



PROCEEDINGS

of the

15TH ANNUAL MEETING

of the

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

1965

CONTENTS

- Proceedings No. 1 - Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, with Appendices (published as Redbook 1965, Part I, and not included hereunder)
- Proceedings No. 2 - Report of Meeting of Panel 2, with Appendix
- Proceedings No. 3 - Report of Meeting of Panel 1, with Appendix
- Proceedings No. 4 - Report of Meeting of Panel 4, with Appendix
- Proceedings No. 5 - Report of Meeting of Panel 3, with Appendix
- Proceedings No. 6 - Report of Meeting of Panel 5, with Appendix
- Proceedings No. 7 - Report of Opening Meeting
- Proceedings No. 8 - Report of First Plenary Session
- Proceedings No. 9 - Report of First Meeting of Commissioners, with Annex
- Proceedings No. 10 - Report of Second Meeting of Commissioners
- Proceedings No. 11 - Report of First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration
- Proceedings No. 12 - Report of Second Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, with Appendices
- Proceedings No. 13 - Report of the ad hoc Committee on ICNAF Trawl Regulations, with Appendix
- Proceedings No. 14 - Report of Second Plenary Session
- Proceedings No. 15 - Report of Third Meeting of Commissioners
- Proceedings No. 16 - Report of Third Plenary Session
- Proceedings No. 17 - Report of Third Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration
- Proceedings No. 18 - Report of Fourth Meeting of Commissioners, with Annex
- Proceedings No. 19 - Report of Joint Meeting of Panels 1-4
- Proceedings No. 20 - Report of Fourth Plenary Session



Serial No. 1553
(B. Proc. e. 65)

Proceedings No. 2

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965

Report of Meeting of Panel 2

Tuesday, 8 June, 11:00 a.m.

1. In the absence of Mr Gardner (UK), the meeting was opened by the Commission Chairman, Mr K. Sunnanaa (Norway), with all member countries represented. Mr A. J. Aglen (UK) was elected Chairman of the meeting.
2. Rapporteur. Dr J. L. Hart (Canada) was elected Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda as circulated in advance was approved without change.
4. Panel members. It was noted that all member countries were represented. No changes in panel membership were proposed.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr A. S. Bogdanov (USSR) presented the report of the meeting of Scientific Advisers which referred to the "Review of status of fisheries and research carried out in Subarea 2 in 1964" (Res. Doc. 78). He outlined the more important points. This review had been adopted by the Panel Advisers whose report was approved by the Panel. It was agreed that the Advisers' report be appended to the report of the Panel Meeting.
6. Review of Conservation Measures. There were no recommendations on conservation measures and requirements from the Scientific Advisers to the Panel.

The Chairman called attention to the bearing on conservation in the subarea of Commissioners' Document No. 12 "Review of possible conservation actions for the ICNAF area" by W. Templeman and J. Gulland.

The Panel were informed that there are no obvious deficiencies in data for making population assessments but detailed study may reveal the need for more refined data on catches, fishing effort, discards, and mesh sizes in actual use.
7. Future Research. There were no proposals for new research. It is understood that research as reviewed will continue at least at present levels.
8. Other business. No further business was brought up.
9. Election of Chairman. Mr A. J. Aglen (UK) was unanimously elected Chairman for the ensuing two years.
10. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a. m.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965

Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 2

Saturday, 5 June, 11:00 a. m.

1. The Chairman, Dr Bogdanov (USSR), presided at the meeting and noted that representatives were present from all member countries with the exception of France. The participants were as follows: A.M. Fleming, F. D. McCracken (Canada); S. Horsted (Denmark); A. Meyer (Federal Republic of Germany); J. Jonsson (Iceland); F. Chrzan (Poland); R. Monteiro (Portugal); O. Rodriguez Martin (Spain); H. A. Cole, B. B. Parrish, J. Gulland (UK); H. W. Graham (USA); S. Studenetsky, G. Semin (USSR) and L. K. Boerema (FAO).
2. The Chairman proposed the following agenda, to which the group agreed:
 - (1) Election of Rapporteur
 - (2) Review of status of the fisheries in Subarea 2 and research carried out in 1964
 - (3) Future research
 - (4) Election of Chairman
 - (5) Other Business
3. Mr A. W. May (Canada) was elected Rapporteur.
4. The Chairman made reference to his review of the status of the fisheries and research carried out in the subarea in 1964 (Res. Doc. 78). This document was read by Mr Semin, the Soviet interpreter, and adopted by the group.
5. There were no further comments on research programs as submitted by the member countries.
6. Dr Bogdanov was re-elected Chairman of the Scientific Advisers to Panel 2.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965Report of Meeting of Panel 1Tuesday, 8 June, 2:30 p. m.

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Mr Mocklinghoff (Germany). Representatives from all countries members of Panel 1 were present.
2. Rapporteur. Mr Gulland (UK) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda was adopted.
4. Panel Memberships. There was no change in panel membership.
5. Meeting of Scientific Advisers. The report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers was presented by Dr Hansen (Denmark). The report, attached as Appendix I, was approved, and the Chairman congratulated Dr Hansen and his colleagues on their work.
6. Review of Conservation Measures. Mr Lassen (Denmark) introduced Comm. Doc. 17, concerned with the Danish proposal for closing Store Hellefiske Bank to trawling. The Chairman referred to the report of the Scientific Advisers, and in particular to the desirability expressed there for further examination of the advisability of protection for small cod. The Panel accordingly

recommended

that the Research and Statistics Committee be requested to examine the desirability of further protection for small cod at West Greenland, and in particular in this connection the effects of a closure of Store Hellefiske Bank

and further noting that this examination would probably require a meeting of a small working group of experts,

recommends

that facilities be provided, if required, for a meeting of such an expert working group.

The Chairman noted that other items concerned with further conservation measures and problems had been referred to meetings of Commissioners, and of the ad hoc Committee, and it was agreed that further decision at the Panel 1 Meeting was not necessary.
7. Future Research Requirements. Mr Aglen (UK) welcomed the proposals from the Assessment Subcommittee, referred to in the report of the Scientific Advisers for research into the effects of the salmon fishery at West Greenland.
8. Date and Place of Next Meeting. The next meeting of Panel 1 will be held during the 16th Annual Meeting of ICNAF.
9. Other Business. There was no other business.
10. Panel Report. It was agreed that the Chairman and Rapporteur should prepare the Panel report.

(over)

11. Election of Chairman. Dr Cole (UK) was unanimously elected Chairman for the coming two years.
12. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 1Saturday, 5 June, 9:00 a. m.

1. The Chairman, Dr P. M. Hansen (Denmark), opened the meeting, and Dr Erik Poulsen (Denmark) was appointed Rapporteur. Representatives from all Panel 1 member countries (except France) and observers from Japan and FAO were present.

2. The Chairman read the "Summary of Research and Status of Fisheries in Subarea 1, 1964" (Res. Doc. No. 79). He congratulated the contributors for their comprehensive and interesting reports, and stressed that the "Status of Fisheries" shall refer only to commercial fisheries and deal separately with the individual species.

Several members commented on the report and provided small amendments.

3. The Chairman read the Danish proposal concerning prohibition of trawl fishery on Store Hellefiske Bank (Comm. Doc. No. 17). He stressed the importance of the maintenance of the cod stock to the Greenlanders whose sole means of existence are the fisheries. He further pointed out the benefits to be gained for all cod fisheries in Greenland waters through a protection of the large stock of smaller cod growing up on Store Hellefiske Bank and later dispersing to other more southern regions.

After remarks by Dr Jonsson (Iceland), Dr Meyer (Germany), Mr Gulland (UK), Mr Bratberg (Norway), Dr Dickie (Canada), Mr Parrish (UK), Dr Rodriguez Martin (Spain), and Dr Cole (UK), the Scientific Advisers to Panel 1

recommended

that it is desirable to examine further the advisability of additional protection for young cod at West Greenland and approved a suggestion from Denmark that in this connection the effects of closure of Store Hellefiske Bank to trawling should be particularly studied.

4. Regarding interchange between the cod stocks of Greenland and Iceland, the Chairman referred to the Report of the ad hoc Committee on Tagging (Proc. No. 1, App. VI).

5. Referring to recaptures of tagged salmon off Greenland, the Chairman noted that the problem had been considered in a joint meeting of the ad hoc Committee on Tagging and the Subcommittee on Assessment, and that the findings of this joint meeting are found in the Report of the Subcommittee on Assessment (Proc. No. 1, App. II).

6. Future work. The Chairman referred to the research programs submitted by the member countries and asked for possible amendments. No amendments were suggested.

7. Dr Paul Hansen was re-appointed Chairman of the Group of Advisers for the ensuing year.

8. As there was no other business, the meeting adjourned at 10:40 a. m.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965

Report of Meeting of Panel 4

Wednesday, 9 June, 9:30 a.m.

1. The meeting was opened by Captain Tavares de Almeida (Portugal), Chairman of the Panel.
2. Rapporteur. Dr J. L. Hart (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda as circulated in advance was adopted without change.
4. Panel members. All member countries were represented. No changes in Panel membership were proposed.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr J. L. Hart presented the report on the Meeting of Scientific Advisers and also Research Document 71, "Status of Fisheries and Research carried out in Subarea 4". The document was accepted by the Panel and it was decided that the Advisers' report be appended to the report on the Panel meeting.
6. Review of Conservation Measures. On the request of Mr W. MacKenzie (Canada), Dr F. D. McCracken (Canada) commented on the Canadian proposal concerning amendment of the trawl regulation in Subarea 4. (Comm. Doc. No. 8). He pointed out (1) that the amendment applied to regulations proposed in 1961 and not yet in effect, and (2) that for exemption purposes, Canadian interpretation of the wording is that flounders be considered collectively and that there should be no 10% exemption for each of the five flounder species individually. He pointed out that the proposal for an annual exemption was for administrative convenience and that significant changes in fishing practices in Subarea 4 are not anticipated. The Chairman of the Assessment Subcommittee (Mr Gulland) pointed out that from the point of view of conservation the important thing is the number of small individuals of regulated species caught. At present the small meshed fisheries take only a small proportion of the total catch of regulated species. The proportion of cod and haddock in the small meshed catch is low. Of the cod and haddock taken only a few are small. The effect on the total cod and haddock catches (except possibly in fishing for silver hake) is therefore very small and presumably does not need to be assessed in detail. However, the fishery needs to be kept in review. The most important data for study are the weight and size composition of the catches and the quantity and sizes of fish discarded.

After some discussion it was moved by Mr MacKenzie (Canada), seconded by Mr T. A. Fulham (US) and agreed that the Panel approve the Canadian proposal. The Panel

recommended

that the Canadian proposal be adopted on the understanding that annual reports be submitted to the Commission on the operation of the annual exemption and that these reports include as far as can be provided size composition of regulated species in the catches of exempted vessels.

7. Future Research. No special needs for future work were noted.
8. Next Meeting. The next meeting of the Panel will be at the time of the 1966 Annual Meeting of the Commission.

9. Other Business. No other business was noted.
10. Panel Report. It was agreed that the Chairman and Rapporteur prepare the Panel Report.
11. Election of Chairman. Mr J. Rougé (France) was elected Panel Chairman for the next two years.
12. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 10:40 a. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 4Saturday, 5 June, 3:00 p.m.

1. Dr J. L. Hart (Canada) acted as Chairman in the absence of Mr Letaconnoux (France) who was unable to be present. Representatives from Canada, Italy, Portugal, Spain, USSR and USA were present.
2. Mr A. W. May (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The advisers agreed to the Chairman's proposal that the agenda as distributed for the Panel meeting be followed.
4. The Chairman presented his report on status of the fisheries and research carried out in Subarea 4 during 1964 (Res. Doc. 71). The report was discussed and several amendments made, following which it was adopted for presentation to the Panel.
5. The Canadian proposal concerning exemptions in Subarea 4 was discussed (1964 Proc. 3 and Proc. 3, App. I; 1965 Comm. Doc. 8 and 16, App. I, page 2). Dr McCracken (Canada) summarized the results reported in Res. Doc. 45, which showed that the amount of regulated groundfish taken by vessels fishing for redfish was small in relation to total catch of those species in the subarea. It was considered that little change in fishing practices would result if an annual, rather than a trip, exemption were allowed. Advisers concluded that the probable low catches of regulated species by redfish fishing vessels would not materially reduce the desired effect (i. e. conservation) of mesh regulation, and were in agreement with the proposal provided that reports on quantities and sizes of species caught be given annually.
6. Dr Bogdanov (USSR) reported on the USSR silver hake fishery in Subarea 4. He noted that the quantity landed in 1964 was less than in 1963. This was mainly due to unfavourable environmental conditions affecting silver hake distribution. There was no decline in catch per unit effort but concentrations were not stable over a given area for long periods of time. Effort was accordingly diverted to other subareas. Silver hake age and size compositions were similar to those of 1963. There is currently no indication of stock decline.
7. Mr Gulland (UK) referred to the report of the Assessment Subcommittee (Proc. 1, App. II) concerning items of relevance to Subarea 4. He reported that there was no reason to alter the 1963 conclusions (1964 Redbook, Pt. 1, Sec. 3, App. VII) for Subarea 4 fisheries.
8. The Chairman called attention to important information contained in Res. Doc. 52 and noted that no manila codends were recorded as now used in Subarea 4.
9. The Chairman drew attention to the important material contained in Comm. Doc. 12. Consideration of this document was left for the Commissioners' meetings.
10. The Chairman pointed out that research plans for 1965 by national group had been circulated some time ago and wished comments and recommendations to the earlier report. Canada noted that its scallop program was temporarily indefinite because of loss of staff. The US drew attention to the important silver hake otolith exchange, which is being continued under US organization. The USA

(over)

also made reference to the recommendation for a plan for an environmental survey of Georges Bank in relation to recruitment of fish stocks (1965 Proc. 1, App. IV) in its possible relation to research in Div. 4X. Research plans of other member countries remain unchanged.

11. Discussion of future research needs centred on requirements for research in connection with the West Greenland salmon fishery. The Advisers took note of the Assessment Subcommittee's recommendations (1965 Proc. 1, App. II) as they applied to home waters in Subarea 4. Information required would necessitate tagging smolts in home waters and would include catch statistics on both grilse and large salmon, data on length and age compositions, and estimates of abundance. This would complement research in Subarea 1.
12. It was agreed that the next meeting of Scientific Advisers to the Panel should be held on the Saturday before the next Annual Meeting.
13. Dr J. L. Hart (Canada) was elected Chairman for the following year.
14. It was agreed that the Chairman and Rapporteur should prepare the report in consultation with other advisers as necessary.
15. The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965Report of Meeting of Panel 3Tuesday, 8 June, 5:00 p. m.

1. The meeting was opened by Mr Sunnanaa (Norway) due to the absence of Mr V. M. Kamentsev (USSR), Chairman of Panel 3. All members of Panel 3 were noted present.

Mr W. MacKenzie (Canada) was elected Chairman of the meeting.

2. Rapporteur. Mr Hennemuth (USA) was chosen as Rapporteur.

3. Agenda. The agenda to Panel 3 was adopted without change.

4. Panel Members. Panel membership was reviewed and no changes were noted.

5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr Graham (USA), Chairman of Advisers to Panel 3, reviewed the Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 3 (Proc. 5, Appendix I). The Report was accepted without change.

Dr Graham next reviewed the Report on the Status of the Fisheries and Researches in Subarea 3 during 1964 (Res. Doc. 76). It was agreed not to read the Report, but to have Dr Graham note the substance thereof.

Dr Templeman (Canada), in reference to Sec. A, Item 4 (Halibut) of Res. Doc. 76, enquired about the species of halibut reported for Polish landings (1,400 tons). Dr Chrzan (Poland) advised they were Greenland or "black" halibut (*Reinhardtius hippoglossoides*). Dr Templeman proposed the Panel notify the Secretariat of the species designation, for correct designation in statistical reporting, and the Panel agreed.

Dr Graham, after reviewing the Report, commented on certain aspects of the preparation of such reports which he felt were inadequate. He proposed that statistics of subarea landings be presented in tabular form by species, countries and years, together with advice as to causes and importance of changes. He added that the reports should point up problems in subarea fisheries, and advise on approaches to the solution of them. Furthermore, he felt the Commissioners preferred a more analytical report indicating trends of fisheries and their relation to regulation and management.

A discussion among Panel Commissioners revealed mixed feelings on the matter, but several objections to tabular presentation were noted. While it was felt that the Panel Commissioners desired a concise report on major problems, and advice as to required action, it was also felt that this function was perhaps too broad and demanding of the Chairman of Advisers and was a duplication of efforts of the R&S Committee in this regard. It was suggested that the Advisers could call the attention of the Panel to those parts of the R&S reports which were of particular importance.

Upon the suggestion of Dr Cole (UK), the Panel

agreed

that Dr Graham should prepare next year's report along the lines he proposed, and the Panel could then review the results and perhaps resolve the issue.

(over)

6. Review of Conservation Measures. Dr Graham referred to the Report of Scientific Advisers regarding conservation measures and requirements and had nothing to add thereto.

Dr McCracken (Canada) commented on the Canadian proposal for a 10% annual exemption in Subarea 3, Div. NOP, as stated in Comm. Doc. 8, Item 2. He pointed out the proposal involved three main points, viz.

- (a) 10% exemption for redfish fisheries on an annual basis;
- (b) 5,000-pound trip exemption (in conjunction with 10% trip exemption);
and
- (c) changes in the wording of last year's proposal so as to define without ambiguity the species concerned (cf. Comm. Doc. 8 on definition of "groundfish").

Mr Aglen (UK) noted that the ambiguity of the word "groundfish" in regulation stems from reference to definitions in Statistical Bulletin groupings, which change from time to time. Since this problem was also being considered by the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations, and also affects other panels and proposed mesh regulations, the proper course of action for decisions in this matter was in doubt.

The Panel, therefore,

agreed

to approve in principle the Canadian proposal for exemptions as stated in Comm. Doc. 8, subject to clarification of species definition by the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations.

7. Future Research. Dr Graham noted only one item for future research that was not covered in national reports. This was the necessity of collecting and reporting data on size composition of catch and amount of discard of regulated species in exempted vessel catches.

8. Next Meeting. Date and place of next meeting was left open pending solution of the problem referred to under Item 6.

9. Other Business. No other business was brought forward.

10. Panel Report. It was agreed that approval of the Panel report for the session of 8 June could be left to the Chairman and heads of delegations.

11. Election of Chairman. Dr Rodriguez Martin (Spain) was unanimously elected Chairman of Panel 3 for the next two years.

12. Adjournment. Adjournment was called at 1812 hours.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965

Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 3

Saturday, 5 June, 1:30 p. m.

1. The Chairman, Dr H. W. Graham (USA), presided, with representatives being present from the following Panel 3 member countries: Canada, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Spain, UK, USSR and USA. Representatives from Germany, Iceland and FAO attended also.
2. Mr A. M. Fleming (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The Chairman presented his report on the status of the fisheries and researches in Subarea 3 during 1964 (Res. Doc. 76). The following points were noted with special interest: (a) the 1964 total cod catch of 565,000 tons in Subarea 3 was the largest in the history of ICNAF; (b) the dominant year-classes recorded in the cod fisheries were the same in Subareas 1, 2 and 3. After discussion and minor revision, it was agreed that the Report was ready for presentation to Panel 3.
4. Because of the Canadian proposal to introduce further exemption provisions for regulated species taken in the non-regulated redbfish fishery in Div. 3NOP, the Chairman referred to Res. Doc. 44 and 58 containing Canadian studies related to the proposal and solicited discussion so that some conclusions on the scientific implications could be presented to the Panel. Although the matter must be referred to the Subcommittee on Assessment for consideration, it was generally felt that the Subcommittee would not be able to provide advice in the near future because of other pressing problems under study. It was noted that Canada is proposing the exemption provision because of an enforcement problem and that Canadian scientists were confident that, as a result of the annual exemption, the total quantity of regulated species taken would be no larger than under the trip exemption and would not adversely affect the general conservation effort.

It was, therefore, agreed to advise the Panel that there appeared to be no objection, on a scientific basis, to the Canadian proposal provided that appropriate data for assessment purposes were collected from the exempted fisheries, including annual reports for the Commission on amounts and sizes of the various species caught.
5. It was noted that research plans of various countries had been presented to the Commission prior to the meeting and no discussion was necessary.
6. The Advisers agreed that the next meeting should take place on the Saturday preceding the meeting of Panel 3 during the 16th Annual Meeting of the Commission.
7. Dr Graham (USA) was re-elected Chairman.
8. Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p. m.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965

Report of Meeting of Panel 5

Wednesday, 9 June, 8:00 a. m.

1. The Chairman, Mr W. C. MacKenzie (Canada), opened the meeting with all countries members of the Panel represented.
2. Rapporteur. Dr F. D. McCracken (Canada) agreed to act as Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda was adopted without change.
4. Panel Membership. No changes were reported.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. The Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel 5, Dr S. A. Studenetsky (USSR), reviewed his report on the status of fisheries and research in Subarea 5 during 1964 (Res. Doc. 80 Revised).

Dr Studenetsky also presented the Report of the Scientific Advisers to Panel 5. With a few minor revisions, this report was adopted and approved as an appendix to the report of the Panel Meeting.

During discussion, particular attention was drawn to Item 7 of the Panel Advisers' Report and the studies now being carried out by the USA on the effect of recent intensification of the haddock fishery of Georges Bank.

6. Review of Conservation Measures. There were no proposals for minimum mesh sizes applying to species other than those now regulated. However, the Panel agreed that the problem of conserving sea scallops be referred to the Assessment Subcommittee for study.

Comm. Doc. 12, "Review of possible conservation actions for the ICNAF Area", was considered briefly in relation to some fisheries in the subarea. The consensus was that the Assessment Subcommittee should consider various possibilities of regulation and not restrict its discussions solely to catch quotas.

7. Review of 10% Annual Exemption. Dr Graham reported briefly on the operation of the 10% annual exemption in Subarea 5 as applied to the US fleet (Res. Doc. 30). In 1964 the number of exempted vessels decreased as did the number of trips and the amount of haddock landed by these exempted vessels.

The ensuing discussion stressed that knowledge of the numbers and sizes of regulated species caught by small mesh nets, whether under an annual or a trip exemption, was important and the Panel requested that member countries provide an annual report of these data. The problems involved in obtaining such information were recognized. Member countries agreed, however, to provide such information in so far as possible and, as a minimum, to report the weight of each regulated species landed with small mesh nets.

8. Future Research. The panel approved a proposal that the US and USSR draw up plans for an environmental survey of the Georges Bank-Gulf of Maine area, to be presented to the Environmental Subcommittee of R&S at the 1966 meeting.

The US expressed the hope that other countries would take an interest in such a program and provide assistance in the form of vessels and personnel.

9. Next Meeting. It was agreed that the Panel and Scientific Advisers to the Panel should meet next at the 1966 Annual Meeting.

(over)

10. Other Business. No other business was proposed.
11. Panel Report. The Panel agreed to have the Chairman and Rapporteur prepare the report of the meeting and circulate it among delegates of member countries for approval.
12. Election of Chairman. Dr A. S. Bogdanov (USSR) was elected Chairman of the Panel for the two ensuing years.
13. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 9:30 a. m.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965

Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 5

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

1. The Chairman, Dr S. A. Studenetsky (USSR) presided over the meeting. Mr J. B. Skerry (USA) was elected Rapporteur. Participants were J. L. Hart, L. M. Dickie, W. Templeman, F. D. McCracken, A. May, A. M. Fleming, W. C. MacKenzie (Canada); A. Meyer (Germany); E. Bratberg (Norway); H. A. Cole, J. A. Gulland (UK); D. L. McKernan, H. W. Graham, R. Hennemuth, J. T. Gharrett, J. A. Poagay, B. E. Skud (USA); A. S. Bogdanov (USSR) and L. K. Boerema (FAO).
2. The Chairman presented his summary report of the status of the fisheries and research conducted in the subarea in 1964 distributed as Res. Doc. 80. A number of suggestions were made regarding changes in this document. 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 provision, the Advisers approved the report.
3. Silver Hake. The US, Canada and USSR have exchanged silver hake otoliths in an attempt to further ageing studies. It was suggested that an exchange of photographs of otoliths would better serve the purpose. The U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Woods Hole Laboratory, will continue to coordinate this exchange. Progress to date is reported in Res. Doc. 65.
4. Industrial Fish. The USSR advised that the large stern trawlers reduce only offal and fish undesirable for human consumption to fish meal.
5. Sea Scallops. Note was taken of the US and Canadian research carried out and discussed at a joint meeting in December, 1964, and reported in Res. Doc. 3. The US drew attention to Res. Doc. 48 which reports on the weight-length ratio of Georges Bank scallops. It was noted that the yield-per-recruit calculations for the Georges Bank scallop fishery suggest that yields could be increased by either advancing the age of captures or reducing the fishing effort. It was pointed out that a rough check on the difficulty of equating fishing mortality with fishing effort could be obtained by comparing the predicted effects with the actual course of yields and fishing activity in the past fishery and that scientists engaged in study of this fishery should compare the actual with theoretical positions. No recommendations for regulation were put forth.
6. Minimum Mesh Size. The US commented on mesh selection experiments conducted on silver hake and red hake using 71 and 73 mm mesh nylon nets. This work is reported in Res. Doc. 61. The results indicate that a mesh of this size cannot be recommended for those fisheries.
7. Haddock. Data is now available which indicates that the Georges Bank haddock stock is being exploited beyond the estimated sustained yield of 100 million pounds per year. This point was mentioned in relation to Comm. Doc. 12 which indicates that catch quotas might be considered by the Commission in conjunction with mesh regulations in fishery regulations. It was recommended that the matter of quota be referred to the Subcommittee on Assessment. No recommendations were made on conservation measures which might be taken.
8. Environmental Survey. The US and USSR will draw up plans for an environmental survey of the Georges Bank-Gulf of Maine area and will present them to the Environmental Subcommittee at the 1966 Meeting of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (Proc. 1, App. III).

(over)

9. Quotas. It was determined that all matters dealing with quotas should be referred to the Subcommittee on Assessment. In addition, when these quotas are discussed in the Subcommittee, it was determined that Scientific Advisers to Panel 5 be represented.
10. Time and Place of Next Meeting. It was agreed that this group would not need to meet before the next Annual Meeting of the Commission.
11. Election of Chairman. Dr S. A. Studenetsky (USSR) was re-elected Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel 5.
12. The Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p. m.



Serial No. 1562
(B, Proc. b. 65)

Proceedings No. 7

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965

Opening Meeting

Monday, 7 June, 10:10 a.m.

The Chairman, Mr. Klaus Sunnanaa, opened the meeting and welcomed the Commissioners, Advisers, Observers and Guests to the 15th Annual Meeting of the Commission in the Nova Scotian Hotel in Halifax, Nova Scotia. He welcomed especially the Honourable Hedard Robichaud, Minister of Fisheries for Canada; Dr. H. D. Smith, President of the Nova Scotia Research Foundation, representing the Government of the Province of Nova Scotia; His Worship Mayor Charles A. Vaughan, Mayor of the City of Halifax; and Dr. A. W. H. Needler, Deputy Minister of Fisheries for Canada.

The Chairman then invited the Honourable Hedard Robichaud to address the meeting. Mr. Robichaud spoke to the meeting as follows:

"It is a great honour and privilege for me to have this opportunity to welcome all members of the visiting delegations to Canada on the occasion of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. I had the pleasure of meeting many of you here in Halifax two years ago and I look forward to meeting the new delegates and visiting with all of you at an informal gathering this evening.

"The annual meeting of the Commission must be an occasion when, among other things, you review achievements, assess current programs and plan for the future. At this meeting you will look back on the results of fifteen years' co-ordinated research and international co-operation in the field of fisheries management. What has been accomplished during this period? The publications of the Commission show very clearly that a major contribution has been made by the scientists in that knowledge of the resources in the care of the Commission has been greatly augmented. Not only has the fund of knowledge related to the general biology of the species and the physical environment been increased but also valuable information has been acquired on how and why the stocks react as they do to such things as intensification of fishing operations. As a result it is possible to predict with some confidence what will happen to the fish and the fisheries under certain conditions which may prevail in the future. This in itself shows that significant progress is being made towards realization of the objectives of the Convention under which your Commission is established.

"In my view, the value of the new scientific knowledge that has resulted from the promotion and co-ordination of research programs under the Commission's auspices, is out of all proportion to the financial contributions made by each member government to support the Commission's activities.

"Progress, however, is being made in other directions as well - but perhaps at a slower rate. The ultimate objective of maintenance of a maximum sustained catch in the Convention Area implies rational management of the fishery resources of common interest and this requires regulation of fishing - not merely study of its effects. Obtaining agreement among our respective countries on what regulations are required and how these should be enforced could be expected to present certain difficulties because social and economic considerations differ from country to country and because the conclusions of fisheries science will always be surrounded with a degree of uncertainty. I am of the opinion that such difficulties will be overcome as mutual trust and understanding and commitment to the common objective are more firmly established. A significant forward step has been taken by the Commission this year with the exchange of enforcement officers on the vessels of certain member nations. There can be no doubt that such exchanges will do a great deal to develop mutual trust and respect with regard to the application of essential regulations in the complex international fisheries of the Convention Area.

(over)

"Although the Commission has established an enviable record in scientific endeavour and international co-operation it has not been so successful in convincing the respective Member Governments of the urgency associated with consideration and decision with respect to recommendations adopted by the Commission. For example, although the Commission unanimously adopted a recommendation to bring the conservation of harp and hood seals within the responsibilities of the Commission at the Annual Meeting in 1961 it has not yet been possible to obtain full ratification of the necessary protocol to the Convention. This matter is of particular concern to Canada and the other member nations whose fishermen participate in the seal fishery and I hope that the Commission soon will be in a position to give immediate consideration to this problem.

"I can assure you that the government and the fishing industry of Canada support the work of the Commission to the fullest extent. As I stated in my remarks to you at the opening of the thirteenth annual meeting, the fisheries of the rich banks off the east coast of Canada provided the basis for the earliest European settlement in the Atlantic region of this country. These fisheries have declined in relative importance in the regional economy but current plans for general industrial development in that area are associated very closely with increased utilization of the fishery resources.

"As you reflect on the contribution you have made to world fisheries during the last fifteen years, I think you will look on your record with justifiable pride but the number and complexity of the items on your agenda indicate that all the problems have not been solved and that there is still much important work to do. I wish you success in your deliberations and wish to express my confidence in your ability to find acceptable and effective measures which will ensure continuation of the orderly development of established and of new fisheries.

"I hope you will have an opportunity during your stay in Canada to visit other areas and obtain more intimate knowledge of our country and its people. I know the members of the Canadian Delegation will be glad to assist in any possible way to make your visit a pleasant one."

The Chairman thanked the Minister on behalf of the Commission and its Guests for his warm welcome, his good wishes, his great interest and concern for the work of the Commission. He then invited Dr. H. D. Smith to take the floor. Dr. Smith brought greetings and good wishes from the Premier and the Province of Nova Scotia. His Worship Mayor Vaughan, upon being invited to take the floor, brought greetings and good wishes from the City of Halifax, noting its centuries-long connection with the fisheries in the Northwest Atlantic Area.

The Chairman thanked all those present and, as there was no other business to be discussed, declared the meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965Report of First Plenary SessionMonday, 7 June, 11:30 a. m.

- Item 1. Opening. The First Plenary Session was called to order by the Chairman of the Commission, Mr K. Sunnanaa (Norway). Delegates from all member countries and Observers from FAO, NEAFC, ICES and Japan were present.
- Item 2. Agenda. The agenda was adopted as presented.
- Item 3. Publicity. The Executive Secretary pointed out that it had been the practice at past meetings to appoint a Committee on Publicity composed of the Chairman of the Commission and the Chairmen of the Standing Committees on Research and Statistics and on Finance and Administration. It was agreed that this Committee be appointed to control policy with regard to publicity.
- Items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11. 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 12, Infringements, 13, Topside Codend Protection, 15, Exemptions. The Chairman's proposal that an ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations be set up with Mr J. Aglen (UK) as Chairman to deal with these Items was adopted.
- Items 14, Uniform North Atlantic Minimum Mesh Requirements, 16, Joint Enforcement, 17, Status of Commission Proposals, 18, Procedures for Effecting Commission Proposals, 19, Review of Possible Conservation Actions, 24, Co-operation with Other International Organizations. These Items were referred to a meeting of Commissioners.
- Item 20. Conservation of Seals. The Executive Secretary made reference to Comm. Doc. 11 on the status of Commission proposals. He drew attention to the fact that the Federal Republic of Germany had deposited a letter of adherence. Dr Chrzan announced that he had received a telegram from his Government stating that notice of ratification had been sent to Depositary Government from Poland. Since Italy had not yet deposited her letter of ratification, the protocol was not yet in effect and no formal action regarding the establishment of a panel for harp and hood seals could be taken.
- Item 21. Conservation Requirements. This Item was deferred to a future meeting of the Plenary.
- Item 22. Fishing and Navigational Practices. The Chairman introduced this Item by referring to a letter written by Captain Almeida (Portugal) to the Commission in 1963 regarding fishing and navigational practices by the fishing vessels of member countries in the Convention Area. He also referred to the adoption at the 1964 Annual Meeting of the proposals of 17 January 1964 of the European Fisheries Conference Resolution on Fisheries Policing for the NEAFC member countries plus Canada, Italy and USA to meet and exchange views on

(over)

a possible new 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. The Chairman asked Mr Aglen (UK) to report on the subsequent meeting, that was called the Fisheries Policing Conference, and which was held in London 6-9 April 1965. Mr Aglen referred briefly to the interim report and reported that all delegations agreed on the need for a modern system of rules which would help to ensure that different methods could be used without difficulties. He indicated that a further meeting of the Conference would be held within the next year. The Chairman's suggestion that the Interim Report of the Conference be circulated as Comm. Doc. 22 was adopted. It was agreed that the Commission would support the objectives of the Conference and would look forward to the development of a modern code for the conduct of fishing operations and of related activities.

- Item 23. Reports of Commission Observers. This Item was deferred to a future meeting of the Plenary.
- Item 25. Report of Standing Committee on Research and Statistics. At the Chairman's request, Dr Templeman (Canada), Chairman of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, presented the Provisional Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (1965 Meeting Proceedings No. 1) with reports of the eight subcommittees as Appendices I-VIII. The Chairman, on behalf of the Commission delegates, thanked Dr Templeman and his Committee for their fine work and valuable report. It was agreed that the Report should be considered for approval by Plenary after the final meeting of the Committee was held.
- Items 26, Report of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, 27, Report of Panels 1-5, 29, Other Business, 30, Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman and 31, Adjournment. The Plenary agreed that these Items should be deferred to the next meeting of the Plenary.
- Item 28. Date and Place of Annual Meeting. The Chairman's proposal that this Item be amended to read "Date and Place of 1966 and 1967 Annual Meeting of Commission" was adopted. It was agreed that the Item should be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965Report of First Meeting of CommissionersMonday, 7 June, 2:30 p. m.

1. The Chairman, Mr Sunnanaa, opened the meeting. Representatives of all member countries were present. The meeting agreed that Advisers and Observers should be allowed to attend.

2. The Chairman noted that the meeting of Commissioners had before it for consideration Items 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 24 from the Plenary Agenda.

3. The Chairman asked the Executive Secretary to read the notes to Plenary Item 14 "Uniform Minimum Mesh Requirements for the Trawl Fisheries in the North Atlantic Area". The Chairman pointed out that there were a number of questions for discussion involved in the Item. There was the question of a similar minimum mesh regulation for the whole of the North Atlantic with accompanying advantages of ease of operation for European vessels and of ease of enforcement of trawl regulations. There was also the question of a standard mesh measuring device which would be simple and satisfy scientists, inspectors, the courts and the fishermen. Further, there was the question of the different selectivity of trawl nets of different materials.

Mr Aglen (UK) reviewed the situation in the North East Atlantic with regard to the questions posed by the Chairman. The complete text of Mr Aglen's review is included as an Annex to this Report. He agreed that it would be desirable to have the same mesh of net for the whole of the North Atlantic if it could be attained practicably. He also agreed that a standard mesh measuring device was a desirable objective and pointed out that NEAFC had revived the need for an acceptable standard mesh measuring gauge. He spoke of the difficulties regarding differentials in selectivity of various net materials.

The Executive Secretary reviewed the ICNAF trawl regulations which were in effect or which were pending entry into effect, with particular emphasis on mesh size, mesh measuring gauge and selectivity items.

The Chairman asked if the Commissioners considered it wise for the Commission to work toward a common minimum mesh size for the whole of the North Atlantic.

Mr MacKenzie (Canada) agreed that this objective might be desirable and that progress had indeed been made at the 1963 and 1964 Annual Meetings on some of the questions in the Item. He pointed out, however, that an extension of the legal mesh size from the Eastern North Atlantic to the Western North Atlantic would mean an increase in mesh size in the Western North Atlantic not based on a need for conservation of the stocks.

Mr Gulland (UK), in response to the suggestion that the scientists be asked to assess the effects of introducing uniform mesh size in the North Atlantic, pointed out that stocks and fishing vary greatly in different localities in the North Atlantic and that therefore the optimum mesh sizes for the various stocks differ. A uniform mesh would therefore imply the use of a larger than optimum mesh for some stocks, and a smaller than optimum for others, with a loss in catch for both. He pointed out that re-assessments could be carried out if required and that the more intensive fishing at present would indicate the need for a larger mesh size.

(over)

Mr Aglen (UK) asked whether new assessments were needed if, as already stated, such a change to uniform mesh size in the North Atlantic was impracticable for some member countries.

It was agreed to defer further discussion of this Item to a later meeting of the Commissioners.

4. The Chairman drew attention to Plenary Item 16, "Joint Enforcement System for ICNAF Trawl Regulations", and referred to the Fisheries Policing Conference held in London, 6-9 April 1965, which agreed that there was no objection, in principle, to a system of international supervision, as such, provided the need for it was shown and suitable arrangements could be made. The Chairman pointed out that, if an international inspection system as discussed by the Conference did not prove feasible, ICNAF should have its own system. He suggested that the information contained in Comm. Doc. 9 and 10 be sent to the Conference Secretary as additional information for the Conference.

Mr Aglen (UK) agreed that the Chairman's suggested action would be most helpful to the Conference. He pointed out that NEAFC, the Fisheries Policing Conference and ICNAF are all exploring the possibilities for international inspection. In view of the difficulties involved in taking joint enforcement to the point of court proceedings, NEAFC are considering a system which will only go to the point of reportings.

Mr MacKenzie (Canada) agreed with Mr Aglen and suggested that the views of member countries on national and joint enforcement in the Convention Area, as reported in Comm. Doc. 9 and 10 relating to Plenary Items 16(a) and 16(c), be summarized for study. The Chairman proposed that the Commission think about setting up an ad hoc Committee to carry out the work of summarizing the views in the two documents.

It was agreed that Canada, USA and USSR would present reports to the next meeting of the Commissioners on the recent exchange of national enforcement officers.

5. The Chairmen of Panels 5 and 4 agreed to the following changes in meeting time:

Panel 5	-	8:00 a.m.	Wednesday, 9 June
Panel 4	-	9:30 a.m.	Wednesday, 9 June

6. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Report on uniformity of minimum mesh regulations, methods of measuring meshes and differential selectivity of different materials in the North-East Atlantic

by Mr A. J. Aglen (UK)

In response to the Chairman's request, Mr Aglen reported on the situation in the North East Atlantic with regard to the questions posed by the Chairman.

1. Uniformity of minimum mesh regulations

In the NEAFC and its predecessor, the Permanent Commission, the desirability of securing uniform mesh regulations in areas fished by the same fishing vessels had frequently been stressed; this had obvious practical advantages both for the fishing vessels themselves and from the point of view of enforcement, particularly where inspection at sea was not possible. And in some measure the principle of uniformity had influenced the decision taken by the Commissions. For example, from 1st January 1964 the minimum mesh in the waters surrounding Iceland, previously 110 mm for manila trawls, had been 120 mm, the same as in the rest of the northern part of the Convention Area. Further, at the NEAFC meeting in Moscow in 1965, the Commission had agreed to recommend an increase in the minimum mesh in the waters surrounding the Faroes from 80 mm for manila trawls to 100 mm, to come into force on 1st January 1967. This increase had been recommended as a first step in bringing the minimum mesh in this area into line with the minimum in the rest of the Northern Region; and on the understanding that further increases would be made within a few years.

Mr Aglen went on to say that in apparent conflict with the principle of uniformity NEAFC had decided at its recent meeting to recommend that in the north eastern part of the Northern Region (east of the meridian of Greenwich) the minimum mesh should be raised to 130 mm for manila trawls as from 1 January 1967. This decision was taken in the light of a recent scientific assessment of the state of the cod and haddock stocks in the area and of evidence of declining yields. The case for a similar increase in the minimum mesh in the Northwestern part of the northern Region (Iceland, East Greenland) had not been developed and no proposal for this area had been put before the Commission. He thought it likely that in due course a proposal to raise the minimum mesh in the northwestern area to 130 mm for manila trawls would be put before NEAFC. Meanwhile, however, the position was that (assuming objection was not taken by Member Governments to the Commission's recommendations) from 1st January 1967 there would be three different minimum mesh regulations in the northern part of the Convention Area (130 mm, 120 mm and 100 mm for manila trawls) instead of two at present (120 mm and 80 mm). (In all these cases there is a 10 mm differential for trawls made of certain materials).

Mr Aglen suggested that the experience in the North East Atlantic illustrated that while the principle of uniformity might be generally accepted it was not always easy to secure its observance in practice. Indeed so long as regulations were based so far as practicable on scientific assessment of the state of the stocks and their need for conservation, it would in practice be difficult to secure uniformity of regulation unless the state of the fish stocks in the different parts of the area was broadly uniform and these stocks reacted in a uniform way to the fishing and natural mortality to which they were subjected. If it was difficult in practice to secure uniformity in the North East Atlantic, it might be even more difficult to do so across the North Atlantic as a whole.

2. Methods of measuring meshes

The Convention of 1946 had specified that meshes were to be measured by a flat gauge 2 mm thick. That was simple and straightforward; but it had long been known that the measurement recorded depended on the force or pressure with which the gauge was applied. This had led to the evolution of the so-called

ICES standard spring-loaded gauge free from operator-bias which had been adopted as standard for all measurement for scientific purposes. It had been thought that it would be sensible and simple to adopt the gauge as standard for enforcement purposes too, but the Permanent Commission had reached the conclusion after examination by an ad hoc Committee that the practical difficulties involved were too great. It had concluded that the use of a spring-loaded gauge would make court proceedings in many countries very difficult; and the gauges, which cost upwards of £ 50 each could not be made readily accessible to fishermen. Accordingly, no change had been made and the regulations inherited by NEAFC, and now in force, still prescribed the use of the flat gauge. Nevertheless, the Commission had asked member countries to supply regular information about the actual mesh sizes in use as measured with the ICES gauge in addition to information about infringements (which reflected the use of the flat gauge). Moreover, in asking the special committee set up in 1964 to study the question of international control to continue their examination of that question, the Commission had asked the Committee to examine also the methods of measurements of meshes of nets in the light of observations from ICES and the practicability of introducing a uniform method of measurement. The Commission would therefore be giving further consideration to this matter and it was possible that changes would be recommended.

3. Differential selectivity of different materials

Mr Aglen said that the mesh regulations in the North Eastern Atlantic incorporated differentials for nets made of certain materials. In theory, differentials were justified where there was clear scientific evidence of difference in selectivity; but, in practice, they gave rise to difficulties both because the scientific evidence on selectivity was not always clear or was variable and because the introduction of new materials from time to time necessitated changes in the regulations. There were other practical difficulties and the differentials adopted by NEAFC did not strictly comply with the scientific evidence and were somewhat illogical. Proposals had been made at the last meeting of NEAFC for the abolition of differentials in the northeastern part of the Northern Region and while some delegations felt that this would have advantages, the Commission had agreed that the differentials should be retained at least for the time being.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965Report of the Second Meeting of CommissionersTuesday, 8 June, 3:30 p. m.

1. The Chairman, Mr Sunnanaa, opened the meeting. A draft of the Report of the First Meeting of Commissioners was read. The Executive Secretary was instructed to incorporate suggested changes in the Report.

2. The Chairman called for consideration of Plenary Item 16(b), "Report on Exchange of National Enforcement Officers". Mr Fulham (USA) reported briefly on the USSR-USA and Canada-USA exchange of enforcement officers. He stated that a more detailed joint statement describing the USSR-USA exchange would be presented in Comm. Doc. 25. The USA would also present a statement on the Canada-USA exchange in Comm. Doc. 25. He reported that the USSR-USA exchange took place from 11-29 May 1965 and the Canada-USA exchange took place from 12-30 May 1965. During the USSR-USA exchange five USSR and three USA vessels were visited, nets and the composition of catches taken at sea were inspected. During the Canada-USA exchange, two Canadian and two US vessels were visited and nets and catch composition inspected. Weather cut short further visits.

Mr MacKenzie (Canada) said that a Canadian report of the Canada-US exchange would also be presented in Comm. Doc. 25. He reported that the Canadian officials were pleased to respond to the invitation extended by the US government to exchange enforcement officers as recommended at the 14th Annual Meeting. The Canadian enforcement officers reported that as a result of the exchange they had acquired a better knowledge of the problems encountered in the fisheries of another member country and some very useful information on administrative devices for application in their own region. The exchange contributed to the development of understanding and trust between fishery administrators and the fishing industries of the two countries. Mr MacKenzie said that Canada looked forward to similar exchanges with other member countries.

Mr Volkov (USSR) spoke of the quiet, friendly, efficient way the USSR-USA exchange had been completed and of the better understanding it had produced between the US and USSR fishing interests.

The Chairman thanked the Commissioners from the three countries for their reports, and suggested that exchange of inspection officers should be carried out by other member countries.

Mr Volkov (USSR) pointed out that no formal arrangements for exchange could be made within ICNAF, as the 1964 proposed change to Convention Article VIII was not yet in effect.

The meeting unanimously agreed that the Commission should draw the attention of member countries to the great value of arranging further bilateral exchanges of inspection teams as a means of gaining experience in each other's enforcement procedures and problems.

3. The Chairman, in referring to Plenary Item 16(c) "Report on National Views regarding the Form an International Inspection System should take", drew attention to the valuable information in Comm. Doc. 10 "Suggestions for an international enforcement system" and asked for suggestions regarding handling these Reports.

(over)

Mr Aglen (UK) referring to Plenary Items 16(a) and 16(c), pointed out that the reports in Comm. Doc. 9 and 10 have, to some extent, been considered in NEAFC and suggested three possible ways of handling the information in these reports; (1) set up a Committee to study the reports; (2) wait for the results of the special NEAFC Committee study, or (3) arrange for Canada, USA and Italy the non-NEAFC member countries, to take part in the NEAFC Committee study. After discussion, the meeting agreed to defer any action until the next meeting of Commissioners.

4. Under Plenary Item 17 (a) Status of Proposal for Changes in the Convention, the Executive Secretary reviewed Comm. Doc. 11 and added the following further information:

(1) that the Federal Republic of Germany had deposited a letter of adherence to the harp and hood protocol on 26 May 1965 and had approved the draft protocol regarding changes to allow proposals national and international measures of control;

(2) that Canada, Denmark, USSR and UK had approved the draft protocol regarding changes to procedure effecting regulatory measures.

5. Under Plenary Item 17(b) Status of Proposed ICNAF Regulations, the Executive Secretary reported that Comm. Doc. 11 contained the latest information on acceptance of proposed regulations to the ICNAF trawl fisheries.

6. The meeting adjourned at 5.00 p.m.

ANNUAL MEETING-JUNE 1965Report of the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and AdministrationTuesday, 8 June, 9.00 a. m.

- F&A Item 1. The Chairman, Mr R. Green (USA), welcomed Commissioners and their advisers from all 13 member countries. The voting Commissioners from each country were as follows: Canada- W.C. MacKenzie; Denmark- K. Lokkegaard; France- J. Rouge; Federal Republic of Germany- G. Mocklinghoff; Iceland- J. Jonsson; Italy- G. Cannone; Norway- K. Sunnanaa; Poland- F. Chrzan; Portugal- T. de Almeida; Spain- L. Villegas; USSR- S.A. Studenetsky; UK- A.J. Aglen; USA- T. A. Fulham
- F&A Item 2. Rapporteur. The Executive Secretary was appointed rapporteur.
- F&A Item 3. Agenda. The agenda was adopted with the addition of plenary Item 10 "Consideration of the U.S. proposed amendment to Financial Regulations" and Plenary Item 28 as amended at the First Plenary Session "Date and place of the 1966 and 1967 Annual Meetings of the Commission". The Items were referred to the Committee from the Plenary at its First Session.
- Plenary Item 10 "Consideration of U.S. proposal to amend the Financial Regulations" was introduced by the Chairman. Mr Wm. Sullivan (US) was asked to speak on Commissioners' Document 3. Following considerable discussion and clarification of the proposal, the Committee unanimously

recommended

that the following changes be made in the Financial Regulations of the Commission:

- 1) Change the last sentence of Regulation 4.3 to read: "The balance of the appropriations shall be placed in the Working Capitol Fund";
- 2) Change the first sentence of Regulation 4.4 to read: "At the end of the twelve-month period provided in Regulation 4.3 above, the then remaining balance of any appropriations retained shall be added to the Working Capitol Fund";
- 3) Amend Regulation 5.2(b) by adding after 'account' and before the semi-colon, "except from sale of publications";
- 4) Delete Regulation 5.2 (d);
- 5) Amend Regulation 6.1 by adding after 'income, "' "except from sale of publication";
- 6) Amend Regulation 6.2 by changing the period after 'budget' to a comma and adding "and the sale of publications";
- 7) Amend Regulation 7.1 by adding "(d) Funds derived from the sale of Publications"; (over)

- 8) Amend Section VI by adding a new Regulation 6.6: "During the course of each annual meeting the Commission shall review the amount of funds available in the Working Capital Fund. Insofar as possible the Commission shall attempt to anticipate capital and special expenditures over the succeeding three years and shall attempt to provide for such expenditures from the Working Capital Fund rather than through annual assessments on Members. However, the Working Capital Fund shall be maintained at a level, determined by the Commission, sufficient to finance appropriations in accordance with Regulation 5.1 and sufficient for use in an emergency".

F&A Item 4.

Audit. The Auditor's Report as published in the 1964 Annual Proceedings Vol. 14, p. 8-10, was tabled. Mr Fulham (US) asked for an explanation of the deficit of \$2,669.00 shown in the Auditor's Report for the year 1963/64. The Executive Secretary explained that the overspending was due to unexpected heavy expenditures incurred in connection with the documentation for the Environmental Symposium held in Rome, January-February 1964. The Committee took note of this and

recommended

that the Auditor's Report for 1963/64 be accepted by the Commission.

F&A Item 5.

Administrative Report and Financial Statements for 1964/65. The Report and its provisional financial statements (Commissioners' Document 2) was reviewed by the Executive Secretary. The Committee found the Report in order and

recommends

that the Administrative Report and Financial Statements for 1964/65 be accepted by the Commission.

The Executive Secretary drew attention to Commissioners' Document 14 "Position of ICNAF under Canadian tax laws". He pointed out that, as a result of investigations made during the past year, certain of the Commission's publications are now exempt from Federal Sales Tax and Nova Scotia Hospital Tax, and that a refund of \$1,245.26 has already been made in respect of Federal Sales Tax paid over the last two years and refund of \$857.17 in respect of N.S. Hospital Tax paid since 1 January 1959 was pending. In addition, the possibility of obtaining relief from the Canadian Government for the Commission in the amount of the Income Tax paid by its staff seems hopeful.

The Committee, noting the financial benefits accruing to the Commission from various sources,

recommends

- 1) that the Commission record its appreciation for the efforts of the Canadian delegation in providing tax relief for the Commission;
- 2) that the Commission accept the kind offer of the Canadian Commissioners to follow up the possibility of relief for the Commission in the Income Tax field;
- 3) that the Commission record its appreciation to the Commissioners from the Federal Republic of Germany for the financial relief to the Commission in connection with the 1964 Annual Meeting in Hamburg.

- F&A Item 6. Panel membership. The Executive Secretary referred to Commissioners' Document 4 and reported no change in panel membership.
- F&A Item 9. Office accommodation. The Executive Secretary reviewed the office accommodation, pointing out the rapid expansion at BIO and the fact that one room had already been given back to the Institute. The Canadian Commissioners stated that the Canadian Government considered themselves committed to provide adequate office accommodation for the Secretariat.
- F&A Item 10. Assistant Executive Secretary. The Executive Secretary reviewed Commissioners' Document 4 "Reclassification of Statistician to Assistant Executive Secretary" and the Committee recommended
- that the Commission approve the reclassification of the position of Statistician to Assistant Executive Secretary in the Commission Secretariat.
- F&A Item 11. Salaries. This Item was introduced by the Chairman. It was agreed that the Item be deferred to the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965Report of Second Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and AdministrationThursday, 10 June, 2:30 p. m.

1. The Chairman opened the meeting with representatives from all member countries present. The Report of the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Proc. 11) was read and adopted with minor revisions.

2. Under F&A Item 4, Salaries, the Executive Secretary reviewed Comm. Doc. 13, Commission Position Classifications and Salaries, which was based on an appraisal by the Classification Branch of the Civil Service of Canada of job descriptions and salary classifications for employees of the Commission Secretariat. The Committee, after consideration,

recommended

- (i) that the salary classification for the Editorial Assistant be established at Civil Service of Canada salary range for Editor 2 (\$5,730-6,630) with annual increments of \$180, and the 1965/66 salary rate be \$5,730;
- (ii) that the salary classification for the Senior Secretary be established at the Civil Service of Canada salary range for Clerk 4 (\$4,410-\$4,860) with annual increments of \$150 and the 1965/66 salary rate be \$4,710;
- (iii) that the salary classification for the Clerk Stenographer be established at the Civil Service of Canada salary range for Clerk 3 (\$3,900-\$4,350) with annual increments of \$150 and the 1965/66 salary rate be \$4,050;
- (iv) that the salary classification for the Clerk Typist be established at the Civil Service of Canada salary range for Clerk 2 (\$3,090-3,540) with annual increments of \$150 and the 1965/66 salary rate be \$3,390.

The Committee further

recommended

that the salary classification for the Asst. Executive Secretary be established at the Civil Service of Canada salary range for Administrative Officer 7 (\$10,900-11,200-11,800-12,300) and the 1965/66 salary rate be \$10,900.

The Committee further

recommended

that the salary classification for the Executive Secretary be established at the Civil Service of Canada salary range for Senior Officer 1 (\$14,500-18,000) with annual increments of \$250 and the 1965/66 salary rate be \$16,250.

(over)

3. In considering F&A Items 7, Estimates for 1965/66, and 8, Forecast for 1966/67, the Chairman called for discussion of F&A Item 12(c), Printing of National Research Reports in Annual Proceedings, the Committee recognized the need expressed by R&S for wide distribution and production in the appropriate form of the National Research Reports but felt that further consideration should be given to the matter. It therefore

recommended

that the National Research Reports not be printed in the Annual Proceedings for 1965 and that the Commission review the matter again at the 1966 Annual Meeting.

4. Under F&A Item 14, Date and Place of 1966 and 1967 Annual Meetings, Mr Villegas (Spain) was pleased, on behalf of the Spanish Government, to extend a cordial invitation to the Commission to hold its 1966 Annual Meeting in Spain. The Committee

recommended

that the kind invitation to hold the 1966 Annual Meeting in Spain be accepted.

Mr Fulham (USA), on behalf of the US Government, was pleased to extend an invitation to the Commission to hold its 1967 Annual Meeting in Boston, Mass. The Committee

recommended

that the kind invitation to hold the 1967 Annual Meeting in Boston, Mass. be accepted.

5. Under F&A Item 7, Estimates for 1965/66, after considerable discussion based on the application of the new Financial Regulations approved at the Second Plenary Session (Proc. 14), it was estimated that approximately \$15,619.22 might be available in the Working Capital Fund (Present WCF \$2,500, unobligated 1964/65 (Comm. Doc. 2, p. 8) \$9,266.05 and unliquidated 1963/64 (Comm. Doc. 2, p. 9) \$3,853.17). The Committee, in order to meet the 1965/66 estimated expenditures (Appendix I) unanimously agreed to

recommend

that appropriations totalling \$84,730 be financed by contributions from member states and that \$11,000 of the Working Capital Fund of \$15,619.22 be used for printing the Environmental Symposium (\$5,000) and the Environmental Survey (\$6,000), leaving \$4,619.22 in the Working Capital Fund.

6. Under F&A Item 8, Forecast for 1966/67, the Committee, in order to meet the 1966/67 estimated expenditures (Appendix II), unanimously agreed to

recommend

that the Commission give consideration at the 1966 Annual Meeting to authorizing appropriations from member states in the amount of \$87,010 to cover expenditures for 1966/67.

7. Under F&A Item 13, Date of Billing, the Committee agreed unanimously to

recommend

that the billings for member state contributions to the 1965/66 budget be sent on 1 August 1965.

8. The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p. m.

1965/66 Expenditures to be Covered by Appropriations of
\$84,730 from Contracting Governments

1.	Personal Services	
	(a) Salaries	\$45,030
	(b) Superannuation	1,200
	(c) Additional help	1,200
	(d) Medical plan	300
2.	Travel	5,000
3.	Transportation	500
4.	Communications	2,500
5.	Publication	11,000
6.	Other contractual services	5,500
7.	Materials and Supplies	3,500
8.	Equipment	2,000
9.	Annual Meeting	6,000
10.	Contingencies	<u>1,000</u>
	Total Regular Budget	\$ 84,730
	Special appropriation from Working Capital Fund	11,000

Detailed statement of expected expenditures 1965/66

re Item 1(a)	Executive Secretary	16,250
	Ass't. Executive Secretary	10,900
	Editorial Assistant	5,730
	Senior Secretary	4,710
	Clerk Stenographer	4,050
	Clerk Typist	<u>3,390</u>
		\$ 45,030
re Item 2	Overseas Travel Exec. Sec.	3,000
	Travel by Ass't. Exec. Sec. and other Service travel	<u>2,000</u>
		\$ 5,000
re Item 5	Annual Proceedings	1,000
	Statistical Bulletin	4,500
	Research Bulletin	4,000
	Redbook	1,000
	Sampling Yearbook	<u>500</u>
		\$ 11,000
Special appropriations from Working Capital Fund	Environmental Symposium	5,000
	Environmental Survey	<u>6,000</u>
		\$ 11,000

1966/67 Expenditures to be Covered by Appropriations of \$87,010

1.	Personal Services	
	(a) Salaries	\$46,310
	(b) Superannuation	1,200
	(c) Additional help	1,200
	(d) Medical plan	300
2.	Travel	5,500
3.	Transportation	500
4.	Communications	3,000
5.	Publications	15,500
6.	Other contractual services	4,000
7.	Materials and supplies	3,500
8.	Equipment	1,000
9.	Annual meeting	4,000
10.	Contingencies	<u>1,000</u>
	Total regular budget	\$ 87,010

Detailed statement of expected expenditures 1966/67

Re Item 1(a)		
	Executive Secretary	16,500
	Ass't. Executive Secretary	11,300
	Editorial Assistant	5,910
	Senior Secretary	4,860
	Clerk Stenographer	4,200
	Clerk Typist	<u>3,540</u>
		\$ 46,310

Re Item 5.		
	Annual Proceedings	4,000
	Statistical Bulletin	4,500
	Research Bulletin	5,000
	Sampling Yearbook	500
	Redbook	500
	List of Vessels for 1965	<u>1,000</u>
		\$ 15,500

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965Report of the ad hoc Committee on ICNAF Trawl Regulations

Chairman: Mr A. J. Aglen; Rapporteur: Mr B. B. Parrish

Meetings of the Committee were held on 7, 10 and 11 June. Representatives of most member countries were present.

The Committee took as its agenda the three Plenary Items 12, 13 and 15, referred to it at the First Plenary Session.

1. Infringements to ICNAF Trawl Regulations (Plenary Item 12)(a) Annual returns of infringements

The Committee reviewed the information in Comm. Doc. 5, which summarized the returns made by some member countries, of inspections made in 1964 for infringements of the Commission's mesh size, mesh obstruction and by-catch exemption regulations. It noted that these returns were made on the revised "Annual Returns of Infringements" forms, in accordance with decisions reached at the last meeting, and has no proposals to make for changes in the nature of the returns. The Committee recommends that the Annual Returns of Infringements to ICNAF Trawl Regulations for 1964 by member countries be accepted.

(b) Annual return form

Again, the Committee has no proposals to make for changes in the revised "Annual Returns of Infringements" form.

2. Topside Codend Protection (Plenary Item 13)

The USSR representative reported that in accordance with recommendations by the Commission at the last meeting (1964 Meeting Proc. 19), attempts were being made in his country to develop stronger trawl codends which would obviate the need for topside codend protection devices. In this regard, he drew attention to the results, in Res. Doc. 66, of preliminary trials on a Russian stern trawler fishing in Subarea 3 with experimental codends made from strong double-braided "Capron" twine. The Committee noted these developments with approval and commended the USSR in its intention to pursue them further. It also noted that in the meantime, Russian trawlers fishing in the ICNAF Area use a topside chafer of the type described at last year's meeting, with the use of which codend selectivity had been shown (Res. Doc. 66) to be about the same as that with the approved ICNAF chafer.

The Polish representative informed the Committee that experiments were also being made at the present time aboard a Polish trawler with a new type of chafer, but as yet no information was to hand of its effect on codend selectivity.

Information was also given of recent German experiments in the north east Atlantic with the approved, multiple flap chafer and a new type, similar in design to the ICNAF chafer, but substantially narrower in width. Both types of chafer were found in these experiments to reduce selectivity of haddock by 9-11%.

The Committee noted that the results of the selectivity experiments with the Russian topside chafer, given in Res. Doc. 66, had not been available for consideration by the Gear and Selectivity Subcommittee of R&S at this Annual Meeting.

(over)

It therefore

recommends

that the USSR results and those of the Polish experiments be presented to the next Annual Meeting in accordance with Recommendations 30 and 31 of R&S at the 1964 Annual Meeting (Redbook, Pt. 1, 1964, p. 43 and 44).

The Committee also

recommends

that R&S be asked to examine all new information on the effect on codend selectivity of the approved ICNAF topside chafer.

With regard to questions raised at last year's meeting concerning the looseness of the topside chafers used by Danish and Icelandic trawlers, the representatives of these countries promised to furnish the necessary information at the 1966 Annual Meeting.

3. Exemption Provisions in ICNAF Trawl Regulations (Plenary Item 15)

The Committee considered in detail the proposed Canadian draft amendments set out in Comm. Doc. 8 to the exemption regulations in Subareas 3 and 4; and the related problems of (a) the definition of "groundfish" as used in the trawl regulations for Subareas 1, 2 and 3 now pending entry into force; (b) clarification of the pending exemption regulation for Subarea 3,

(a) Definition of "groundfish"

The Committee noted the contents of Comm. Doc. 6, drawing attention to the ambiguity in the definition of "groundfish" in the pending trawl regulations for Subareas 1, 2 and 3. This stems from changes in the grouping of species in the ICNAF Statistical Bulletin, on the species grouping in which the regulations had been drawn up. Note was also taken of a recommendation of R&S at this meeting that the classification and grouping of species in the Statistical Bulletin should be kept flexible for scientific purposes.

The Committee agreed that, to avoid this ambiguity, the term "groundfish" should be eliminated from the trawl regulations for these subareas and should be replaced by the names of the species of fish to which they apply. It was further agreed that these should be as follows:

Subarea 3 - cod (Gadus morhua L.); haddock (Melanogrammus aeglefinus (L.)); redfish (Genus Sebastes); halibut (Hippoglossus hippoglossus (L.)); witch (Glyptocephalus cynoglossus (L.)); yellowtail flounder (Limanda ferruginea (Storer)); American plaice (Hippoglossoides platessoides (Fabr.)); Greenland halibut (Reinhardtius hippoglossoides (Walb.)); pollock (saithe) (Pollachius virens (L.)); white hake (Urophycis tenuis (Mitch.)).

Subareas 1 cod, haddock, redfish, halibut, witch, American
and 2 plaice, Greenland halibut.

The Committee therefore

recommends to the Commission

that paragraph 1 of the amended version of the trawl regulations for Subareas 1, 2 and 3, adopted at the 1964 Annual Meeting (Ann. Proc. 14 for 1963-64, p. 16), be replaced for each subarea by the following: *

*It is understood that paragraphs 1(a) and 1(b) will follow and remain part of the new regulation (Proc. 20, para. 4)

for Subarea 1 -

"The Contracting Governments take appropriate action to prohibit the taking of cod (Gadus morhua L.); haddock (Melanogrammus aeglefinus (L.)); redfish (Sebastes); halibut (Hippoglossus hippoglossus (L.)); witch (Glyptocephalus cynoglossus (L.)); American plaice (Hippoglossoides platessoides (Fab.)); and Greenland halibut (Reinhardtius hippoglossoides (Walb.)) in Subarea 1 by persons under their jurisdiction with trawl nets having in any part of the net meshes of dimensions less than 114 millimeters or 4 1/2 inches 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 the equivalent thereof when measured dry before use. 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."

for Subarea 2 -

"The Contracting Governments take appropriate action to prohibit the taking of cod (Gadus morhua L.); haddock (Melanogrammus aeglefinus (L.)); redfish (Sebastes); halibut (Hippoglossus hippoglossus (L.)); witch (Glyptocephalus cynoglossus (L.)); American plaice (Hippoglossoides platessoides (Fab.)); and Greenland halibut (Reinhardtius hippoglossoides (Walb.)) in Subarea 2 by persons under their jurisdiction with trawl nets having in any part of the net meshes of dimensions less than 114 millimeters or 4 1/2 inches 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 the equivalent thereof when measured dry before use. 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."

for Subarea 3 -

"The Contracting Governments take appropriate action to prohibit (except as provided in paragraphs 2 and 3) the taking of cod (Gadus morhua L.); haddock (Melanogrammus aeglefinus (L.)); redfish (Sebastes); halibut (Hippoglossus hippoglossus (L.)); witch (Glyptocephalus cynoglossus (L.)); yellowtail flounder (Limanda ferruginea (Storer)); American plaice (Hippoglossoides platessoides (Fab.)); Greenland halibut (Reinhardtius hippoglossoides (Walb.)); pollock (saithe) (Pollachius virens (L.)); and white hake (Urophycis tenuis (Mitch.)) in Subarea 3 by persons under their jurisdiction with trawl nets having in any part of the net meshes of dimensions less than 114 millimeters or 4 1/2 inches 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 the equivalent thereof when measured dry before use. 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."

(over)

(b) Exemption regulation for Subareas 3 and 4

The Committee noted that at present there are no provisions for by-catch exemptions for the pending trawl regulations in Subareas 1 and 2 and the northern Divisions 3K, 3L and 3M of Subarea 3. It agreed that no recommendations for such provisions for the fisheries in those areas are justified at the present time, and that they be confined, as previously to the southern Divisions 3N, 3O and 3P of Subarea 3.

The Committee considered the Canadian proposal set out in Comm. Doc. 8 for amending paragraph 3 of the pending trawl regulation for Subarea 3, adopted at the 11th Annual Meeting. It was agreed that the present regulations are somewhat ambiguous and that, furthermore, the recommendations passed under item (a) above necessitated some reframing of this proposal. It was agreed that the intent of the provision should be to allow the landing of up to 10% of each of (a) cod; (b) haddock, and (c) all other regulated species (as defined above), thereby allowing a maximum of 30% by weight of all regulated species.

The Committee also accepted the Canadian proposal that the exemption regulation for Subarea 3 should be extended to include an annual provision along the same general lines as that in existence for Subarea 5. In discussing this proposal attention was drawn to the suggestion made at the last Annual Meeting that it might be desirable to substitute for the exemption for each species or group of species an inclusive exemption of 5,000 lbs (2268 kg) or 10 percent for all species taken together. It was however explained that this suggestion had been discussed at the meeting, at Woods Hole in December 1964, of representatives of Canada and the USA reported in Res. Doc. 3, and that for the reasons set out in the report of that meeting the suggestion for an inclusive exemption had been abandoned. The Committee accordingly

recommends to the Commission

that paragraph 3 of the pending trawl regulation for Subarea 3, adopted at the 11th Annual Meeting (Ann. Proc. 11, 1960-61), be substituted by the following:

"In order to avoid impairment of fisheries conducted primarily for redfish (genus Sebastes) in the area specified in paragraph 2 and which take small quantities of cod, haddock and other regulated species incidentally, the Contracting Governments permit persons under their jurisdictions to take these species with nets having a mesh size less than that specified in paragraph 1 so long as such persons do not have in possession on board a vessel fishing primarily for redfish with small meshed nets for each of (a) cod (b) haddock and (c) other species mentioned in paragraph 1 taken together quantities in excess of 5,000 lbs or 2268 kg or ten percent by weight of all fish on board such vessel whichever is greater, or so long as such persons do not catch with trawl nets having a mesh smaller than that specified in paragraph 1 in any period of twelve months (a) cod, (b) haddock or (c) other species mentioned in paragraph 1 taken together in excess of ten percent by weight for each of (a), (b) and (c) of all the fish taken by such persons with such trawl nets in that period of twelve months."

The Committee also supported the Canadian proposal set out in Comm. Doc. 8, for the extension of the by-catch exemption regulation for Subarea 4, to include an annual exemption provision in the pending regulations. It therefore

recommends to the Commission

that paragraph 2 of the pending trawl regulation for Subarea 4 be deleted and replaced by the following:

"In order to avoid impairment of fisheries conducted primarily for other species and which take small quantities of cod, haddock and flounders incidentally, the Contracting Governments permit persons under their jurisdictions to take cod, haddock and flounder with nets having a mesh size less than that specified in the preceding paragraph, so long as such persons do not have in possession on board a vessel fishing primarily for other species, cod, haddock and flounders in amounts in excess of 5,000 lbs or 2,268 kg for each or ten percent by weight for each of all fish on board such vessels whichever is the greater; or so long as such persons do not catch with trawl nets having a mesh smaller than that specified in paragraph 1 in any period of twelve months, cod, haddock and flounders in excess of ten percent by weight for each of all the fish taken by such persons with such trawl nets in that period of twelve months."

It was noted that there is no annual exemption provisions in the regulations now in force in Subareas 3 and 4 and it was agreed that such provisions should be made. The Committee accordingly

recommends to the Commission

that the regulations now in force for each of these subareas also be amended by deleting paragraph II and substituting it by the following:

"In order to avoid impairment of fisheries conducted primarily for other species and which take small quantities of cod and haddock incidentally, the Contracting Governments permit persons under their jurisdiction to take cod and haddock with trawl nets having a mesh size less than that specified in the preceding paragraphs so long as such persons do not have in possession on board a vessel fishing primarily for other species, cod or haddock in amounts in excess of 5,000 lbs or 2,268 kg for each or ten percent by weight for each of all the fish on board such vessel, whichever is the greater; or so long as such persons do not catch with trawl nets having a mesh smaller than that specified in paragraph 1 in any period of twelve months, cod or haddock in excess of ten percent by weight for each, of all the fish taken by such persons with such trawl nets in that period of twelve months."

4. Procedure for acceptance of regulations in Subareas 1-4

Attention was drawn to the confusing situation which may arise if member Governments signify their acceptance under the present procedure of amendments to regulations which have been recommended by the Commission but are not yet in force. The Committee considered that it would help to avoid such confusion if the regulations proposed by the Commission but not yet in force could be reproduced in full, incorporating all subsequent amendments recommended by the Commission, including those now proposed by the Committee, assuming they are adopted by the Commission. Accordingly the Committee, after considering the note on procedure presented by the US delegation (Appendix I)

recommends to the Commission

that the regulations for each of the subareas proposed by the Commission at their Annual Meeting in 1961 with the amendments recommended at subsequent Annual Meetings including the present Meeting, be recommended to Contracting Governments in full to supercede all previous recommendations which have not yet been given effect under the present procedure.



ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations

Note on Procedure by the United States Delegation

Note has been taken of the announcement of the Soviet Delegation that the USSR has approved the 1964 proposals. This acceptance would bring the 1964 proposal for Subarea 4 into effect prior to the entry into force of the 1961 proposals, which the 1964 proposal amends. The US Delegation has enquired of the Depositary Government as to whether it might be considered that the entry into force of the 1964 proposal for Subarea 4 would substitute a new paragraph 1 for the existing paragraph 1 of the proposals adopted in 1955, and confine further action on the 1961 proposal for Subarea 4 to paragraphs 2-4. The Delegation has received the following telegram from the Depositary Government on this matter:

RE APPROPRIATENESS OF AN INTERPRETATION THAT REQUIRED ACCEPTANCES 1964 PROPOSED AMENDMENT PARAGRAPH 1 SUBAREA 4 REGULATIONS NW ATLANTIC FISHERIES WOULD (1) BRING SUCH AMENDMENT INTO FORCE AS SUBSTITUTE FOR PARAGRAPH 1 OF 1955 REGULATIONS, AND (2) RENDER OBSOLETE 1961 PARAGRAPH 1 PROPOSALS SUCH INTERPRETATION MIGHT BE OPEN TO QUESTION ON BASIS THAT 1964 PROPOSALS SPECIFICALLY REFER TO AMENDMENT OF 1961 PROPOSED REGULATIONS, NOT 1955 REGULATIONS. IT MIGHT ALSO BE ARGUED THAT FROM STANDPOINT EFFECTIVE OPERATION THE ENTRY INTO FORCE OF 1964 AMENDMENTS PARAGRAPH 1 SHOULD OCCUR ON THE SAME DAY AS ENTRY INTO FORCE 1961 AMENDMENTS OF OTHER PARAGRAPHS OR REGULATIONS. SINCE NOT A CLEAR-CUT CASE IS A MATTER ESSENTIALLY DEPENDENT UPON INTENTION PARTIES AND SINCE EXCEPTION COULD BE TAKEN BY CONTRACTING PARTIES IF DEPOSITARY UNDERTOOK TO INTERPRET, SUGGEST CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO WHETHER IT IS CLEAR THAT NO PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES WOULD ARISE FROM ENTRY INTO FORCE OF PARAGRAPH 1 AMENDMENT WITH EFFECT AS INDICATED ABOVE. IN THIS CONNECTION, NOTE IN PARTICULAR THAT PARAGRAPH 2 OF THE 1955 REGULATIONS SETS FORTH EXCEPTIONS IN CERTAIN CASES FOR COD AND HADDOCK BUT NOT FOR FLOUNDER AS IN 1961 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS, WHILE 1964 PROPOSALS RELATE TO FLOUNDER AS WELL AS TO COD AND HADDOCK. IF CONSIDERATION REVEALS NO PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES IT WOULD BE DESIRABLE FOR (COMMISSION) TO MOVE AS MATTER OF RECORD ITS UNDERSTANDING THAT ACCEPTANCE WILL HAVE EFFECT AS INDICATED BEGINNING THIS TELEGRAM.

RUSK

Thus it is up to the Commission to determine whether the 1964 proposal for Subarea 4 should enter into force now or should await entry into force of the 1961 proposal for Subarea 4.

The effect of the entry into force of the 1964 proposal as a substitute for paragraph 1 of the existing regulations would be:

- (a) paragraph 1 as set forth on page 15, Comm. Doc. 16, Appendix III, would be substituted for paragraph 1 as set forth on the third page of Appendix 1, Comm. Doc. 16;
- (b) no further action would be required on paragraph 1 as set forth on page 9, Comm. Doc. 16, Appendix III, but further action would be required on paragraph 2 to 4;
- (c) the 1964 proposals on gauges and synthetic materials would enter into force for Subarea 4;
- (d) incidental to the entry into force of the gauge provisions, flounders would be added to the species protected in Subarea 4;
- (e) there would be no exemption for flounder, as there is for haddock and cod, since paragraph II of the existing regulations (third page of Comm. Doc. 16, Appendix I) would remain in force pending final acceptance of paragraph 2 of the 1961 proposals (page 9, Comm. Doc. 16, Appendix III).

(over)

Accordingly, the Commission should decide either:

- A. It was the Commission's intention in adopting the 1964 proposal that it enter into force in lieu of the obsolete first paragraph of the 1961 proposal, in substitution for paragraph 1 of the present regulations for Subarea 4, and that remaining action by Governments on the 1961 proposal should be considered to be confined to paragraphs 2 to 4.

OR:

- B. The entry into force of the 1964 proposal prior to the entry into force of the 1961 proposal for Subarea 4 would cause practical difficulties since it would have the incidental effect of regulating flounders without providing an exemption as for cod and haddock, and that, therefore, the entry into force of the 1964 proposal should be deferred to occur on same day as the entry into force of the 1961 proposal, even though the 1964 proposal has been accepted by all Contracting Parties required to do so.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965

Report of Second Plenary Session

Thursday, 10 June, 10:30 a. m.

1. The Chairman, Mr K. Sunnanaa, opened the meeting.
2. The Plenary took note of the Report of the Opening Meeting (Proc. 7).
3. The Chairman drew attention to the Report of the First Plenary Session (Proc. 8) and asked for comments. The Report, with minor changes, was accepted.
4. Under Plenary Item 27, Report of Panels, the Reports of Panel 1 (Proc. 3), 2 (Proc. 2), and 3 (Proc. 5) were presented and approved.
5. Under Plenary Item 10, US Proposal to Amend Financial Regulations, Mr Green, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, presented the decision of the Committee with regard to Plenary Item 10 referred to it by the First Plenary. Following discussion, the Plenary approved the recommendation of the First Meeting of the Committee on Finance and Administration (Proc. 11) that the Commission accept the US proposal for amendments to the Financial Regulations and agreed that the Financial Regulations as amended should be applied to the preparation of the 1965/66 and subsequent annual budgets.
6. The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965Report of Third Meeting of CommissionersThursday, 10 June, 11:45 a. m.

1. The Chairman opened the meeting with all member countries represented.
2. The Commissioners approved the Report of the First Meeting of Commissioners (Proc. 9) and the Second Meeting of Commissioners (Proc. 10) with minor revisions and additions.
3. The Chairman called for further consideration of Plenary Item 16 Joint Enforcement System. Following discussion, the Commissioners

recommended

that the Commission accept the suggestion that NEAFC might arrange for representation of Canada, Italy and USA, the non-NEAFC member countries, to take part in the further deliberations of the Special Committee of NEAFC which is considering proposals for joint inspection and requests NEAFC to consider this suggestion.

4. The Commissioners agreed that Plenary Item 18 Procedures for Effecting Commission Proposals had been dealt with effectively in Plenary Item 17(a) Status of Commission Proposals for Changes in the Convention.

5. The Chairman asked for comments on Plenary Item 19 Review of Possible Conservation Actions for the Commission Area. Mr Aglen (UK) said that the United Kingdom regarded the Templeman-Gulland report (Comm. Doc. 12) as of great importance both because the subject with which it dealt was fundamental to the future rational exploitation of the ICNAF fish stocks and because it made it much easier for administrators and those in the fishing industries to appreciate the scientific consideration which had to be taken into account. The report made it clear that it was not sufficient to rely on mesh regulations as long as fishing effort went on increasing and that some limitation of effort or catch was required. It was for Commissioners to consider what action should be taken and this was a matter of considerable difficulty.

The question had also been raised at the recent meeting of NEAFC. The Liaison Committee had drawn attention in their report (Comm. Doc. 19) to the sustained increase in fishing effort in parts of the North East Atlantic since 1946, and in marked contrast to the lack of increase in total catch; and to the very considerable decrease in catch per unit effort. It had emerged clearly that some regulation of fishing effort or of total catch would bring beneficial results. The NEAFC were not at present in a position to recommend specific proposals to this effect; but it had been suggested at their recent meeting that they might soon have to do so especially if catch limits were introduced in the ICNAF area since in that event surplus effort might be directed to the North East Atlantic. The United Kingdom had drawn attention to the practical difficulties which would be involved in introducing a system of catch or effort limitation, and suggested that the member countries should think over these problems and be ready to discuss them more fully at next year's meeting. This suggestion had met with general acceptance.

Mr Aglen suggested that the problems confronting the Commissions on both sides of the Atlantic were similar and this might suggest a similar approach.

(over)

Mr MacKenzie (Canada) said that the notion of catch quotas troubled him somewhat. He thought it important that the fishing industries of all countries should be able to adapt to changes in demand, as well as supply, factors. They should be flexible enough to pursue new sources of supply as price changes and the like make possible the substitution of stocks and species. Catch quotas, by themselves, tend to introduce an undesirable rigidity in this respect. He suggested that perhaps the most urgent requirement was to obtain more knowledge of the economic implications of current and anticipated changes in the resource and marketing situations in member countries.

Mr Bogdanov (USSR) said that Comm. Doc. 12 was of great interest and value but that it poses problems. He spoke of the practical problems involved in effecting catch quotas and said that the USSR use of a catch quota system in the Azov Sea based on many years of scientific data, due to sharp fluctuations in fish stocks from year to year, often proved inadequate. He also spoke of the great social and economic problems involved and agreed with Mr Aglen and Mr MacKenzie regarding the sharing of national problems with economists for further study.

Mr Popper (FAO) expressed the interest of his organization in the subject of Comm. Doc. 12. This was of concern not only to ICNAF and also, as Mr Aglen had explained, to NEAFC, but beyond that to all international bodies charged with ensuring rational exploitation of fishery resources. FAO was therefore closely following discussions in this field so as to be able to assist the various bodies in their deliberations. FAO had a particular interest in the economic implications of fishery regulations and had taken some initiative in bringing about discussion among biologists, economists and administrators (e. g. the FAO meeting on this subject held in Ottawa in 1961). He also made reference to studies being sponsored by OECD. If regulatory bodies were to take into consideration the economic aspects of managing the exploitation of fish stocks, then it was necessary for them to have economic indicators of the yields from such exploitation and of its economic efficiency under various regimes of management just as they had indicators of physical yield and of the effects of management measures on the stocks. Much work remained to be done to develop such indicators in practice and to establish sound methods of using them in economic assessment of fishery management. As a step in this direction, FAO was planning to prepare outlines of the kind of studies and investigations that should be carried out for this purpose and to have these examined by a very small group of experts in the fall of this year. He felt that it would undoubtedly be valuable if these experts included persons familiar with ICNAF problems and thinking. As a result of the consultation, countries wishing to pursue consideration of this matter would have well-considered suggestions available on the kind of work they might undertake in preparation for fuller discussions within the international commissions and bodies concerned.

Mr Fulham (USA) spoke of the need for more background work and that economists should play a very strong part in the work of the national industry advisers to the Commissioners. National problems should be brought for consideration within the Commission.

The Commissioners discussed a proposal by Mr MacKenzie (Canada) to accept the FAO invitation to have ICNAF associated with the work of the small interagency consultation group.

The Commissioners agreed to give further consideration to this Item at the next meeting of Commissioners.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965

Report of Third Plenary Session

Friday, 11 June, 10:30 a. m.

1. The Chairman, Mr Sunnanaa, opened the meeting. Delegates and advisers from all member countries and observers were present.
2. The Executive Secretary read the Report of the Second Plenary Session (Proc. 14) which was then approved by the Plenary.
3. The Report of the First Meeting of Commissioners (Proc. 9) was read by the Executive Secretary and the Plenary took note of the contents.
4. Under Plenary Item 27, Reports of Panels, the Report of Panel 4 (Proc. 4) was read by Captain de Almeida (Portugal) and approved by the Plenary with two changes. The Report of Panel 5 (Proc. 6) was read by Mr MacKenzie (Canada) and approved by the Plenary with minor changes.
5. The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a. m.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965

Report of Third Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration

Friday, 11 June, 2:30 p. m.

1. The Chairman called the meeting to order and asked the Executive Secretary to review the Report of the Second Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Proc. 12). The Committee approved the Report as written.
2. The Chairman asked the meeting to consider possible additional expenses relating to a proposal by the Fourth Meeting of Commissioners (Proc. 18) to send a suitable ICNAF representative in the autumn of 1965 to an FAO meeting of experts to study and draw up a program on the economic factors in the assessment of fishing yields. The Executive Secretary stated that he felt that travel plans for the Secretariat in 1965/66 were sufficiently flexible to allow for the possibility of sending a representative to this meeting.
3. Under F&A Item 14, Date and place of 1966 and 1967 Annual Meeting, it was unanimously agreed to
recommend to the Commission
that the meeting in Spain in 1966 would be commenced on 6 June and following days, and that the meeting in Boston, USA, in 1967 would be commenced on 5 June and following days.
4. Under F&A Item 15, Invitations to send observers to the 1966 Annual Meeting, it was agreed to
recommend to the Commission
that, as in the past, invitations should be sent to FAO, ICES, NEAFC, IOC, SCOR, INPFC, IPHC and to the Government of Japan.
5. Under F&A Item 17, Election of Chairman, Mr R. Green was unanimously re-elected Chairman of F&A for the year 1965/66.
6. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965Report of Fourth Meeting of CommissionersFriday, 11 June, 11:30 a. m.

1. The Chairman, Mr Sunnanaa, opened the meeting with delegates and advisers from all member countries present.
2. The Report of the Third Meeting of Commissioners (Proc. 15) was read. A redraft of the recommendation in the Report was approved. The Chairman instructed that the revised Report be circulated.
3. The Chairman then asked the Commissioners to continue their consideration of Plenary Item 19, Review of possible conservation measures for the ICNAF Area. He suggested that member countries stimulate discussion of this important problem among the fishing industry and administrators and at the political level. He suggested that international organizations such as FAO, OECD, NEAFC should also consider the problem as there is a need for information from all quarters in order to arrive at any practical and sound solution.

Mr Aglen (UK) agreed with the Chairman's proposal. He said there was a need to give more consideration to this subject on a national level before there can be any discussion internationally.

Mr MacKenzie (Canada) stated that scientists associated with past and current research programs have suggested that there are occasions when problems reveal economic aspects which they would like to give to specialists in the economic field. He said Canada is prepared to make a contribution in this field but the main obstacle is the scarcity of economists available to do such work.

The Chairman said it was most important that all member countries raise this question in their countries in such a way that ICNAF Commissioners at later meetings will know the views of all concerned with the fisheries. With the national questions considered there is then a good basis for discussions in the Commission. He suggested, and the Commissioners approved, that the review of conservation actions be placed on the agenda for the 1966 Annual Meeting and that any information available be presented to the Commission at that time for study and that the Chairman's Report of the 1965 Annual Meeting should include a summary of the Commissioner's discussion.

Mr Popper (FAO) said that he would like persons familiar with ICNAF problems to join the FAO group of experts to study economic aspects of fishing yield.

The meeting, noting the value of having ICNAF participation in the study group,

recommended

that the Commission accept any invitation to be represented at a meeting of the FAO consultative group and that, if funds can be made available, ICNAF pay the travel expenses of the representative.

4. Under Plenary Item 24, Cooperation with other international organizations, the Executive Secretary made an oral report based on Comm. Doc. 2. He also read a letter from Dr Sen, Director of FAO, proposing closer cooperation between the Commission and FAO and an exchange of letters (Annex). The meeting agreed to

(over)

recommend

that the Commission, through the Chairman, send a letter to Dr Sen stating its pleasure in agreeing to close cooperation with FAO in fisheries activities.

5. The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p. m.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

4 May, 1965

Dear Dr Sunnanaa,

As you know, the FAO Council at its 43rd Session in October 1964 discussed at some length this Organization's constitutional responsibility in the field of international fishery work and the increasingly important role that the Organization should play in this regard. It also laid stress, in this context, on the need for developing closer working relationships with existing international bodies.

I would like gratefully to acknowledge the close and cordial collaboration which has existed between the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries and this Organization since the Commission's foundation in 1949. I would however like to take this opportunity of bringing our working relationships into somewhat sharper focus through an exchange of letters, and thus lay the basis for any further development of these relations that may become desirable. I therefore propose the following:

- (i) Regular exchange of information and documents.
- (ii) Reciprocal consultations on questions of common interest in the field of fisheries, particularly those falling within the terms of reference of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries which may also lie within the competence of this Organization under its constitution.
- (iii) Participation, to the extent possible and on invitation, by observers at meetings on topics of mutual interest, where collaboration between the two bodies appears desirable.
- (iv) The establishment, where desirable, and mutually agreeable, of joint working parties with the possible participation of other international bodies to study, and report on, matters of common interest.

I have designated the Director, Fisheries Division, to act on behalf of this Organization in its working relation with your Commission and I propose that correspondence between him and the Executive Secretary of your Commission should continue as hitherto. Communications of a formal and policy nature would however, if you agree, be exchanged between the Chairman of the Commission and the Director-General of FAO. Invitations to meetings should also be addressed to me.

I hope that these procedures will enable us to develop further the present cordial collaboration between the Commission and FAO and I would invite you therefore to comment on these proposals and signify to what extent you feel able to agree with them.

I look forward to continued close and fruitful co-operation between our two Organizations.

I remain,

Yours truly,

(signed) B. R. Sen
Director-General

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965Report of Joint Meeting of Panels 1-4Saturday, 12 June, 10:15 a.m.

1. As agreed by the Plenary during its Fourth Plenary Session, Mr Aglen (UK), Chairman, called to order a Joint Meeting of Panels 1-4 to consider proposals under Plenary Item 15, Exemptions, made by the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations (Proc. 13) and requiring approval by Panels 1-4 before presentation to Plenary for adoption.
2. The Executive Secretary, Mr Day, was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Under Plenary Item 15(a), Definition of "groundfish", the Chairman explained the proposed changes to paragraph 1 of the pending trawl regulations in Subareas 1, 2 and 3 in order to replace the term "groundfish" with the names of the fish species intended (Proc. 13, paragraph 3(a)). Panels 1, 2 and 3 were each polled and each agreed to recommend the proposed changes relating to its trawl regulations to the Commission.
4. Under Plenary Item 15(b), Clarification of exemption clause, and 15(c), Extension of exemptions, the Chairman explained the proposals (1) for clarifying the by-catch exemptions and adding a trip and annual by-catch exemption in Div. 3NOP and (2) adding a trip and annual by-catch exemption for Subarea 4. Panels 3 and 4 were polled and each agreed to recommend the proposals to the Commission. In addition, the Chairman polled Panels 3 and 4 regarding provision of an annual by-catch exemption to regulations now in force in Subareas 3 and 4. The Panels agreed to recommend their acceptance to the Commission.
5. The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m. by the Chairman, Mr Aglen, who turned the chair back to the Commission Chairman, Mr Sunnanaa, to reconvene the Fourth Plenary Session.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965Report of Fourth Plenary SessionSaturday, 12 June, 9:00 a. m.

1. The Chairman, Mr Sunnanaa, opened the meeting with all delegates, advisers and guests present.
2. The Chairman referred to Plenary Item 25, Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, and asked Dr Templeman (Canada), Chairman of the Committee, to present Addendum 1 and 2 to the Committee's Report (Proc. 1).

After this presentation, Mr MacKenzie spoke, on behalf of the Canadian delegation, in favour of the recommendation of the Research and Statistics Committee for assistance from economic disciplines in solving the Commission's problems.

Mr MacKenzie also said that "the Canadian delegation notes with satisfaction the proposal to expand research on the salmon stocks, with reference to the effect of the fishery along the coast of Greenland. Some time must pass before we may expect to have the data necessary for effective management and we hope that, meanwhile, the Danish authorities and others, recognizing the special interest of the salmon-producing countries, would endeavour to restrain intensification of that fishery.

"Our concern with this matter arises from the fact that most of the salmon-bearing streams on the western side of the Atlantic are located in Canada. The salmon resource has long been an important factor in the regional economy of our Atlantic provinces - a segment of the recreational industry (sports fishing) as well as a commercial fishing industry is based on it.

"Programs of research in the salmon resource and development of the resource by cultural means have been sponsored by the Canadian government for many years. Moreover, fishing operations have been closely restricted and substantial costs imposed on water-using industries to prevent impairment (through pollution and other ways) of the natural habitat. All this has been regarded as an investment to preserve a resource, the yield of which would accrue in large part to the national economy. The importance of the Greenland fishery to the livelihood of the native people is recognized, of course, but if the resource were to be damaged to the point where it could no longer provide a return sufficient to justify the programs and protective measures just mentioned, these probably would have to be abandoned - to the detriment of the international community."

Mr Aglen (UK) spoke of the UK interest in the effect of the fishery along West Greenland on the salmon stocks in UK waters and expressed the hope that Denmark would give careful consideration to Mr MacKenzie's statement. He expressed his pleasure that more research was planned.

Mr Løkkegaard (Denmark) said that he had taken note of the statements regarding the West Greenland salmon fishery. He pointed out that there was a need for much more research on the problem before any action which could seriously affect the economy of Greenland could be taken. He assured the member countries that every consideration and care would be given by his Government to this matter.

(over)

Dr Cole (UK) drew attention to the recommendation of the Research and Statistics Committee that the ambiguity found by the USSR in the description of the taper of the ICNAF mesh measuring gauge be drawn to the attention of the Commission. Dr Bogdanov (USSR) said that the USSR delegation agreed with the interpretation given by Canada and USA that the gauge decreases in width by 2 cm in each 8 cm of its length (Proc. 1, Appendix V, paragraph 9).

The Plenary accepted, unanimously, Addendum 1 and 2 to the Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics. Dr Cole (UK) spoke of the fine work of the members of the Research and Statistics Committee and of its Chairman, Dr Templeman (Canada), and Rapporteur, Mr Parrish (UK). The Plenary marked its appreciation with applause.

3. Under Plenary Item 26, "Report of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration", Mr Green (USA), Chairman of the Committee, presented the Report of the First (Proc. 11), Second (Proc. 12) and Third (Proc. 17) Meetings of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration. Mr Villegas (Spain) repeated the kind invitation of his Government to hold the 1966 Annual Meeting of the Commission in Spain. Mr Fulham (USA) repeated the kind invitation of his Government to hold the 1967 Annual Meeting of the Commission in Boston, Massachusetts. The Chairman expressed the Commission's sincere thanks for these invitations and announced the 1966 Annual Meeting for Spain beginning on 6 June and following days and the 1967 Annual Meeting for Boston, Mass. on 5 June and following days. Mr Aglen (UK) spoke of the immediate and good effects of the adopted amendments to the Commission's Regulations on Finance and Administration in lowering the amount to be appropriated from member countries while meeting the estimated operating costs of the Commission's Secretariat in 1965/66.

The Plenary accepted, unanimously, the Reports of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration.

4. The Chairman then called for consideration of the Report of the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations (Proc. 13) which had had referred Plenary Items 12, Infringements, 13, Topside codend protection, and 15, Exemptions. Mr Aglen (UK), Chairman of the Committee, presented the Report, with the following additions (1) paragraph 1 to be changed to include a third meeting of the Committee on 11 June, (2) change the heading of paragraph 3(b) to read "Exemption regulation for Subareas 3 and 4", (3) change the heading of paragraph 4 to read "Procedures for acceptance of regulations in Subareas 1-4", (4) change line 6 of the recommendation in paragraph 4 to read "in full to supercede all previous recommendations". Mr Fulham (USA) pointed out that, in order to avoid possible misunderstanding in the amendments proposed by the Committee to replace the term "groundfish" with the names of fish species intended in paragraph 1 of the trawl regulations adopted in 1964 for Subareas 1, 2 and 3 (Proc. 13, paragraph 3(a)) the following should be added "It is understood that paragraphs 1(a) and 1(b) will follow and remain part of the new regulation".

Mr Aglen (UK) pointed out the need for approval by Panels 1-4 of regulations proposed to the Commission in the ad hoc Committee Report.

The Plenary agreed to resolve itself into a Joint Meeting of Panels 1-4 with Mr Aglen (UK) as Chairman at 10:15 a. m.

The Chairman of the Commission reconvened the Plenary after the Joint Meeting of Panels 1-4 was adjourned at 10:30 a. m. The Plenary then unanimously adopted the recommendations of the ad hoc Committee as agreed to by the Panels and also the complete Report of the ad hoc Committee.

5. The Chairman then called for consideration of the Reports of the Second (Proc. 10), Third (Proc. 15), and Fourth (Proc. 18) Meetings of Commissioners, which had deliberated on Plenary Items 16, Joint enforcement, 17, Status of

Commission Recommendations, 18, Effecting Commission Proposals, 19, Review of possible conservation actions for the ICNAF Area, and 24, Co-operation with other international organizations.

The Report of the Fourth Meeting of Commissioners (Proc. 18) was read by the Executive Secretary. It was agreed that the Report was correct and should be presented to the Plenary without change. The Plenary accepted, unanimously, all Reports. It was agreed by the Plenary that the Chairman should decide who would represent the Commission at the meeting proposed by FAO for the autumn of 1965 to examine FAO outlines of plans for developing economic indicators and methods of using them in economic assessment of fishery management.

6. Under Plenary Item 23, Reports by Commission Observers, the Plenary took note that Reports of Commission Observers are included in Research and Commissioners' Documents presented to the meeting.

7. Under Plenary Item 30, Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman, the Chairman called for nominations for Chairman. Mr T. Fulham (USA) was nominated and accepted unanimously by the Plenary as Chairman of the Commission for the 1965/66 and 1966/67 sessions. Mr V. Kamentsev (USSR) was unanimously accepted Vice-Chairman of the Commission for the same period.

8. Under Plenary Item 29, Other business, the Chairman acknowledged statements by Mr Mocklinghoff (Germany) as Observer from NEAFC, by Dr Cole (UK) as Observer from ICES, by Mr Boerema (FAO) as Observer from FAO and Mr Isogai (Japan) as Observer from Japan. The Chairman thanked the Canadian and Nova Scotia Governments and the City of Halifax for their cooperation and hospitality, the Nova Scotia Fish Packers' Association and the Canadian Atlantic Salt Fish Exporters Association for providing the transportation to visit the National Sea Products plant in Lunenburg, N. S. He thanked all participants and observers for their contributions to the success of the meeting and asked the new Chairman, Mr Fulham (USA), to take the chair. Mr Fulham thanked the Commission for the honour and referred to the high standard of service and efficiency set by the former Chairman, Mr Sunnanaa.

9. The Fifteenth Meeting of the Commission adjourned at 11:15 a. m.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1965

Officers

Chairman of Commission - Mr K. Sunnanaa (Norway)
Vice-Chairman of Commission - Mr F. P. Briggs (USA)
Executive Secretary - Mr L. R. Day (ICNAF Secretariat)

Panels

Chairman, Panel 1 - Mr G. Mocklinghoff (Fed. Rep. Germany)
Scientific Advisers - Dr P. Hansen (Denmark)
Chairman, Panel 2 - Mr A. J. Aglen (UK)
" Scientific Advisers - Dr A. S. Bogdanov (USSR)
Chairman, Panel 3 - Mr W. MacKenzie (Canada)
" Scientific Advisers - Dr H. W. Graham (USA)
Chairman, Panel 4 - Capt. T. deAlmeida (Portugal)
" Scientific Advisers - Dr J. L. Hart (Canada)
Chairman, Panel 5 - Mr W. MacKenzie (Canada)
" Scientific Advisers - Dr S. A. Studenetsky (USSR)

Research and Statistics

Chairman of Standing Committee on
Research and Statistics - Dr W. Templeman (Canada)

Finance and Administration

Chairman of Standing Committee on
Finance and Administration - Mr R. Green (USA)

