) The Chairman then asked Mr. Beverton, Chairman of R&S, to place before the Committee the proposals of R&S which involved finances. Mr. Beverton reported on the following four proposals for consideration of F&A.
 - (1) Publication of Environmental Symposium
R&S recommended that, to meet the total cost of \$12,500 required to publish the Environmental Symposium by the lowest cost method (offset), and in addition to the \$7,500 included in the 1964/65 estimates the sum of \$5,000 be added to the estimates for 1965/66 (See Sec. 3(a)(iv) of Proceedings No. 1 of the Provisional Report of R&S).
 - (2) Publication of the Environmental Survey (NORWESTLANT 1-3)
After receiving the contributions at the 1964 Annual Meeting and only then being able to estimate generally the size of such a published report, R&S recommended that the \$8,000 requested in estimates for 1965/66 be reduced to \$6,000. (See Sec. 3(b)(iv) of Proceedings No. 1).
 - (3) Publication of National Research Reports
R&S recommended that national research reports be included in the printed Annual Proceedings instead of in the Redbook at a small additional estimated cost of \$3,000.
 - (4) Continuing Working Party (CWP) on North Atlantic Statistics
R&S recommended that ICNAF proceed with plans, agreed to in 1963 (Redbook Recommendation #59), to pay the expenses of the Chairman of the Statistical Subcommittee and the Commission Statistician to attend a meeting of CWP in 1965 (See Sec. 6(c) of Proceedings No. 1).
- The Committee noted the proposals and after considerable discussion agreed to give further consideration to them under F&A Agenda Items 7 and 8 at the next meeting of F&A.
- (c) The Committee then heard a USSR proposal which would limit the Commission's estimates for 1964/65 to \$74,500, an increase of \$3,000 over its 1963/64 appropriations.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:45 a. m.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964

Report of Third Meeting of Commissioners

Thursday, 4 June, 5:30 p. m.

The Chairman, Mr. Sunnanaa, opened the meeting with representatives from all countries present and drew attention to the Report of the Second Meeting of Commissioners (Proceedings No. 9) and distributed the proposal of the Chairman, Executive Secretary and Chairman of Research and Statistics regarding Plenary Agenda Item 18 "Adequacy of present measures for conservation of fisheries in the Convention Area".

The Report of the Second Meeting of Commissioners (Proceedings No. 9) was accepted with minor editorial changes. The Chairman then requested the Executive Secretary to read the proposal regarding "Adequacy of present measures for conservation of fisheries in the Convention Area" prepared by the Chairman, Executive Secretary and Chairman of Research and Statistics. Having heard the proposal the Committee

recommends

that, having considered the report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (Proceedings No. 1) and mindful of the increasing fishing activity in the ICNAF area and its probable consequences, the Commission

1. Commends the progress made by the Assessment Subcommittee in its report to this meeting (Proceedings No. 1, Appendix VII), and urges it to continue its analysis and interpretation of trends in ICNAF fisheries, and its researches into the effects of fishing on the stocks, along the lines proposed, and to report further progress at the next Annual Meeting.
2. Requests that the Chairman of Research and Statistics and of the Assessment Subcommittee review meanwhile in general terms the various kinds of action which might be taken by the Commission for the purpose of maintaining the stocks of fish in the ICNAF area at a level at which they can provide maximum sustained yields. In so doing, special reference should be made to the provisions contained in Article VIII of the Convention and their probable effects on the stocks and fisheries. Their report should be sent via the Executive Secretary to the Chairman of the Commission by 31 December, 1964, and circulated to all member countries not later than 31 January, 1965.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p. m.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964

Report of Second Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration

Thursday, 4 June, 9:30 a.m.

The Chairman opened the meeting with delegates and advisers representing all 13 member countries present.

The Executive Secretary reviewed the Report of the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Proceedings No. 10). The Committee approved this report.

The Chairman asked the meeting to consider Finance and Administration Agenda Item 7 "Budget estimate for 1964/65". He pointed out that, as a result of discussion in the Commission in 1959 the practice has been not to include salary increases recommended by the Secretariat in the advance estimates. Therefore, the salary item 1(a) of the proposed estimates for 1964/65 did not include provision for salary increases.

Mr. MacKenzie (Canada) explained that salaries for Canadian government workers were under continuous review and that increases to bring them more in line with salaries in Canadian industry and business had been granted within the past year. He pointed out that the Commission must also face this competition.

The Chairman asked the Executive Secretary to present a detailed review of the 1964/65 proposed estimates totalling \$ Can. 80,600. The Committee then gave provisional approval to items on the 1964/65 proposed estimate except the salary item 1(a).

The Executive Secretary was then asked to speak to the salary item 1(a) in the 1964/65 estimates and presented a proposed salary schedule for ICNAF Secretariat personnel covering the fiscal year 1964/65 (Appendix I) for consideration of the committee. After brief remarks in support of salary increase for others of the Secretariat, the Executive Secretary was asked to withdraw from the meeting while the salary question was discussed.

On recall to the meeting, the Chairman advised the Executive Secretary that the Committee, having considered all aspects of the question and recognizing the commendable efforts of the Secretariat, was pleased to recommend salary increases totalling \$3,820 for 1964/65 based on comparable Fisheries Research Board of Canada 1 July 1963 salary classifications and ranges, as follows: Executive Secretary from \$14,000 to \$16,000 per annum; Statistician from \$7,320 to \$8,500 per annum; Editorial Assistant from \$5,000 to \$5,040 per annum; Secretary to Executive Secretary \$4,260 to \$4,560 per annum; Clerk-Stenographer from \$3,750 to \$3,900 per annum; Typist from \$3,150 to \$3,300 per annum.

The Executive Secretary thanked the Committee on behalf of the Secretariat for their expression of confidence and pledged continued best efforts from the Secretariat in the work of ICNAF.

Following a discussion of the possibility that salary and salary structure for ICNAF staff be based on Fisheries Research Board of Canada scales, it was agreed by the Committee that the Executive Secretary should draft a recommendation in this regard for the next meeting of Finance and Administration, the

recommendations to include the necessity, in the future, of presenting job descriptions for each member of the Secretariat in order for the Commission to establish a comparable job classification.

The meeting agreed to the proposals and was the adjourned at 10:50 a. m.



1964

Salary Schedule for ICNAF Secretariat Personnel
Executive Secretary (Mr. L. R. Day)

Present salary	\$14,000
F. R. B. of Canada salary range (effective July 1, 1963):	
Scientist 5	\$15,500 - 16,000 - 16,500

Statistician (Mr. B. F. C. DeBaie)

Present salary	\$7,320
F. R. B. of Canada salary range (effective July 1, 1963):	
Scientist 2	\$7,000 - 7,900 - 8,200 - 8,500 - 8,800 - 9,100
Recommended salary	\$8,500

Editorial Assistant (Mr. H. Champion)

Present salary	\$5,000
F. R. B. of Canada salary range (effective July 1, 1963):	
Editor 1	\$4,320 - 4,500 - 4,680 - 4,860 - 5,040 - 5,220 - 5,400
Recommended salary	\$5,040

Secretary to Executive Secretary (Miss J. Maclellan)

Present salary	\$4,260
F. R. B. of Canada salary range:	
Clerks 4	\$4,260 - 4,410 - 4,560 - 4,710
Recommended Salary	\$4,560

Clerk-Stenographer (Miss G. Schrader)

Present salary	\$3,750
F. R. B. of Canada salary range:	
Clerk 3	\$3,750 - 3,900 - 4,050 - 4,200
Recommended salary	\$3,900

Typist (Mrs. B. MacKenzie)

Present salary	\$3,150
F. R. B. of Canada salary range:	
Typist 3	\$3,150 - 3,300 - 3,450 - 3,600
Recommended salary	\$3,300

Present total salary expenditure	\$37,480
----------------------------------	----------



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964

Report of Second Plenary Session

Wednesday, 3 June, 4:30 p. m.

1. The Chairman drew attention to the Report of the First Plenary Session (Proceedings No. 8) and asked for comments. After receiving no comments the meeting accepted the Report.

2. The Chairman then introduced Plenary Agenda Item 19 "Fishing and Navigational Practices in the Convention Area" and asked the Executive Secretary to read 1964 Meeting Document No. 80 which recommended that the Commission consider the proposal of the European Fisheries Conference Resolution in Fisheries Policing adopted 17 January 1964 to invite the Governments of all countries participating in the Northeast Atlantic fisheries and Canada and U. S. A. to send representatives to a technical conference to consider a draft Convention, on the lines of the 1882 Convention for regulating the policing of the North Sea fisheries, and embodying a modern code for the conduct of fishing practices in the whole of the North Atlantic.

Captain Almeida (Portugal) suggested this important matter be studied by an ICNAF group.

Mr. Gardner (UK) informed the meeting that the UK would be sending out invitations shortly to all countries fishing in the North Atlantic, including U. S. and Canada, to attend a conference on rules of conduct governing fishing operations. For the wider issues, however, the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) would seem to be the appropriate agency.

Mr. MacKenzie (Canada) and M. Rougé (France) spoke in favour of the action proposed in 1964 Meeting Document No. 80 and the meeting agreed to adopt its proposal.

3. The Chairman then called Mr. Beverton to speak on the Addendum to the Provisional Report of R&S (Proceedings No. 1). The Chairman expressed the hope that the Commission would accept all the reports and recommendations of R&S subject to further consideration by F&A of the financial and administrative matters in the addendum. The Plenary agreed to this proposal and the thanks of the Commission was passed along to Mr. Beverton, the Chairmen of his sub-committees and the members for their work in R&S. Mr. Beverton (UK), who was leaving the chairmanship of R&S, was accorded the thanks and applause of Commission members for his excellent, well-directed and inspiring leadership over the years of his service.

4. The Chairman then moved consideration of the Report of Panel 5 (Proceedings No. 5). This report was read by Mr. W. MacKenzie (Canada) and accepted.

5. The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Opening MeetingMonday, 1 June, 10:40 a. m.

The Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Klaus Sunnanaa, (Norway), opened the meeting and addressed a welcome to the Commissioners, Advisers, Observers and Guests to the 14th Annual Meeting of the Commission. He introduced the representative of the host country, Ministerialdirigent Dr. Gerhard Meseck of the Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Forestry, who also spoke to the meeting as follows:

Mr. President,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

The Federal Minister of Food, Agriculture and Forestry has asked me to welcome you on his behalf most cordially to the Federal Republic of Germany. The Minister had intended to welcome you personally. But much to his regret he cannot do so because of a meeting of the Council of Ministers of EEC. He asks you to excuse him.

We consider it a special privilege to have here so many distinguished scientists and administrators from the member countries of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention and well-known guests and observers from other important fishing nations and fishery organizations. I hope that the rooms in our Federal Research Center of Fisheries will suffice for this meeting. We shall make every effort to meet your wishes.

Our invitation to hold this year's meeting of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries in Hamburg should be taken as a sign of how much we appreciate the work of the Commission. At present about half of the catches of the Federal Republic of Germany's deep sea fisheries come from the Northeast and the other half from the Northwest Atlantic. Since not only the fishing fleet but also the fish industry, and trade and commerce depend on sufficient landings, my Government is very much interested in the most reasonable use of fish stocks possible. Therefore, we make every effort to cooperate actively and constructively in international organizations. I always feel great pleasure and satisfaction that in these bodies the human atmosphere is such a good one.

The common struggle of fishermen with nature and the common responsibility of all Governments concerned have led very early to a close and trustful cooperation in the sector of marine fisheries. This Commission is an excellent example of that fact. But also with other international fisheries organizations, I have observed that in spite of conflicting interests and differing points of view, fishery administrators and scientists have always found a fair solution to many problems on the basis of a lasting and friendly exchange of views. I know that the diplomats often envied us. I was even told that the two Geneva Conferences on the Law of the Sea would have been more successful if the fisheries people had been more in the forefront.

Coming now to the special tasks to be performed by the Commission, I should like to mention that it shall see to it that the maximum sustainable yield of the stocks of fish in the Northwest Atlantic is ensured. So far, we can fulfil

this task only in a very limited way and we are approaching this objective very slowly. For some time to come we shall probably not be able to control production in the sea to the same extent as this can be done in agriculture. Despite great progress in science and technology we are mostly dependent on many unforeseeable factors of nature which we can counteract to a very modest extent only. We are therefore far from an effective management of fishing grounds or the so-called "farming the sea". We can bring of course fishing activity into better harmony with the existing fish stocks. Yet, the far greater natural fluctuations relative to the size and the composition of fish populations as well as their migrations will probably remain in future the principal problems with which our fishing fleets are faced. Therefore, I consider the continuing scientific control of fish stocks in connection with their environmental conditions and the catches as one of the major tasks to be performed by this Commission. We need as constant and reliable forecasts as possible of the development and changes of stocks. Such forecasts are very useful for our practical marine fisheries because they ensure as rational utilization of our vessels as possible. Moreover, we do not want only to regulate our fisheries but also to support it. In this very field, the Commission can be proud of their exemplary achievements and we would welcome a further development of assessments and forecasts by means of intensified and co-ordinated scientific investigations as well as a systematic evaluation of all attainable results. This will enable us to at least improve our fishing activities and come to what we might call "controlled fisheries", as distinct from "hunting".

Since I am firmly convinced that fishing can be rationalized by scientific and technical knowledge I should like to raise the question here whether our scientific and administrative cooperation cannot be made more effective. At present, there is much demand on our time owing to the many meetings and conferences. Moreover, there are numerous special committees, subcommittees and working parties dealing with special problems. I should think that Parkinson's Laws also apply to our sector. But even if we would not have to blame ourselves it is nevertheless worthwhile to consider what we can do with the objective of concentrating our scientific and administrative activities.

In the area of the North Atlantic in which we are particularly interested, there are, f. i. three renowned organizations investigating and regulating fisheries, although in many respects they deal with the same or similar problems; whereas, I think I can say without exaggeration, in terms of biology the North Atlantic is one coherent area.

It is of course true that the three organizations, I just mentioned, have their own historic origin and that they enjoy high esteem. But this should not frustrate the development of a broader coordination. In the past 20 years, conditions of marine fisheries have undergone greater changes than ever before and we must more and more take into account this fact in our research, our fisheries policy, and our international cooperation.

We have followed with interest the decision taken by the Fisheries Conference in London to organize a technical conference in the near future during the course of which - I should like to hope - a uniform code for the conduct of fishing vessels, operating in the fishing grounds of the entire North Atlantic, rules for their inspection as well as for technical, medical, and meteorological services will be prepared. This code is to replace the regionally limited Convention concerning the policing of fisheries in the North Sea of 1882. We hope that all states fishing in the North Atlantic will participate in the conference. I cannot see any reasons why this significant project should not be crowned with success, and success in that field will certainly encourage the participating governments to take further steps towards co-operation covering larger areas.

Now, I do not wish to put before you any further considerations for the future. Numerous current problems have been put on our Agenda which will need our full attention over these following days.

Finally, I wish to point out that we have not only invited you to Hamburg for hard work; I mention this since Germans are often said to exaggerate in this respect. You should also take the opportunity of seeing the cosmopolitan city of Hamburg.

We have ordered our new fisheries research vessel "Walther Herwig" into Hamburg. On Thursday afternoon you are invited for a short trip on the River Elbe. During this trip it will be possible for you to have a close look at the facilities on this vessel. And tonight you are all invited to a reception given in the "Old Town Hall". Those who have not received an invitation by sheer mistake are of course also invited and the wives of delegates are too cordially invited.

I hope that we shall have a few pleasant hours of relaxation. Finally, the Senate of the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg will give a reception on Friday afternoon in the Town Hall and for Tuesday a boat will be made available for a harbour tour.

I wish the fourteenth Meeting of ICNAF every success and wish you a good time in Hamburg.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Report of the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations

Participants: Gardner (UK), Chairman; Martin (Canada), Rapporteur; Russell (Canada); Djurhuus (Denmark); Lagarde (France); Mocklinghoff (Germany); Jonsson (Iceland); Cannone (Italy); Olsen (Norway); Chrzan (Poland); Almeida (Portugal); Rodriguez Martin (Spain); Lucas (UK); Fulham (USA); Kamentsev (USSR); and advisers.

1. We were asked at the first Plenary Session on 1st June (Proceedings No. 8) to examine Items 10, 11 and 12 of the Agenda. We referred these matters to a working group whose report is attached.
2. We were also asked at the first meeting of Commissioners on 1st June (Proceedings No. 7, paragraph 4) to study the problem of international enforcement (Plenary Item 13), and recommend the next step towards establishing possible international measures of control. Our comments on this are set out in paragraph 11 below.
3. On Item 10(a) of the Agenda, we have examined the returns of infringements and have no comments to make except that those countries which do not fish in subareas where regulations are in force should not be shown in the annual returns as having made no inspections.
4. On Item 10(b) of the Agenda, the new form appears generally to have been acceptable, but there are certain points which are still doubtful. We recommend that these should be clarified by explanatory notes attached to the forms before they are issued on the lines of section 3 of the Working Group's report. Attention is also drawn in this connection to section 4 of the Working Group's report.
5. On Item 11 of the Agenda, we would draw attention to Section 1 of the Working Group's report, to which we have little to add. The approach to the question of top-side codend protection which emerged from the 1963 meeting of ICNAF appeared to be working satisfactorily in practice. But we are satisfied that the ultimate solution to this problem can only be the adoption of materials in the construction of nets that are sufficiently strong not to require additional protection, or methods of hoisting the net on board that obviate this need.
6. Item 12 of the Agenda gives rise to specific proposals for Subareas 1, 2, and 3, and also 4 and 5, which are annexed to this report, and which we submit to the Commission for endorsement.
7. The discussion of this matter, leading to positive proposals, is contained in Section 2 of the Working Group's report. Briefly, it is proposed that a standard should be retained for trawl nets made of manila and measured with the ICNAF gauge. On the basis of scientific advice, the Commission may then prescribe
 - (i) the appropriate mesh size for trawl nets made of other materials, or for seine nets;
 - (ii) not more than two alternative methods of measuring mesh sizes other than by the ICNAF gauge; and the mesh sizes equivalent for such methods of measurement.

8. The purpose of the amendment is

- (a) to provide an appropriate mesh size for each material commonly in use;
- (b) to provide alternative methods of measurement for enforcement purposes, having regard to the differing legal and administrative problems of member countries; and mesh sizes for each method equivalent to the sizes prescribed when the ICNAF gauge is used.

9. We believe that we have solved this problem, and recommend for approval and ratification, through the usual procedures, the revised regulations annexed to this report. If, in due course, these regulations are adopted, we recommend that the Commission adopt the proposed mesh-size equivalents for materials other than manila, and for the different methods of measurement indicated in Table 1 in Section 2 of the Working Group's report.

10. The Committee took note of the Canadian proposal to change the 10% exemption provisions in ICNAF mesh regulations (as described in Section 5 of the Working Group's Report). In proposing an extension of the annual exemption provision for Subarea 5 regulations to Subarea 4 and Divisions 3 NOP, the Canadian delegation have, in our view, called attention to a valid point when they indicate that a 10% exemption for each regulated species might be reexamined in the light of (1) increases in the amount of trawling with small-mesh nets for non-regulated species and (2) increases in the number of species regulated. The Committee agreed that the question should be studied in preparation for full consideration of the Canadian proposal which is to be circulated more than 60 days in advance of the next annual meeting.

11. Item 13 of the agenda (Joint Enforcement) raises difficult problems for each member country; but they are problems with which we have to grapple if the conservation regulations now in force, and those envisaged, are to be effective. The amendment to Article VIII of the Convention, adopted at the 1963 Annual Meeting is now awaiting ratification. Having regard to the time occupied by the formal procedures, it is unlikely that we shall be able to introduce firm proposals to implement a provision for joint enforcement in the Convention until - say - the 1966 meeting of the Commission. We have, therefore, contented ourselves with exploring the possibilities, without commitment at this stage, so that all member countries can give detailed and constructive thought to the problems of joint enforcement in the next twelve months, and the matter can be carried further at the 1965 meeting of the Commission. Our objective should be to have an agreed system ready for introduction as soon as the powers are available in the Convention.

12. To facilitate the discussion, the Committee considered in outline the practicability of arrangements under which officers who enforce conservation regulations on their own nationals would be authorised also to board and inspect fishing vessels of other member countries fishing in the Convention Area, to satisfy themselves that the Convention regulations were not being infringed. It was noted that, under such a system, safeguards would be necessary to ensure that there was no undue interference with fishing activities; and that the detailed instructions to captains of national protection vessels might contain helpful guidance on means of avoiding this. Under these arrangements, the inspecting officer who found an infringement of the Commission's regulations on a fishing vessel of another country would have no power of arrest, either of vessels or persons; but should, perhaps, be empowered, for purposes of evidence, to take any fishing gear on board which had been, or was suspected of having been, used in contravention of the regulations. The duty of the inspecting officer would be to report any infringement to the flag country of the offending vessel and he would send a copy of his report to the Commission. It would, of course, be for the flag

state alone to try the offence and impose penalties if infringements were established. If a system of joint enforcement on these lines were introduced, further thought would need to be given to the method by which the evidence of an authorised officer of another member country should be brought before the courts of the flag country.

13. In the general discussion in the Committee, a number of countries expressed the view that the framework indicated above was on the right lines; and that more detailed proposals should be developed on this basis. Other countries reserved their position. We have set out the course of the discussion to help member countries in their further consideration of this problem; but we make no recommendation at this stage as to the form a scheme of international inspection or joint enforcement might ultimately take.

14. We recommend that each member country should be asked to supply to the Secretariat before the end of 1964

- (a) A statement of its enforcement procedures, and particulars of the instructions given to its enforcement officers
- (b) A general statement of its views as to the form that should ultimately be taken by a system of international inspection or joint enforcement when powers are available in the Convention.

The Secretariat should collate these statements and circulate them to member countries not less than four months before the next meeting of the Commission.

15. We considered a proposal that the Commission should engage an expert on enforcement questions to examine the statements submitted by member countries and to draw up positive proposals for the Commission's consideration at its 1965 meeting. Owing to budgetary considerations, we did not pursue this matter further. We make the suggestion, however, that, to gain experience in each other's enforcement procedures and problems, it would be helpful if invitations were given in the next twelve months to enforcement officers of member countries to accompany the inspection officers of other countries on their work. We commend this idea, and hope that it will prove possible, by agreement between member countries, to arrange for such an exchange of visits. This should add to our practical knowledge of the problem when we come to discuss the matter again at the 1965 meeting.



Ad Hoc Committee on ICNAF Trawl Regulations

Proposed Changes in Mesh Regulations

The first paragraph of each ICNAF mesh regulation is quoted below. In each case the appropriate reference is noted. Proposed deletions are enclosed in square brackets and proposed additions are underlined.

Reference - ICNAF Annual Proceedings, Volume 11, for 1960-61,
pages 15-17

I. Mesh Regulations for Subareas 1, 2 and 3

1. The Contracting Governments take appropriate action to prohibit (except as provided in paragraphs 2 and 3) the taking of groundfish in Subareas 1, 2 and 3 by persons under their jurisdiction with trawl nets [or seine nets (hereinafter called nets)] having [a mesh size] in any part of the net meshes of dimensions less than 114 millimetres or 4 1/2 in. as measured by the ICNAF gauge specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) below. These mesh sizes relate to manila twine netting when measured wet after use or [less than] the equivalent thereof when measured dry before use. [When nets other than manila are used they shall have a selectivity equivalent to that of a 114 millimetre or 4 1/2 in. manila trawl net. For the purpose of this proposal the 114 millimetre or 4 1/2 in. mesh size when measured wet after use shall be taken to be:]

The Commission may, on the basis of scientific advice as to selectivity equivalents, determine the appropriate mesh sizes when trawl nets made of materials other than manila are used or when seine nets are used. The Commission may also, on the basis of scientific advice, approve not more than two alternative gauges, by defining the gauges, together with approved methods for their use and with accepted scales of equivalent mesh dimensions.

II. Mesh Regulation for Subarea 4

1. The Contracting Governments take appropriate action to prohibit (except as provided in paragraph 2) the taking of cod, *Gadus morhua* L.; haddock, *Melanogrammus aeglefinus* (L.); and flounders (witch), *Glyptocephalus cynoglossus* (L.); yellowtail, *Limanda ferruginea* (Storer); winter flounder, *Pseudopleuronectes americanus* (Walb.); and American plaice, *Hippoglossoides platessoides* (Fabr.) in Subarea 4 by persons under their jurisdiction with trawl nets [, or seine nets (hereinafter called nets)] having [a mesh size] in any part of the net meshes of dimensions less than 114 millimetres or 4 1/2 in. [manila twine] as measured by the ICNAF gauge specified in [sub-] paragraphs (a) and (b) below. . These mesh sizes relate to manila twine netting when measured wet after use or [less than] the equivalent thereof when measured dry before use. [When nets other than manila are used, they shall have a selectivity equivalent to that of a 114 millimetre or 4 1/2 in. manila net. For the purpose of this proposal the 114 millimetre or 4 1/2 in. mesh size when measured wet after use shall be taken to be:]

The Commission may, on the basis of scientific advice as to selectivity equivalents, determine the appropriate mesh sizes when trawl nets made of materials other than manila are used or when seine nets are used. The Commission may also, on the basis of scientific advice, approve not more than two alternative gauges by defining the gauges, together with approved methods for their use and with accepted scales of equivalent mesh dimensions.

Reference -

ICNAF Annual Proceedings, Volume 5, for 1954-55, page 11.

III. Mesh Regulation for Subarea 5

1. That the Contracting Governments take appropriate action to prohibit (except as provided in paragraph II) the taking of cod, *Gadus morhua* L., and haddock, *Melanogrammus aeglefinus* (L.), in Subarea 5, by persons under their jurisdiction with trawl nets having [a mesh size] in any part of the net meshes of dimensions less than 4 1/2 in. or 114 millimetres [manila twine] as measured by the ICNAF gauge, specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) below. These mesh sizes relate to manila twine netting when measured wet after use or [less than] the equivalent thereof when measured dry before use. [When trawl nets other than manila are used, they shall have a selectivity equivalent to that of a 4 1/2 in. or 114 millimetre manila trawl net. For the purpose of this proposal, the 4 1/2 in. or 114 millimetre mesh size when measured wet after use shall be taken to be:]

The Commission may, on the basis of scientific advice as to selectivity equivalents, determine the appropriate mesh sizes when trawl nets made of materials other than manila are used or when seine nets are used. The Commission may also, on the basis of scientific advice, approve not more than two alternative gauges, by defining the gauges, together with approved methods for their use and with accepted scales of equivalent mesh dimensions.

Working Group on Chafing Gear and Mesh Measuring ProblemsTuesday, 2 June, and Wednesday, 3 June

Members: Lucas (Chairman); Martin (Rapporteur); McCracken, Dezeustre, Bohl, Jonsson, Cannone, Olsen, Chrzan, Monteiro, Rodriguez Martin, Beverton, Skerry, Studenetsky, with advisers.

1. Chafing Gear (Plenary agenda Item 11)

The Group took note of previous Commission action to prohibit the use of double codends, but to permit the use of top-side chafers which do not obstruct the meshes of the cod-end. Three types of top-side chafers have been approved by the Commission (ICNAF chafer, United Kingdom modification of the ICNAF chafer and the multiple-flap chafer). A fourth type of chafer used on USSR and Polish stern trawlers is being studied by USSR and is being reviewed by the Research and Statistics Committee.

In accordance with a recommendation made at the 1963 Annual Meeting, countries submitted detailed reports and sketches of the types of chafing gear used in their countries. These reports were reviewed by the Working Group.

It was noted that Canada, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Spain, United Kingdom, and United States all use the ICNAF type of top-side chafers.

There was some question about the looseness of chafers described by Denmark and Iceland, and these countries were asked to submit further information on their chafers to the Commission. If the top-side chafers differ in any essential respect from those approved by the Commission, results of selectivity experiments are required for study by the Research and Statistics Committee. It was noted that Document No. 67 on effects of multiple-flap chafers on cod-end selectivity is a good example of the type of reporting required.

Portugal advised the Group that no top-side chafers are used as a result of conversion to synthetic materials in the net and to use of power-block hoisting of the cod-end to the deck. The Working Group commended this action and any other steps that countries can take to discourage the use of top-side chafers. It suggested that appropriate gear technology studies through the Research and Statistics Committee and encouragement by enforcement officers are required to meet this problem.

2. Comparability of Mesh Measuring (Plenary Agenda Item 12)

The group considered the mesh regulation problems resulting from use of an increasing variety of materials in cod-ends and the suitability for different reasons of three types of mesh gauge for trawl inspections and enforcement purposes. Canada reaffirmed her problems with certification of any spring-loaded gauge for enforcement purposes and her need for early amendment of ICNAF regulations. The group reviewed the suggested approach to the problem made at the 1963 Annual Meeting together with further considerations following a year of study. Reference was made to the 1964 Research and Statistics Report and to Documents 72, 92, 93 and 100.

As a result of considerations of (a) the need for gauges which are acceptable to the courts, (b) the need for precision in mesh measuring, (c) the need for a simple gauge for use by fishermen and (d) the change in mesh materials used in trawls from manila to synthetics, with the resultant need for ICNAF specification of mesh sizes for materials with different selectivity,

The Working Group recommends that ICNAF mesh regulations should be amended to define the approved minimum mesh sizes in relation to measurements made with a standard precision gauge (ICNAF) and to a standard type of net twine (manila), with provision for use of alternative gauges which have the approval of the Commission, and for which equivalent mesh sizes and methods of use are specified by the Commission, with selectivity equivalents for other materials and for seine nets, all based on scientific advice.

An example of the wording required to so amend mesh regulations is set out below, referring to Section 17, Para. 1 commencing on p. 15 of Annual Proceedings Vol. 11 for the year 1960-61; with the proposed changes in wording underlined:

1. The Contracting Governments take appropriate action to prohibit (except as provided in paragraphs 2 and 3) the taking of groundfish in Subareas 1, 2 and 3 by persons under their jurisdiction with trawl nets or seine nets (hereinafter called nets) having in any part of the net meshes of dimensions less than 114 mm or 4 1/2 in. as measured by the ICNAF gauge specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) below. These mesh sizes relate to manila twine net when measured wet after use or less than the equivalent thereof when measured dry before use. The selectivity equivalents, when nets other than manila are used, shall be determined by the Commission from time to time. The Commission may, on the basis of scientific advice, approve not more than two alternative gauges, by defining the gauges, together with approved methods for their use and with accepted scales of equivalent mesh dimensions.

Similar changes in wording, modified to specify the species regulated, would be required to amend mesh regulations for Subareas 4 and 5.

The Group recommends that in addition to the ICNAF gauge the Commission might approve the use of two alternative gauges, the simple flat gauge as specified by the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Commission, and the ICES gauge as specified by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.

The Working Group agreed to offer the following advice to the Commission on a schedule of equivalent mesh sizes for the three mesh gauges and for the seine nets and different trawl materials used in ICNAF fisheries:

Table 1.

Type of Net	ICNAF gauge	ICES and simple gauge
Seine Net	100 mm (4 in.)	95 mm (3 3/4 in.)
Such part of any trawl net as is made of cotton, hemp, polyamide fibres or polyester fibres	105 mm (4 1/8 in.)	100 mm (4 in.)
Such part of any trawl net as is made of manila or any other material not mentioned above	114 mm (4 1/2 in.)	110 mm (4 3/8 in.)

The Commission may wish to be informed that in relation to the 120 mm mesh minimum introduced into the northern waters of the NEAFC as from 1st June 1964, suitable mesh equivalents are as follows:

Table 2

Type of Net	ICNAF gauge	ICES and simple gauge
Seine Net	105 mm (4 1/8 in.)	100 mm (4 in.)
Such part of any trawl net as is made of cotton, hemp, polyamide fibres or polyester fibres	115 mm (4 1/2 in.)	110 mm (4 3/8 in.)
Such part of any trawl net as is made of manila or any other material not mentioned above	125 mm (4 7/8 in.)	120 mm (4 3/4 in.)

3. Proposed Explanatory Notes to be added to the prescribed form for Annual Returns of Infringements

With reference to the request of the ad hoc Committee for clarification in the use of the form for Annual Return of Infringements, the group recommends the following instructions:

- Line A - Returns relating to mesh size - inspections reported in this line should include only those made on gears inspected which are used to fish primarily for regulated species.
- Line B - Returns relating to mesh obstruction - returns should also relate only to inspections of gears used to fish primarily for regulated species. In most cases the number of inspections in B should be the same as in A.
- Line C - Returns relating to excess landings - returns of inspections should record only those inspections on gears used to fish primarily for unregulated species but which take regulated species as incidental catches.

4. New prescribed form for reports of Trawl Material and Mesh size sampling (Proceedings No. 1, Appendix V, Annex 1)

With reference to the draft form in Proceedings No. 1, Appendix V, the Group considered the practical problem of providing returns and expressed the view that no difficulties are anticipated in making such returns to the Commission. It would, however, be of assistance if a list could be completed of the trade names of twines used in each specified chemical category, and Mr. Skerry kindly undertook to consult with other experts and to provide such a list to be included in explanatory notes on the form.

5. Canadian proposal to change 10% exemption clause (Proceedings No. 3 (Panel 4) and Proceedings No. 6 (Panel 3))

The Group discussed the Canadian proposal that the 10% annual exemption provision in Subarea 5 mesh regulations should be extended to Subarea 4 and Division 3 NOP.

In view of the great expansion of fisheries for non-regulated species, using small-mesh trawls, it was noted that catches of regulated species by such fisheries represent an increasing part of the total catch of each regulated species. The Canadian participants suggested that it may be timely for the Commission to consider whether the 10% exemption clause should apply to the catch of all regulated species rather than the catch of each regulated species. Such consideration would

involve re-examination of both the trip exemption and annual exemption clauses in ICNAF mesh regulations for all subareas.

The Group requested that the Canadian proposal should be recorded in this report for further discussion at the ad hoc Committee meeting. This proposal is as follows:

1. Introduce an annual exemption clause similar to that provided for Subarea 5 (Directory, page 52), for Subarea 4 and Division 3 NOP minimum mesh regulations.
2. Consider amendment of all existing and proposed 10% exemption clauses (both trip and annual) to apply to incidental catches of all regulated species inclusively, rather than to catches of each regulated species.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Report on Joint Meeting of PanelsFriday, 5 June, 5:30 p. m.

1. In accordance with the decision taken at the Third Plenary Session on 5th June (Proceedings No. 17, Item 5), Mr. Gardner (UK) took the chair at a joint meeting of Panels.
2. Mr. Day was appointed Rapporteur to the joint meeting.
3. The Chairman explained the proposals before the meeting with reference to Plenary Agenda Item 12 as dealt with in the Report of the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations (Proceedings No. 15). Paragraphs 6 to 9 of this report describe the proposals in general terms; and the proposed changes in mesh regulations for each of the five subareas were set out in Appendix I to Proceedings No. 15. In addition to the changes in regulations the report of the ad hoc Committee contained recommendations as to the equivalents for trawl nets made of materials other than manila and for seine nets; and also set out mesh size equivalents when instruments other than the ICNAF gauge were used for measurement. These equivalents were discussed in Section 2 of the Report of the Working Group, attached as Appendix II to Proceedings No. 15; and Dr. Lucas, the Chairman of the Working Group, explained what was proposed.
4. There were no comments and accordingly, on a motion from the chair, Panels 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 each agreed to recommend to Plenary for acceptance the proposed changes in mesh regulations set out in Appendix I to Proceedings No. 15.
5. It was agreed that the Chairman and Rapporteur should prepare a report of the meeting for presentation to Plenary and the meeting concluded at 5:50 p. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Report of Third Plenary SessionFriday, 5 June, 4:30 p.m.

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Mr. K. Sunnanaa.
2. The Plenary accepted the Report of the Third Meeting of Commissioners (Proceedings No. 11) containing proposals for action under Agenda Item 18 "Adequacy of present measures for conservation of fisheries in the Convention Area"
3. Under Agenda Item 25, Reports of Panel 1 (Proceedings No. 2), Panel 2 (Proceedings No. 4), Panel 3 (Proceedings No. 6) and Panel 4 (Proceedings No. 3) were read by the Panel Chairmen and accepted unanimously by the Plenary.
4. The Plenary heard the Report of the Second Plenary Session. (Proceedings No. 13) read and agreed unanimously to its acceptance.
5. The Chairman then turned to the Report of the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations (Proceedings No. 15) and asked the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Gardner (UK), to present the Report.

Mr. Gardner informed the Plenary that his Committee was presenting amendments to the mesh regulations for Panels 1-5 under Plenary Agenda Item 12 and since each Panel must approve proposals relating to it, he requested advice on procedure.

Mr. Briggs (USA) proposed that the Plenary resolve itself into a joint meeting of Panels which could then consider the ad hoc proposals on trawl regulation amendments.

The Plenary accepted this proposal and the Chairman of the Commission having convened the Panels and obtained Plenary approval of the appointment of Mr. Gardner (UK) as Chairman of the Joint Meeting of Panels, declared the Third Plenary Session adjourned at 5:30 p.m. to be reconvened at 10 a.m. 6 June.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Report of Third Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and AdministrationFriday, 5 June, 9:20 a. m.

1. Report of Second Meeting of F&A. The report was considered and adopted by the Committee.
2. Estimates for 1964/65 (F&A Agenda Item No. 7). The Executive Secretary pointed out that provisional approval only was given, at the Second Meeting of F&A, of the 1964/65 estimates other than salaries.

Mr. MacKenzie (Canada) announced that he had been in touch with his government and that there was every expectation the annual rental fee of \$2,400 paid by the Commission for office accommodation for the Secretariat in the Bedford Institute of Oceanography would not be required in 1964/65 or following fiscal years of the Commission.

Mr. Green (U. S.) suggested that the amount of \$7,500 required in 1964/65 as part payment of publication of the Environmental Symposium be taken out of Item 6 and advanced from the Working Capital Fund in 1964/65 (Authority: Financial Regulation Sec. VI(2)) and reimbursed over a two or three year period (Authority: Financial Regulations Sec. VI(4)).

The Committee agreed unanimously to this proposal and, in order to meet the 1964/65 estimated expenditures (Appendix I)

recommends

that the appropriations totalling \$74,000 be financed by contributions from member states and that the amount of \$7,500 be advanced from the Working Capital Fund to meet the part payment of publishing the Environmental Symposium in 1964/65 and that the advance from the Working Capital Fund be reimbursed to the Fund over a period of 3 years.

3. Estimates for 1965/66 (F&A Agenda Item No. 8). The Executive Secretary read the notes to the agenda item.

Mr. Cannone (Italy) suggested that the first payment to the Working Capital Fund be deferred to 1966/67. The Committee agreed unanimously to this proposal.

Mr. Green (U. S.) proposed that Item 10 (Contingencies) be reduced to \$1,000. This was agreed to unanimously.

Under Item 6 (Other Contractual Services), the following reductions were proposed: Research Bulletin from \$6,500 to \$4,000; the publishing of the Environmental Survey from \$8,000 to \$6,000; Other Services from \$6,000 to \$5,500; and that \$5,000 be added to the Item to cover the remainder of the cost of publishing the Environmental Symposium.

The Committee then recommends that the Commission give consideration at the 1965 Annual Meeting to authorizing appropriations from member states to cover expenditures for 1965/66 as detailed in Appendix II.

4. Time and place of 1965 Meeting (F&A Agenda Item 13). There being no invitations, it was agreed that the 15th Annual Meeting of the Commission should be held in Halifax, Canada, on 7 June 1965 and following days.

5. Salary structure. The Executive Secretary read the draft of a recommendation requested by the Committee at its Second Meeting. Following discussion the Committee

recommends

that the salary structure and classification effective for employees of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada be used as a guide for the Commission to establish salaries for the staff of the Commission's Secretariat and that position classifications be established based on comparable written job descriptions. These suggested classifications might be made by an appropriate board of the Civil Service Commission of Canada.

6. Publications (F&A Agenda Item 11). The Committee was asked to consider a proposal from the Executive Secretary to reimburse FAO in Rome for meeting rooms, secretarial help, public address operators, overtime of attendants, watchmen and elevator operators during the Environmental Symposium, January 27- February 1, in the form of a gift of copies of the ICNAF Selectivity Report and Marking Report. The Committee agreed to the proposal and

recommends

that 200 copies each of the Selectivity Report and Marking Report be sent to FAO with the compliments of the Commission in return for considerations during the ICNAF Environmental Symposium.

The Committee also agreed that the Executive Secretary should look into the possibilities of selling bulk lots of ICNAF publications to book publishers and distributors.

7. Procedures for Effecting Commission Proposals (Plenary Agenda Item 15). The Committee took note for information of a suggestion from the U. S. delegation on this subject that would require amendment of some paragraphs of Article VIII of the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (Appendix III and IV) and

recommends

that, since the governments of member countries had not yet seen or studied the suggestion, the Executive Secretary be asked to circulate it, through Depositary Government, to the Governments of member countries for consideration as a possible item for the agenda of the 15th Annual Meeting.

8. Election of Chairman. The Chairman informed the Committee that he would not be standing for re-election. He thanked the members for their support during his years as Chairman of Finance and Administration and wished them every success in their important work for the future.

Captain Almeida expressed his regret, personally and on behalf of the members, at the retirement of Dr. MacKichan from the office of Chairman of F&A after so many years of valuable service to the Commission.

The Committee accepted unanimously the election of Mr. R. W. Green (USA) as the new Chairman of Finance and Administration for 1964/65. Mr. Green expressed his appreciation for the honour accorded to him and to his country.

9. The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a. m.



(a) 1964/65 Expenditures to be covered by appropriations of \$74,000 from Contracting Governments

1. Personal Services	
(a) Salaries	\$ 41,300
(b) Superannuation	1,200
(c) Additional help	1,200
(d) Medical plan	300
2. Travel	3,500
3. Transportation	500
4. Communications	2,000
5. Other Contractual Services	16,500
6. Supplies & Materials	3,000
7. Equipment	1,500
8. Annual Meeting	3,000
	<hr/>
	\$74,000

Detailed statement of expected expenditure 1964/65

re item 1 (a)

Exec. Sec.	\$ 16,000
Statistician	8,500
Editorial Asst.	5,040
Secretary	4,560
Clerk-Steno.	3,900
Clerk-Typist	3,300
	<hr/>
	\$ 41,300

re item 2

Two overseas travel (CWP on Statistics)	\$ 2,000
Possible overseas travel (re Seal and R&S meetings)	1,500
	<hr/>
	\$ 3,500

re item 5

Ann. Proc.	\$ 1,000
Stat. Bull.	4,000
Sampling Yearbook	500
Res. Bull.	5,000
Redbook	800
Other services	5,200
	<hr/>
	\$16,500

re item 8

Estimated cost of Annual Meeting in Halifax-Dartmouth area

(b) 1964/65 Expenditures to be covered by Advance of \$7,500 from Working Capital Fund

Publishing of Environmental Symposium (part payment) \$7,500



1965/66 Expenditures to be covered by Appropriations of \$91,000 from
Contracting Governments

1. Personal Services	
(a) Salaries	\$41,300
(b) Superannuation	1,200
(c) Additional help	1,200
(d) Medical	300
2. Travel	4,000
3. Transportation	500
4. Communications	2,500
5. Other Contractual Services	27,500
6. Supplies & Materials	3,500
7. Equipment	2,000
8. Annual Meeting	6,000
9. Contingencies	<u>1,000</u>
	\$91,000

Detailed statement of expected expenditures 1965/66

re item 5

Env. Symposium	\$ 5,000	
Annual Proceedings	1,000	
Stat. Bull.	4,500	
Sampling Yearbook	500	
Res. Bull.	4,000	
Env. Survey (S.P. #7)	6,000	
Redbook	1,000	
Other services	5,500	<u>\$27,500</u>

re item 9

Estimated cost of Annual Meeting outside North America



Consideration of Procedures for Bringing into Effect Proposals adopted by the
Commission (Plenary Agenda Item 15)

The procedure followed in paragraphs 7 and 8 of Article VIII of the Convention has caused considerable delays in some instances in bringing into effect the Commission's regulatory proposals. Delays by the various Members in accepting proposals seem to stem from the routine manner of processing paperwork, since substantive questions related to the proposals have, in most instances, not been raised.

There are precedents for less time-consuming procedures for bringing regulations into force under international fisheries conventions, however. For example, the International Whaling Convention and the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Convention provide that regulations come into force after a fixed period of time, except that Members may object during this time and are then not bound by the regulation. All Parties to ICNAF are parties to the Whaling Convention and/or signatories to the Northeast Atlantic Convention, except Italy.

We suggest that this speedier procedure used in the Northeast and Whaling Conventions be considered for use in ICNAF. For this purpose we have prepared a draft proposal along the lines of these two conventions and urge that consideration be given to it at this meeting.

The draft is based on the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Convention and the International Whaling Convention, adapted to provide for the Panel set-up of ICNAF, and adapted to conform to ICNAF language and provisions.

Paragraph 7 (a) would provide that proposals of the Commission become effective after a fixed period, except as otherwise provided. It is suggested that the period be six months rather than ninety days as provided by the Northeast Atlantic and Whaling Conventions in order to give Contracting Governments more time to consider proposals and to lodge objection if desired, and in order that proposals become effective in mid-winter when the fisheries are least intensive rather than in the fall when the season is still under way.

Paragraph 7 (b) would provide that any Contracting Government participating in the Panel or Panels for the subarea or subareas to which a proposal applies may object during the fixed period, thereby retaining the present ICNAF concept that Governments participating in the Panel for the subarea to which a proposal applies are the ones primarily concerned with approval or disapproval of a proposal. It would further provide that any Contracting Government may object during the fixed period to any proposal made under paragraph 5 which would apply to the entire ICNAF area. This language would take into account the proposed amendment on joint enforcement made in 1963. If any objections were made, there would be a further period of sixty days, or thirty days after receiving notice of an objection, whichever is later, during which other Governments could object. The Northeast Atlantic Convention has a similar provision; the Whaling Convention provides for a further ninety days or thirty days from notice. The proposal would then become effective for all Governments which had not objected during the extended period, thereby retaining the ICNAF concept that all Governments are bound by regulations while only Panel members pass on regulations. However, if a majority of Governments participating in a Panel, or a majority of all Governments in the case of paragraph 5 proposals, object, then all Governments would be relieved of any obligation to enforce the regulations unless any Governments agreed among themselves to give effect to them. This is based on the provision of the Northeast Atlantic Convention whereby if

three or more Governments object all Governments are relieved of their obligation to give effect to a proposal unless they agree otherwise among themselves. It is modified to provide that a majority of Governments affected must object because of the varying Panel memberships. There is no analagous provision in the Whaling Convention; all non-objecting Governments are under obligation to give effect to a proposal even if a majority should object.

Paragraph 7 (c) would provide that any Contracting Government which has objected may withdraw the objection at any time. If the proposal is already in effect that Government would give effect to it immediately on withdrawing objection; no lead time is necessary since the Government would know when it was going to withdraw an objection and could plan to give effect to the proposal at that time. If the proposal was not yet in effect at the time an objection is withdrawn, it would be effective for that Government at the same time as for all others under the terms of the Article. There are similar provisions in both the Whaling and Northeast Atlantic Conventions.

Paragraph 8 would require the Depositary Government to notify all Governments upon receipt of objection or withdrawal of objection and of the entry into force of any proposal, a standard requirement.



U. S. proposal for changes to Article VIII, para. 7 & 8 of the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries regarding procedures for bringing into effect proposals adopted by the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (1964 ICNAF Plenary Agenda Item 15 refers).

"7. (a) Each proposal made by the Commission under paragraphs 1 or 5 of this Article shall become effective for all Contracting Governments six months after the date on the notification from the Depositary Government transmitting the proposal to the Contracting Governments, except as otherwise provided herein.

" (b) If any Contracting Government participating in the Panel or Panels for the subarea or subareas to which a proposal applies, or any Contracting Government in the case of a proposal made under paragraph 5 above, presents to the Depositary Government objection to any proposal within six months of the date on the notification of the proposal by the Depositary Government, the proposal shall not become effective for any Government for an additional sixty days. Thereupon any other Contracting Government participating in the Panel or Panels concerned, or any other Contracting Government in the case of a proposal made under paragraph 5 above, may similarly object prior to the expiration of the additional sixty-day period, or within thirty days after receiving notice of an objection by another Contracting Government made within such additional sixty days whichever date shall be the later. The proposal shall become effective for all Contracting Governments except those Governments which have presented objections, at the end of the extended period or periods for objecting. If, however, objections have been presented by a majority of Contracting Governments participating in the Panel or Panels concerned, or by a majority of all Contracting Governments in the case of a proposal made under paragraph 5, the proposal shall not become effective unless any or all of the Contracting Governments nevertheless agree as among themselves to give effect to it on an agreed date.

" (c) Any Contracting Government which has objected to a proposal may at any time withdraw that objection and the proposal shall become effective with respect to such government, immediately if the proposal is already in effect, or at such time as it becomes effective under the terms of this Article.

"8. The Depositary Government shall notify each Contracting Government immediately upon receipt of each objection and of each withdrawal of objection, and of the entry into force of any proposal."

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1964Report of Final Plenary SessionSaturday, 6 June, 10:00 a.m.

1. The Session was opened by the Chairman, Mr. K. Sunnanaa (Norway), with the Commissioners and Advisers from the 13 member countries and Observers from Japan and FAO present.
2. The Chairman announced that Plenary Agenda Items 1, "Opening", 2 "Agenda", 3 "Publicity", 4 "Panel membership", 14 "Status of Commission recommendations", 16 "Harp and hood seals" and 17 "Conservation requirements" had been completed in the Second meeting of the Plenary (Proceedings No. 13).
3. The Report of the Third Plenary Session (Proceedings No. 17) was read by the Executive Secretary and accepted unanimously by the meeting, thus completing Plenary Items 18 "Adequacy of conservation measures" and 25 "Reports of Panels 1, 2, 3 and 4".
4. Under Plenary Item 12 "Mesh regulations", the Chairman asked the Plenary to consider the Report on the Joint Meeting of Panels (Proceedings No. 16) which recommended to Plenary for acceptance the proposed changes in mesh regulations set out in Appendix I to the Report of the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations (Proceedings No. 15). The Report on the Joint Meeting of Panels (Proceedings No. 16) was accepted unanimously.
5. The Chairman asked Mr. Gardner (UK) to present the Report of the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations (Proceedings No. 15) which contained recommendations under Plenary Items 10 "Infringements", 11 "Topside Cod-end Protection", 12 "Mesh regulations" and 13 "Joint Enforcement". Each agenda item was presented by Mr. Gardner and considered by the Plenary separately. Under Plenary Item 10 "Infringements", recommendations for clarification of the requirements on the Annual Returns form (Section 3 of Appendix II to Proceedings No. 15) were accepted. Under Plenary Item 11 "Topside codend protection", recommendations for future use of materials in the construction of nets that are sufficiently strong not to require additional protection or methods of hoisting the net on board that obviate this need were accepted. Under Plenary Item 12 "Mesh regulations", recommendations to adopt proposed mesh-size requirements for materials other than manila and for the different methods of measurement (Table 1 in Section 2 of Appendix II to Proceedings No. 15) after adoption of the revised mesh regulation (Appendix I to Proceedings No. 15) were accepted. Under Plenary Item 13 "Joint enforcement", recommendations to obtain information on national procedures and the views of each member country as to the form of international inspection or joint enforcement which should ultimately be taken and to arrange for exchange of visits of enforcement officers in order to provide practical knowledge of the problem before the 1965 meeting, were accepted.
6. Under Plenary Item 23 "Research and Statistics", the Chairman requested consideration of Addendum 2 to the Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (Proceedings No. 1). Mr. Beverton (UK), Chairman of the Committee, then presented recommendations regarding (a) publications (b) Atlantic tuna organization (c) ICES Liaison Committee Reports (d) arrangements for 1965 R&S meetings (e) representatives on S&P subcommittee for 1964/65 and (f) observers at other international meetings. The Report of the

Standing Committee on Research and Statistics with Addenda 1 & 2 (Proceedings No. 1) was accepted. The Chairman of the Commission expressed sincere appreciation on behalf of the Commission and himself for the excellent efforts of Mr. Beverton while Chairman of the Committee. Dr. Graham (USA) spoke on behalf of the Commission scientists of the brilliant record of Mr. Beverton as a scientist and administrator. He cited Mr. Beverton's accomplishments in guiding the ICNAF Assessment Report to completion, in chairing the successful ICNAF Tagging Symposium and in providing direction for an attack on the problem of the adequacy of present ICNAF conservation measures. Mr. Beverton thanked the Chairman of the Commission and Dr. Graham for their kind words. The Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics was accepted subject to consideration of the recommendations from the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration regarding items in the Report involving expenditures.

7. The Chairman of the Commission asked Dr. MacKichan to present the Report of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Proceedings No. 10, 12 and 18). All recommendations under Plenary Items 5 "Administration and Finance 1963/64", 6 "Audit 1962/63", 7 "Estimates 1964/65", 8 "Estimates 1965/66", 9 "Commission headquarters", 15 "Effecting Commission proposals", 22 "1965 Annual Meeting" and 24 "Finance and Administration" were accepted unanimously.

8. Under Plenary Item 20 "Reports of ICNAF Observers", Mr. McKernan (USA) as ICNAF observer to the 1963 meeting of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission referred to his report presented as Meeting Document 110; Mr. Beverton (UK) as ICNAF observer to the 1963 meeting of ICES referred to his report presented as Meeting Document 82; Mr. Mocklinghoff (Federal Republic of Germany) as ICNAF observer to the 2nd Annual Meeting of the NEAFC, May, 1964 referred to Meeting Document 100. All reports were accepted by the Plenary with thanks.

9. Under Plenary Item 21 "ICNAF Observers to other meetings", the Plenary agreed that the Chairman of the Commission and the Executive Secretary should be empowered to appoint ICNAF observers when necessary. The Chairman recognized the observer from FAO, Mr. Roy I. Jackson, Chief of the Fisheries Division, who thanked the Commission for the invitation and reviewed pertinent FAO plans (Meeting Document 111).

The Observer from Japan, Mr. Y. Uchimura, First Secretary, Japanese Embassy, London, expressed the gratitude of his colleagues and his government for the opportunity of attending the meeting and reviewed Japanese fisheries developments in the Northwest Atlantic (Meeting Document 112).

10. Under Plenary Item 26 "Other business", Mr. Briggs, Head of Delegation for U. S. A., moved that the best thanks of the Commission be extended to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, to Dr. Meseck and his colleagues of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Forestry, to Dr. von Brandt of the Federal Institute for Fisheries Research and to the officials of the City of Hamburg for their generosity, hospitality and excellent meeting facilities and arrangements. Mr. Mocklinghoff (Federal Republic of Germany) expressed the pleasure of his Government and its workers for the opportunity to be host to the 14th Annual Meeting of ICNAF and to contribute to the furtherance of the Commission's objectives.

11. There being no other business, the 14th Annual Meeting of the Commission was adjourned by the Chairman at 11:30 a.m.