



PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
16TH ANNUAL MEETING

1966

CONTENTS

- Proceedings No.1 - Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics. with Appendices (published as Redbook 1966, Part I, and not included hereunder)
- Proceedings No.2 - Report of Meeting of Panel 1, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.3 - Report of Meeting of Panel 3, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.4 - Report of Meeting of Panel 2, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.5 - Report of Meeting of Panel 4, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.6 - Report of First Plenary Session, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.7 - Report of Inaugural Meeting
- Proceedings No.8 - Report of Meeting of Panel 5, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.9 - Report of First Meeting of Commissioners
- Proceedings No.10 - Report of First Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration
- Proceedings No.11 - Report of Second Meeting of Commissioners
- Proceedings No.12 - Report of Meeting of Panel A
- Proceedings No.13 - Report of Second Plenary Session
- Proceedings No.14 - Report of Second Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration
- Proceedings No.15 - Report of Special Plenary Session
- Proceedings No.16 - Report of Third Meeting of Commissioners, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.17 - Report of First Meeting of ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation
- Proceedings No.18 - Report of Third Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, with Appendices
- Proceedings No.19 - Report of Second Meeting of ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation
- Proceedings No.20 - Report of Third Meeting of ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.21 - Report of Fourth Meeting of ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.22 - Report of Fourth Meeting of Commissioners
- Proceedings No.23 - Report of Fourth Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration
- Proceedings No.24 - Report of Fifth Meeting of ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.25 - Report of Third Plenary Session
-

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Index to Major Items

Annual Meeting 1968	Proc.14
Budget	
1966/67	Proc.18, App.I
1967/68	Proc.18, App.II
Conservation	
Bio-Economic Assessment	Proc.11, Proc.16, App.I
Greenland cod	Proc.2, 13, 24
North Atlantic salmon	Proc.2, 25
Seals	Proc.12, 15, 25
Convention Articles	
Status	Proc.9
Financial Regulations	
Amendments	Proc.10
Salaries	Proc.10
Trawl Regulations	
Amendments	Proc.24, App.I
Codend protection <u>or</u> topside chafers	Proc.19
Infringements	Proc.17
International Inspection	Proc.9, 16
Mesh Measuring	Proc.20, 21 App.I
Simple Codification	Proc.25
Status	Proc.9

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of Meeting of Panel 1Tuesday, 7 June, 1600 hr.

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr H. A. Cole (UK). Representatives of all member countries of the Panel were present.
2. Rapporteur. Mr B. B. Parrish (UK) was appointed as Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda as circulated was amended by the introduction of West Greenland salmon as a separate item.
4. Panel Membership. No changes in panel membership were proposed.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. The Chairman of Scientific Advisers (Dr P. M. Hansen, Denmark) presented a summary of the status of fisheries and researches carried out in Subarea 1 (Res. Doc. 66/82). The Report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers (Appendix I) was also considered. Dr Hansen was thanked by the Chairman for his excellent and informative summary.
6. West Greenland Salmon. The Chairman drew the Panel's attention to the draft Report of the ICES/ICNAF Joint Working Party on North Atlantic Salmon (Res. Doc. 66/78). He informed the Panel that the draft report had not yet received the approval of all members of the Working Party of ICES. Pending their approval, the report must be regarded as provisional and no part of its conclusions could be released to the press. He had been informed that steps were being taken to circulate the draft report to all members of the Working Party and to the President of ICES and to obtain the approval of ICES for a joint press statement.

The Panel noted that the Research and Statistics Committee, through its Assessment Subcommittee, had examined the draft report and had endorsed its recommendations for further research and had recommended that ICNAF scientists give every assistance in carrying them out. In this connection the UK delegate expressed appreciation of the help given by Denmark in the development of a cooperative research program.

The Panel agreed that steps should be taken to ensure that the recommendations of the Working Party regarding future research could be implemented and

recommended

that the ICES/ICNAF Joint Working Party on North Atlantic Salmon continue its studies and be given the necessary support to enable it to do so and present a further agreed report at the 1967 meeting of the Commission.

7. Review of Conservation Measures and Requirements including consideration of further protective measures for small cod at West Greenland and the effects of a possible closure of Store Hellefiske Bank. The Chairman drew attention to the final Report of the Greenland Cod Working Group (Res. Doc. 66/77), the supporting papers (Res. Docs. 66/18, 66/56 and 66/72) and the relevant section of the Report of the Research and Statistics Committee. The

(over)

Research and Statistics Committee had supported the main conclusions of the Working Group which showed that long-term gains in catches of cod could be expected in Subarea 1 as a whole both from the closure of Div. 1B to trawlers alone or to all forms of fishing, and from an increase in mesh size to 150 mm either alone or together with closure. It was noted that no mesh regulations were currently in force in Subarea 1.

After a statement by the representative of Denmark in support of its 1965 proposal for the closure of Div. 1B to trawlers, representatives of all member countries commented on the conclusions of the report and expressed their interest in measures to protect the small cod at West Greenland. The representative of Portugal said that in principle he was prepared to consider the closure of Store Hellefiske Bank to trawlers but a majority was of the opinion that mesh regulation rather than closure would be the appropriate measure at this stage. The representative of Norway proposed a manila minimum mesh size of 130 mm, which would be in conformity with that recently adopted for the northwestern part of Region 1 of the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC). This proposal received support from the majority of members but the representative of Spain stated that there would be difficulty for his country because its regulations prescribed a uniform mesh size of 114 mm for the whole Convention Area. The representative of Portugal also referred to practical difficulties if different minimum mesh sizes were adopted for the various parts of the ICNAF area.

On motion of Germany, seconded by Iceland, the Panel agreed to

recommend

that a minimum mesh size for trawl codends of 130 mm (manila) be introduced in Subarea 1, to come into effect, if possible, on 1 June 1967 (the date of introduction of 130 mm mesh size in the adjoining NEAFC area).

8. Future Research. The Chairman drew attention to the recommendations for further research contained in the reports of the ~~ICNAF/ICNAF~~ ^{ICNAF/ICNAF} Working Party on North Atlantic Salmon and the West Greenland Cod Working Group. He also referred to the desirability of obtaining more information on the inter-relationship of the cod stocks of West Greenland and Labrador as suggested in the meeting of Panel 2. The need for this work was supported. The recommendation of the Environmental Subcommittee regarding the presentation of a synopsis of meteorological and hydrographic conditions in the Davis Strait area was also noted.

9. Date and Place of Next Meeting. It was agreed that the Panel should meet during the 17th Annual Meeting of ICNAF.

10. Other Business. There was no other business.

11. Panel Report. It was agreed that the Chairman and Rapporteur would prepare the Panel Report in draft form and circulate it among members for their approval.

12. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 1730 hr.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 1

Saturday, 4 June, 1830 hr.

1. The Chairman, Dr P. M. Hansen (Denmark), opened the meeting and Mr S. A. Horsted (Denmark) was appointed Rapporteur. The following Panel 1 member countries were represented: Denmark, Germany, Norway, Poland, Spain, UK and USSR. Representatives from Canada, USA and FAO attended the meeting.

2. The Chairman read the "Summary of Research and Status of Fisheries in Subarea 1, 1965" (Res. Doc. 66/82). He said that the various national research reports now have a form which makes it much easier to prepare the summary but also stressed that countries should submit their reports early so that they could be dealt with properly.

Several members had comments on the Chairman's summary report and provided some amendments now included in the revised summary report. Amendments to some of the national research reports were also reported.

Dr Cole (UK) asked whether the Danish redfish tagging experiments in Godthaab Fjord gave any returns and the Chairman informed the advisers that several tagged redfish were returned. Most of them were caught at the tagging locality but some were caught by trawlers in the southern part of Subarea 1 and off southeast Greenland. This may indicate a spawning migration of redfish from West Greenland to the Irminger Sea. The recaptured specimens show a very slow growth rate.

Dr Dickie (Canada) asked for further information on small cod caught inshore in pound nets. The Chairman said that pound net fishery took place in May-July, and often great quantities of small cod (20-40 cm) were caught. Such fish will, however, survive when properly discarded and introduction of a minimum size for cod caught in pound nets was therefore now being considered by Denmark.

3. Referring to the Panel 1 recommendation from the 1965 meeting concerning protection of small cod at West Greenland, the Chairman called upon Mr Gulland (UK) to report on the findings of the Greenland Cod Working Group. Mr Gulland gave a short review of the work carried out. The final report of the Working Group is distributed as Res. Doc. 66/77 to which the Advisers were invited to refer.

The Greenland Cod Working Group believes it has finished the work given to it last year, but as some additional work may be requested some time in the future, special attention must be given to the basic data needed for such future work and member countries are therefore urged to try to fill the gaps now occurring in their sampling and statistics.

No further discussion on conservation measures took place, but it was noted that at present the younger year-classes (1962-64) in the Greenland cod stocks are poor year-classes, and hence the immediate loss by introduction of conservation measures to protect small cod would be rather small in this and

(over)

the following two years.

4. The Chairman asked Mr Gulland (UK) to report on the work carried out by the ~~ICES/ICNAF/ICM~~ ~~ICES/ICNAF/ICM~~ Salmon Working Party. The preliminary results are given in Res. Doc. 66/79 and in the 1966 report of the Subcommittee on Assessment. No further discussion on the salmon problems took place.

5. Several member countries reported on their plans for future research work in Subarea 1. It was especially noted that USSR will continue their long series of hydrographical observations and that Denmark next year expects to get a new research vessel for Greenland waters.

6. Dr P. M. Hansen was re-elected Chairman of the Panel 1 Advisers for the ensuing year.

7. As there was no other business, the meeting adjourned at 1925 hr.



Serial No. 1717
(B. e. 66)

Proceedings No. 3

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Report of Meeting of Panel 3

Tuesday, 7 June, 1145 hr.

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr O. Rodriguez Martin (Spain). All member countries of the Panel were represented.
2. Rapporteur. Dr L. M. Dickie (Canada) was chosen as Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda was adopted without change.
4. Panel Membership. The panel membership was reviewed; no changes were noted.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr Graham, the Chairman of the Scientific Advisers, first presented his report on the status of the fisheries and review of researches carried out in Subarea 3 (Res. Doc. 66/81) according to the new format suggested at the 1965 Annual Meeting (1965 Meeting Proceedings No. 5). He first reviewed Part I (Detailed tables of total nominal catches by countries in 1964 and 1965) then tables for each species by countries with appended notes drawn from documents submitted to the meeting on the information on trends. He drew attention to the relatively large amounts of "flounders" and "other groundfish" which are not identified by species, in the statistical submissions, and to a recommendation of the Research and Statistics Committee that these should be identified wherever possible. He then reviewed Part II (Assessments), Part III (Additional Researches) and Part IV (Additional Researches Required).

The Panel noted that the wording "Assessments" for Part II of the report was somewhat vague, since the stocks now being fished in the Subarea were not necessarily the major stocks in the area. Mr Gulland, Chairman of the Assessment Subcommittee, noted for the information of the Panel that the stocks referred to by the Assessment Subcommittee were the stocks of cod and haddock in Subarea 3.

The Chairman drew the attention of the Panel to the information in the Spanish Research Report (Res. Doc. 66/38) that in Subarea 3 in 1965 landings by Spanish pair trawlers, for the first time, exceeded those by Spanish otter trawlers. Mr Espada (Spain) commented on the trend toward pair trawling and noted that technical changes were being made in the vessels to simplify the changing from one type of fishing to the other.

Dr Graham presented the report of the meeting of Scientific Advisers which was adopted for appending to this report of the Panel.

6. Review of New Reporting Form. The Panel expressed its gratitude to Dr Graham for the great amount of work put into preparation of his detailed report. The Panel agreed that this format generally met its requirements, but that since details on landings of species by countries was otherwise available at the meeting, in future, reports of detailed tables should be presented only for total nominal catches by countries, and nominal catch by countries for cod, haddock, and redfish. Information on other species should be given in a condensed table.

(over)

7. Review of Conservation Measures. The Panel agreed that there were no special items concerning Panel 3 uniquely, and that further discussions were a subject for the general meetings of the Commission.

8. Future Research. The Panel noted the recommendation of the Research and Statistics Committee that additional researches were needed on the cod population of Div. 3K and 3L.

9. Date and Place of Future Meetings. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Panel and its Scientific Advisers should take place in conjunction with the 1967 Annual Meeting of ICNAF.

10. Other Business. There was no other business to be discussed.

11. Approval of Panel Report. It was agreed that a draft report of the meeting would be circulated to members for their approval.

12. The meeting was adjourned at 1245 hr.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 3Saturday, 4 June, 1200 hr.

1. The Chairman, Dr H. W. Graham, presided over the meeting. Representatives of the following countries were present: Canada, Poland, Spain, USSR, UK and USA.
2. Dr J. L. Hart was appointed Rapporteur.
3. It was agreed to make use of the agenda as prepared for the Panel.
4. The Chairman explained that some Panel members were critical of the pattern of reporting to panels in general use throughout the group of scientific Advisers. Dr Graham had been instructed by the Panel to prepare as an experiment his reports in such a way as to emphasize the information of primary interest to panel members in directing management of the fisheries. Dr Graham read his report which was approved for submission to the Panel with the agreement that certain changes and corrections be incorporated. It was pointed out that judgement on the form of the report was the responsibility of the Panel. There was evidence of confusion between statistics of halibut and Greenland halibut. It is suggested that the Secretariat be asked to examine the possibility of errors and to make any necessary corrections in the official figures.

The Advisers point out that it would be advantageous for scientific study to have flounder species reported as much as possible by species, and asked that participating countries be asked to provide statistics by species as far as possible.
5. The Assessment Group had no special studies on assessment to report. Mr Gulland commented on the futility in expecting the Committee to provide fruitful opinions based on hurried analyses on ad hoc tasks at annual meetings.
6. It was noted that there was a special need for assessment of cod stocks in Div. 3K and 3L.
7. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Advisers should be in connection with the 1967 Annual Meeting of ICNAF as arranged by the Secretariat.
8. It was agreed that the Chairman and Rapporteur should prepare a report on the meeting and consider the criticism of the national groups in preparing a final draft.
9. Dr H. W. Graham was re-elected Chairman.
10. There was no further business and the meeting closed at 1325 hr.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Report of Meeting of Panel 2

Tuesday, 7 June, 1030 hr.

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Mr A. J. Aglen (UK), All member countries were represented along with observers from FAO.
2. Rapporteur. Dr McCracken (Canada) was elected Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda, as circulated in advance, was adopted without change.
4. Panel Membership. No changes in panel memberships were proposed.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr A. W. May (Canada), substituting for Dr A. Bogdanov who was unable to be present, 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 1965" (Res. Doc. 66/71). This latter report had been adopted by the Panel Advisers. Dr May drew attention to the marked increase in landings of Subarea 2 cod and the increase in fishing activity which had occurred mainly in Div. 2J. He noted in particular problems for cod concerning stock definition, mortality rates, growth rates and recruitment as outlined in the report of the Panel Advisers. He drew the attention of the Panel to Item 8 of the Panel Advisers' Report which endorsed recommendations from the Assessment and Environmental Subcommittees for future research in the area.

It was agreed that the Panel Advisers' Report be appended to the report of the Panel meeting and the Chairman thanked the Chairman of Scientific Advisers and his colleagues on the results of their efforts to provide a digest of their discussions for panel members.
6. Review of Conservation Measures. The Chairman noted that so far none of the conservation measures recommended for the subarea had entered into force. No further measures were proposed but the Panel took note of the present position as outlined in the Report of the Research and Statistics Committee.
7. Future Research. Proposals for future research as outlined in the Panel Advisers' Report were discussed and supported. Dr Meyer pointed out the particular need for tagging of spawning cod in Div. 2G and 2H to obtain further information on cod stock separation.
8. Date and Place of next meeting. The recommendation from Panel Advisers that they should meet on the Saturday preceding the next Annual Meeting was adopted.

It was agreed that the next meeting of Panel 2 be held during the course of the 1967 Annual Meeting of ICNAF.

9. Other business. There was no other business proposed.
10. Approval of Panel Report. It was agreed that the Rapporteur should prepare the report and circulate it for approval.
11. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 1130 hr.



Serial No. 1719
(E. f. 66)

Proceedings No. 4
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 2

Saturday, 4 June, 0930 hr.

1. Dr A. W. May (Canada) acted as Chairman in the absence of Dr Bogdanov (USSR) who was unable to be present. Advisers were present from Canada, Germany, Poland, Spain, UK and USSR. The FAO representative also attended.
2. Dr J. Messtorff (Germany) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The Chairman proposed an agenda similar to that of the Panel Meeting and the Advisers agreed that this be followed.
4. The Chairman presented his summary report on status of the fisheries and research carried out in Subarea 2 during 1965 (Res. Doc. 66/71). The report was discussed and several amendments made, following which it was adopted for presentation to the Panel.
5. Dr Dickie (Canada) made reference to Dr May's note on natural mortality in Labrador cod (Res. Doc. 66/26) and noted the importance for assessment purposes of collecting information on mortality of various species before fisheries became intense. He noted that natural mortality may be greater when effort is low than when it is high because of possible replacement of natural mortality by fishing mortality in the latter situation.
6. The question of possible drift of cod larvae from West Greenland to Baffin Island and Labrador was discussed. Larval drift away from West Greenland is known to occur. However, further research is required to determine whether these larvae contribute to recruitment of cod stocks in Subarea 2. Dr Meyer (Germany) noted the possibility that cod from the northern part of the Subarea might occasionally move to the northeast, and spawn over great depths in the Labrador Sea. The Advisers agreed that further investigation of this possibility would be desirable. It was noted that the phenomenon of homing instinct (or back migration) in cod was relevant to these problems.
7. The Chairman reviewed research plans for 1966 as circulated by member countries and asked for further comment on these. Dr Templeman (Canada) reported that the hydrographic section occupied by Canada for some years would probably not be occupied in 1966 due to lack of vessel time. Dr Messtorff (Germany) noted that one research cruise to the Subarea had been made in 1966, and that no further field work was planned for this year. Dr Chrzan (Poland) reported that no research vessels would operate in Subarea 2 this year. Dr Alekseev (USSR) stated that Soviet research would continue along present lines.
8. The Chairman drew attention to recommendations of the Assessment and Environmental Subcommittees concerning future research requirements in Subarea 2, especially for cod. In view of increased cod catches in 1965, especially the relatively great increases in Div. 2G and 2H, the Advisers wish to endorse these recommendations, which include:

(over)

- (a) tagging of spawning cod in Div. 2G and 2H;
- (b) assessment of changes in age compositions and mortality rates from the offshore trawl fisheries;
- (c) further information on growth rates of cod from the offshore fishery and factors responsible for these changes;
- (d) information on environmental factors governing distribution and availability of cod in the area.

9. It was agreed that the next meeting of Scientific Advisers to the Panel should be held on the Saturday before the 1967 Annual Meeting.

10. It was agreed that the Report should be prepared by the Chairman and Rapporteur, in consultation with other Advisers as necessary.

11. Dr Bogdanov (USSR) was re-elected Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel 2 for the following year.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of Meeting of Panel 4Tuesday, 7 June, 1730 hr.

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman of the Commission, Mr Fulham (USA), in the absence of the Panel Chairman, Mr J. Rougé (France). Mr R. Letaconnoux (France) was elected Chairman. All member countries of the Panel were represented.
2. Rapporteur. Dr L. M. Dickie (Canada) was chosen as Rapporteur.
3. Agenda: The agenda, as circulated, was adopted without change.
4. Panel Memberships. The panel memberships were reviewed; no changes were noted.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr J. L. Hart (Canada), Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel 4, reviewed the report on status of the fisheries and researches in Subarea 4 (Res. Doc. 66/78). He also presented the report of the meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 4, which was accepted by the Panel for attachment to these minutes. In this report he drew attention especially to the change in the character of the haddock fishery in 1965, need for re-assessment of the cod fishery in Div. 4T, new information on topside chafing gear, and the report of the ICNAF/ICES Working Party on North Atlantic Salmon.

Mr McKernan (USA) noted that the reason for the drop in Canadian haddock landings, simultaneously with the large increase in Soviet landings, was not explained in the report. Dr McCracken (Canada) said that the Canadian drop was apparently due to lowered availability of haddock during the time of the spring spawning concentration when the main fishery is pursued. Mr McKernan also requested further information on the difference in year-class strengths as reported by Canada and the USSR. Dr Alekseev (USSR) confirmed that the USSR catches appeared to be of the 1962 and 1963 year-classes, although the biological data supporting this were not immediately available, having been submitted to the ICNAF Secretariat for publication in the Sampling Yearbook. He also noted that the USSR catch was made in the autumn in shallow water, following disappearance of the silver hake. Dr McCracken noted that while Canadian research vessel catches indicated that the 1962 year-class was moderately strong, the 1963 year-class appeared to be much better; however, these indications could not be confirmed for some time since the 1962 and 1963 year-classes would not enter the Canadian commercial fishery in numbers until 1967 or 1968.
6. Review of Conservation Measures. Dr Needler (Canada) noted the report of the Research and Statistics Committee on the Polish-type topside chafing gear. Discussion of its possible approval for use in Subarea 4 was deferred pending reporting to the Commission by the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations.
7. Future Research. The Panel noted the report of the Scientific Advisers, calling for the following new research programs:

(over)

- (a) A re-assessment of the cod fishery of Div. 4T;
- (b) A taxonomic study of the hakes of Subarea 4;
- (c) Further researches on chafing gear of the Polish type.

8. Date and Place of Next Meeting. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Panel and its Advisers would be held in conjunction with the 1967 Annual Meeting of ICNAF.

9. Other Business. There was no other business.

10. Report Approval. It was agreed that a draft report would be circulated for approval.

11. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 1830 hr.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 4Saturday, 4 June, 1130 hr.

1. Dr J. L. Hart (Canada) opened the meeting as Chairman. Representatives from Canada, USSR, USA and Spain were present. Federal Republic of Germany and Poland were represented by observers.
2. Mr K. R. Allen (Canada) was chosen as Rapporteur.
3. The meeting agreed that the agenda distributed for the Panel meeting should be followed as far as appropriate.
4. The meeting had no advice to offer on the membership of the Panel.
5. The Chairman presented his report on fisheries and research in 1965 in Subarea 4 (Res. Doc. 66/78). This report was discussed and adopted for presentation to the Panel with minor amendments.
6. Dr Dickie (Canada) stated that the report of the Assessment Subcommittee was in substantial agreement with the Chairman's report on the status of the fisheries in the subarea.
7. The Chairman referred to the large catches of haddock by USSR in Subarea 4 in 1965 and asked the USSR if there was undistributed information on its extensive new fishery. The representatives of the USSR stated that the 1963 year-class was very strong. Mr McKernan (USA) asked whether the 1963 year-class, which would not normally enter the fishery at this stage, had contributed to the increased catch. Dr Studenetsky (USSR) stated that USSR started fishing for haddock in the second half of 1965 after the catches of silver hake declined. Available biological data are being reported to the ICNAF Secretariat in the usual way for inclusion in the Sampling Yearbook. It could be said now that the catches were dominated by the 1962 and 1963 year-classes, but analyses had not yet been completed. It was hoped to submit a research report on this to the next ICNAF meeting. Dr McCracken (Canada) pointed out that no data on the mesh sizes used for haddock in Subarea 4 in 1965 had been included in the USSR reporting. There was some discussion as to whether age composition data should be included in the national research reports to Annual Meetings or supplied only to the Sampling Yearbook. It was agreed that the full data should go to the Yearbook, but a summary should be included in the national research reports so as to be available to the meeting.
8. The Chairman pointed out the need for a new assessment of the cod of Div. 4T; Dr McCracken (Canada) said that since the last assessment was made several of the population parameters had changed and it was agreed that a re-assessment should be recommended to the Panel.
9. The Chairman referred to the increased abundance of redfish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Dr Graham (USA) confirmed that the evidence for this was based on catch-per-effort data.
10. In reply to a question from the Chairman, Dr Alekseev (USSR) stated that no additional information was available for the meeting regarding the

(over)

silver hake fishery beyond what was contained in the research reports.

11. The Chairman pointed out that 53,000 tons of miscellaneous species were included in the catches from the subarea and constituted about 7-8% of the total.

12. Dr McCracken (Canada) said that the Statistics and Sampling Subcommittee had made a recommendation for an ichthyological study to find a basis for separating red hake and white hake. It was agreed to recommend that the Panel support this recommendation (Res. Doc. 66/55).

13. Dr McCracken (Canada) drew attention to Res. Doc. 66/36 describing Polish experiments with a new type of chafing gear. This had been discussed by the Gear and Selectivity Subcommittee which had recommended that such experiments should be continued. It was agreed that the Panel should be advised to support this recommendation.

14. The Chairman drew attention to Res. Doc. 66/59 dealing with catches of unregulated species. This was the only report which had been received on this topic, on which the Panel last year had asked for reports. This document was noted for consideration by the Panel. Dr Graham stated that US redfish fishermen operating in the subarea mainly caught unregulated species.

15. The Chairman said that although there was no fishing for salmon in the subarea, the adjacent land provided important breeding areas. Mr Allen (Canada), who had been elected Chairman of the ICES/ICNAF Working Party on North Atlantic Salmon, reported on results obtained by the Working Party and on the possible effect of Greenland salmon fishing on salmon fishing in Subarea 4.

16. Mr Allen (Canada) summarized the report (Res. Doc. 66/34) on the Canadian seal fishery in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. He emphasized the need to examine further the estimates of sustainable yield of these animals.

17. Dr McCracken (Canada) drew attention to the difficulty in obtaining data on the state of halibut stocks in the subarea in the absence of a regular fishery for the species.

18. Dr Studenetsky (USSR) stated that in 1966 USSR will continue its work on age and size distribution in silver hake and haddock and will make selected hydrographical studies.

19. Mr Posgay (USA) stated that USA will continue its work on haddock and redfish and on plankton in the subarea. The Chairman said that Canadian research will continue along present lines in 1966.

20. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Panel Advisers should be held in conjunction with the next Annual Meeting of ICNAF at a time and place to be arranged by the Secretariat.

21. It was agreed that the Chairman and Rapporteur should draft the report to the Panel, and obtain clearance from the heads of member delegations.

22. Dr J. L. Hart (Canada) was re-elected Chairman.

23. The meeting adjourned at 1500 hr.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of First Plenary SessionMonday, 6 June, 1100 hr.

- Item 1. Opening. The First Plenary Session was called to order by the Chairman of the Commission, Mr T. Fulham (USA). Delegates from all member countries and Observers from FAO, GFCM, ICES, INPFC, IPHC, NEAFC, OECD, SCOR, and Japan were present. The Chairman in his opening statement (Appendix I) reviewed progress and asked delegates to make every effort to resolve the vital problems still facing the Commission.
- Item 2. Agenda. The agenda was adopted as presented.
- Item 3. Publicity. The Chairman, in accordance with past practice, appointed a Committee on Publicity consisting of the Chairman of the Commission and the Chairmen of the Standing Committees on Research and Statistics and on Finance and Administration. The Committee will control policy on publicity.
- Items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. Finance and Administration, 18, Harp and Hood Seals, 26, Date and Place of 1968 Annual Meeting. These Items were referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration. Under Item 18, Harp and Hood Seals, the Chairman instructed the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration to recommend member countries for participation in the Panel on Harp and Hood Seals for approval by Commissioners at their third meeting on Wednesday, 8 June.
- Item 10. Status of Proposals, 11, Eliminating Obstruction to Proposals, 15, Exchange of Inspection Officers, 16, Form of International Inspection System, 17, Possible Conservation Actions, 19, Fishing and Navigational Practices. These Items were referred to a meeting of Commissioners.
- Item 12. Returns of Infringements, 13, Codend Protection, 14, Mesh Measuring. These Items were referred to an ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations with Mr A. J. Aglen (UK) as Chairman.
- Item 20. Report of Standing Committee on Research and Statistics. The Chairman asked Dr Templeman (Canada), Chairman of the Research and Statistics Committee, to present the Provisional Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics. The Chairman of Research and Statistics explained that the reports of the seven subcommittees would be appended to the Provisional Report and the full Report with appendices presented to the Plenary for approval after the last meeting of the Committee. The Chairman of the Commission thanked Dr Templeman for his presentation.

The meeting adjourned at 1155 hr.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR



THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 1724
(B. b. 66)

Proceedings No. 6
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Opening Statement at the First Plenary Session of ICNAF

by the Chairman, Mr T. Fulham

Fifteen years ago today some of you were attending the First Annual Meeting of this Commission. Since that time much has been accomplished toward achieving the purposes of the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries - the investigation, protection and conservation of the fisheries of the Northwest Atlantic Ocean for the stated purpose of making possible the maintenance of a maximum sustained yield from those fisheries.

Our greatest achievements have been in the investigation of the fisheries, the scientific work of the Research and Statistics Committee and the various national fisheries research bodies. Considerably more is known today about the abundance and extent of the fisheries stocks and the factors affecting their availability on a maximum sustainable basis. From time to time the scientists have concluded as a result of these investigations that measures were necessary for the protection and conservation of the stocks, and have made recommendations to the Commission to that end. The Commission in turn has proposed regulations to Governments, and certain of these proposals have entered into force after approval by the Governments participating in the Panel concerned - first in Subarea 5 and later in Subareas 3 and 4. These regulations have been concerned with minimum mesh size for nets. Now, however, our scientists have concluded that minimum mesh size regulations are inadequate and that other controls are necessary. This progressive thinking is commendable.

But, many of our minimum mesh size proposals have yet to enter into force, some dating from 1961.

The Commission is facing a major crisis, one which could adversely affect the entire future of the Commission unless we are able to resolve it. We accomplish little supplementing the minimum mesh size regulations until we have put those regulations into effect. Therefore, it is critical that we overcome the problems which have prevented these proposals from entering into force. If workable solutions should prove impossible, then we must devise some modification of the proposals or some new proposals which will achieve effective control over mesh sizes where needed.

We must do this at this meeting if at all possible.

If we do not succeed, we demonstrate failure in two important respects; the Commission fails in its task of protecting and conserving the fisheries of the Northwest Atlantic and we, as a group, weaken the possibility of this type of organization being effective anywhere in the world in the future.

As you know well the failure of the Commission's conservation measures to come into force has been due to the chafing gear problem, not through any fault of the basic proposals. These proposals have been approved by the thirteen governments with the exception of some minor amendments proposed at last year's meeting and no quarrel is known to exist concerning the 1965 proposals. The United States Government has not taken action on the 1965 proposals because it considers them defective, but because it considers it pointless

(over)

to go on taking action on amendments to previous proposals until we can determine if those proposals will enter into force.

We are all appreciative of the problems faced by those members utilizing large stern trawlers in the Convention Area in the use of topside chafing gear. We have no wish to impose undue burdens on these members in the use of their stern trawlers. On the other hand, we all have a great interest in bringing the needed conservation measures into force. The nations utilizing stern trawlers have, perhaps, an even greater interest in resolving the problem than do the other nations since the present regulations in force for Sub-areas 3, 4 and 5 do not permit, at the present time, the use of the types of topside chafing gear here in question when fishing for regulated species. Therefore, I am sure that we are all in agreement on the need to resolve the problem. The question is whether we can do so. I believe strongly that there is among us sufficient technological and administrative talent to bring about this resolution.

This is not the first time we have attacked the problem. In 1963 we adopted a proposal on the use of chafing gear which we hoped would put an end to the problem. Unfortunately it has not done so because we have been unable, up to the present, to approve certain types of chafing gear for use under the proposal. I hope sincerely that the necessary evidence will be presented at this meeting to enable us to approve the use of this chafing gear. If we can do so, the problem may be resolved by that action, the reservations which are holding up entry into force of the proposals will no longer be needed, and the proposals will enter into force upon the withdrawal of the reservations by the governments which have imposed them. We may then proceed with the appropriate regulations necessary for the conservation of the Northwest Atlantic fisheries, including, I hope, rapid action on bringing the 1965 amendments into force.

Other great and difficult problems lie ahead for the Commission. The catch of some species of greatest value has reached or passed the level of maximum sustainable amount and the total catch from the Northwest Atlantic continues to increase. New countries are beginning to fish the area and increased fishing effort is being added by many of us. The total result complicates the conservation problem and places a greater responsibility on the Commission to aggressively seek solutions to these complex common property problems of high seas fishing and to use all our abilities to reduce these problems to practical measures which can be successfully implemented. Many people in our countries and elsewhere are watching with great interest how we in this Commission resolve the fisheries conservation problems of the Northwest Atlantic. Let us resolve to make definite proposals towards our goal at this meeting.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR



THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 1724
(B. b. 66)

Proceedings No. 7

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Inaugural Meeting

Monday, 6 June, 1015 hr.

The Chairman, Mr T. A. Fulham (USA), opened the meeting and welcomed the Commissioners, Advisers, Observers and Guests to the 16th Annual Meeting of the Commission in the Instituto Nacional de Industria, 46 Padilla Street, Madrid, Spain. He introduced the following distinguished Spanish officials: Ilmo. Sr. D. Dámaro Berenguer, Director, Oceanographic Institute of Spain; Ilmo. Sr. D. Ignacio del Cuvillo y Merello, Director General of Fisheries; Excmo. Sr. D. Leopoldo Boada Enderza, Undersecretary of the Merchant Navy.

The Chairman then invited the Minister of Commerce, Excmo. Sr. D. Faustino Garcia Monco to address the meeting. The text of the Minister's address follows:

"It has been a great honour for us that the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries has accepted the Spanish Government's invitation to celebrate its 16th Annual Meeting at Madrid, and I have the pleasure of welcoming the Delegates, Advisers and Technicians from all the member countries of this Commission, as well as the Observers who attend representing other international organizations or interests relative to the fishing matters in the Northwest Atlantic.

"The exploitation of the biological resources of the sea, that is to say the fishing industry, is no longer an enterprise subject to unforeseen hazards, but has turned into a highly technical industry, and since human beings need for their sustenance the products obtained from the oceans, we must live in good harmony, not only among ourselves, but also with nature, in order to be able to avail ourselves of the resources that it generously offers us in the sea; but, at the same time, respecting the natural laws and principles that rule the development of such resources in order to avoid their exhaustion.

"For a long time, fishing has been exercised in an anarchical way, with the sole idea of increasing the catch, without paying any attention to the harmful consequences that this 'abundance economy' could cause in the biological balance of species.

"Today things have changed, and we observe, with pleasure, that new ideas, the consequence of thorough technical investigations, are channeling the fishing industry toward a 'more reasonable exploitation of the sea'. This is more significant to us because, for Spain which is a country with mariner vocations, the fishing industry constitutes a most important part of its economy.

"Spain has the maximum interest in the preservation of the Northwest Atlantic fishing wealth, because the Newfoundland, Labrador, Nova Scotia and Greenland 'stocks' have been for hundreds of years important food sources for our people, as dried or salted fish, in times when we have been short of fresh fish or, in the interior, where the latter could not arrive in good condition.

"The developments introduced in the fishing fleets and the better transportation have made it easier to bring the fish to all towns, no matter where they are located, but nevertheless the Spanish people continue to like dried and

(over)

salted codfish, notwithstanding the available facilities for obtaining it fresh.

"The preference of the Spanish people for the codfish began in historical times when the Vasco fishermen (the French and Spanish ones) pursuing whales, discovered the rich Newfoundland 'stocks'.

"By the second quarter of the XVIth century, our fishermen were already carrying out normal fishing operations based on these 'stocks' and about 6,000 men went to the Newfoundland fishery each year, manning more than 200 fishing vessels, that left from our ports at the Cantábrico.

"Our anxiety and interest in the future of these fisheries has already been made evident and consequently we were present at Washington in 1949 for collaborating first in the wording, and afterwards signing, the 'International Fisheries Convention' which handed over to this 'Commission' the difficult task of attaining the objective established by it, that is to say 'to maintain the North-west Atlantic fisheries at the highest production level and in a continued way'.

"Today any regulation intended to attain the maximum benefits in the exploitation of live resources must necessarily have a technical and scientific basis.

"From the very beginning this Commission has been lucky to be able to count on the invaluable services of its Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, where the most prominent technicians come together to study the resource and give valuable scientific advice.

"This Committee has done extraordinary work, collecting and publishing the international statistics of catches, production, determining net 'selectivity', etc., studying the species 'demographie', the physical and chemical conditions of the sea and even more, the Committee has succeeded when it has ventured into the intricate problem of 'predicting' the catches.

"Recommendations and suggestions made by the Research and Statistics Committee have helped the Commission to take decisions that have crystallized in the wording of international regulations that, for several reasons, need to be firmly seconded in order to put them into force and produce advantageous effects.

"Here are gathered delegations of the fishery science and of the administrations of several countries, which are willing to maintain and, if possible, increase the catches from an ocean area that we must exploit together, without producing any harm to its natural development.

"I hope that we shall agree with the idea that, in order to attain our objective, we need the efficient collaboration of the fisherman and if we want to get it, we must pay particular attention to his professional qualifications, giving him a thorough understanding of his responsibility.

"By our doing so, the fisherman shall be able to understand better the need for regulations and shall be better prepared to comply with them, to collaborate in the research work, to recover 'tags', to furnish true statistics, etc., because we can't forget that the fisherman is the one who maintains a permanent contact with the sea and fishes and, therefore, he shall be not only the first one to benefit from our success but constitutes the first link of its elaboration.

"In consequence, I am glad to be able to inform you that in Spain we are trying hard to give greater improvement to those professional qualifications by establishing schools of a high technical level; some of them, as the one at Vigo, are already at work and we hope that in a short time our fishermen shall attain

the professional qualifications needed to facilitate and encourage the attainment of our objectives.

"I don't want to take the time that you need for your interesting discussions. I know that you have a very full agenda with plenty of items to be studied during the next few days.

"I wish you great success in your discussions and I must tell you, at the same time, that I have confidence in your knowledge and experience and that I am sure that you will attain your proposed objectives.

"I hope that you will feel at home in our country and we sincerely wish that, when the time to say good-bye arrives, besides the satisfaction of accomplished duty, you will have good and lasting memories of Spain and her people."

The Chairman of the Commission thanked the Minister for his warm welcome and good wishes and declared the meeting adjourned at 1100 hr.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Report of Meeting of Panel 5

Wednesday, 8 June, 0900 hr.

1. The meeting was opened by Mr V. M. Kamentsev (USSR), who replaced Dr A. S. Bogdanov (USSR) as Chairman.
2. The Chairman proposed and the Panel agreed that Mr J. A. Posgay (USA) should act as Rapporteur.
3. The Chairman proposed and the Panel agreed to the adoption of the agenda as circulated.
4. There were no new applications for membership in the Panel so the composition remains unchanged.
5. The report of the meeting of Scientific Advisers to the Panel was read. There were no comments or amendments and it was agreed to make the report an appendix to the report of the Panel Meeting.
6. There were no new proposals for conservation measures in the subarea and it was agreed that all measures now in force should be continued.
7. Mr R. W. Green (USA) asked Dr H. W. Graham (USA) to comment on the 10% annual exemption for cod and haddock. Dr Graham reviewed Res. Doc. 66/83 which reports that only 6.4% of the trips by US vessels operating under exemption certificates exceeded the trip allowance. The excess poundage landed by these trips amounted to 0.4% of total US landings for cod and 0.3% for haddock.

There were no other reports on this matter and the Panel agreed to keep the situation under review.

8. The Chairman reported that Comm. Doc. 66/5 shows that all Panel Members have adopted the trawl regulations as set down in ICNAF Annual Proceedings Vol. 14, p. 17.

Dr Studenetsky (USSR) observed that all of the proposals for conservation in the subarea had been adopted by the USSR and were now included in the rules and regulations issued to their fishermen. Mr McKernan (USA) asked if the Panel was required to act on the matter of accepting the mesh-size equivalents for nets made of different materials and measured by different gauges. After some discussion, Mr McKernan proposed adoption of the amendment to the trawl regulations for cod and haddock in Subarea 5, as shown on page 17 of the Annual Proceedings, Vol. 14, Part 2, Section 9, Subsections (IX) and (X).

Dr Needler (Canada) supported the proposal and it was adopted.

9. The Chairman reported that future research in the subarea was covered in the Report of the Chairman of Scientific Advisers. Dr Graham was asked to report on the progress of the plans for an environmental survey of the Georges Bank-Gulf of Maine area. He stated that the USA and the USSR had submitted a proposal (Res. Doc. 66/50) which had been considered by the Environmental Subcommittee. Since there did not seem to be a sufficient

(over)

number of research vessels available to carry out the proposed program, a working group had been set up to revise the program in the light of the resources available. The report of this Working Group (Annex 1 of Appendix IV of the Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics) states that the USSR, USA, UK and Canada will exchange information on their past and present efforts on problems of a similar nature during the coming year and produce a revised plan for consideration at the 1967 meeting of the Research and Statistics Committee.

There were no other comments. The Chairman moved adoption of the proposal for the Georges Bank survey and the Panel agreed.

10. The Chairman suggested that the next meeting of the Panel be held at the time of the next Annual Meeting. The Panel agreed.

11. There was no other business.

12. The Panel agreed that the Rapporteur should prepare a draft report of the meeting and that the Panel would reconvene later to review the draft, amend it if necessary, and then approve it.

13. The Chairman thanked all participants in the meeting for their help in conducting the meeting rapidly and efficiently. The meeting adjourned at 0935 hr.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report on Meeting of Advisers to Panel 5Saturday, 4 June, 1625 hr.

1. The Chairman, Dr S. A. Studenetsky (USSR), opened the meeting with representatives from the member countries, Canada, USA, and USSR, represented. Observers from Germany, Poland and UK were also present.
2. Dr F. D. McCracken (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The Chairman presented his summary report outlining the status of fisheries and research studies carried out during 1965 (Res. Doc. 66/80). The following points were noted with special interest:
 - (a) that total landings from the Subarea had increased by about 100,000 metric tons in 1965;
 - (b) that the landings of herring had decreased markedly, mainly as a result of reduced effort by the USSR on Georges Bank;
 - (c) that landings of haddock had increased about 120% in 1965, with all countries fishing haddock increasing their landings, but the greatest increase in landings resulted from the diversion of USSR effort;
 - (d) that sea scallop landings had decreased both as a result of diversion of effort to a more southern region and a decrease in catch-per-effort on Georges Bank.
4. Silver hake. The USSR reported that even though the fishery had increased markedly, the great majority of silver hake taken were 3 and 4 years of age, as in previous years. It was agreed that this fact should be stressed to the Panel.
5. Haddock. The Panel Advisers pointed out the great need for samples of sizes and ages of haddock caught and landed and urged that each country fishing the stock provide such data. Canada and USA have been sampling landings and estimating discards. The USSR have reported on sizes of haddock caught by research vessels and promised to do so for their commercial vessels, beginning with 1966.
6. Scallop. The USA reported that measures of scallop availability on Georges Bank, both from research vessels and commercial vessel efforts, show reduced stocks of this species.
7. Industrial fish. The USA reported that about 35,000 metric tons of fish were landed for industrial purposes. The USSR reported that they had no fishery specifically for industrial purposes and were unable to report on quantities of by-catch used for industrial purposes.
8. Future Research. Canada reported that sampling of landings of groundfish for sizes and ages would be continued but that no research vessel surveys for these species are expected for Subarea 5. Research on scallops will be continued and herring will be studied in the area, including plankton surveys (eggs and larvae). Research on large pelagic species is expected to follow the fish and fishery and should include work in Subarea 5.

The USA will carry out oceanographic and plankton cruises related to herring biology both in coastal and offshore waters. Studies concerning

(over)

particularly behaviour of herring on Georges Bank will be attempted. A study on benthic organisms on Georges Bank is in progress. An intensive three year program of groundfish surveys is just completed and reporting will begin shortly. Fall surveys will continue as in previous years. Scallop surveys will also continue in spring and fall. Special plankton and midwater studies will be conducted in preparation for the planning of the cooperative Georges Bank Surveys.

The USSR expects to continue research on herring and silver hake at the same level and with continuing environmental, plankton and hydrological surveys with the main aim of determining the pattern of distribution of species. It expects to extend research studies to include haddock and will continue work begun in 1963 on herring eggs on spawning grounds on Georges Bank. Serological studies on silver hake will be continued.

Some non-member countries reported briefly on research work planned. Poland expects to collect material for studies of cod, haddock, redfish, flatfish, bottom fauna and plankton over a wide area including Georges Bank.

UK expects to continue continuous plankton recorder work and will stress publication of the work.

9. The Georges Bank Survey Proposal (USA-USSR). The USA and USSR reported that the Research and Statistics Committee has set up a small working party to revise the original Georges Bank Survey proposal with a view toward conducting a pilot study in 1968, the proposal to be submitted to the next Annual Meeting of ICNAF for review.

10. Time and Place of Next Meeting. It was agreed that Scientific Advisers to the Panel should meet prior to the Panel Meeting at the time of the next Annual Meeting of the Commission.

11. Dr S. A. Studenetsky was re-elected Chairman.

12. The meeting adjourned at 1730 hr.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of First Meeting of CommissionersMonday, 6 June, 1215 hr.

1. The Chairman, Mr Fulham (USA), opened the meeting. Commissioners from all member countries were present with their Advisers.
2. The Chairman noted that the Meeting of Commissioners had before it Items 10, 11, 15, 16, 17 and 19 from the Plenary Agenda.
3. The Chairman introduced Item 10, Status of Commission Proposals, and asked the Executive Secretary to present Comm. Doc. 66/5. The Executive Secretary advised the Meeting that, with the receipt by Depositary Government of ratification by Italy, the protocol to bring harp and hood seals under the provisions of the Convention entered into force 29 April 1966. He also advised that since completion of Comm. Doc. 66/5 notification had been received by Depositary Government on 1 June 1966 of United Kingdom acceptance of the ten proposals for international regulation of trawl fisheries adopted by the Commission on 12 June 1965. Mr Kamentsev (USSR) announced that USSR had, as of 22 April 1966, approved all ICNAF trawl regulations. All proposals regarding topside chafing gear were accepted with reservations for stern trawlers. Mr Sullivan (USA) pointed out that these acceptances had not yet reached Depositary Government which had made arrangements to cable any acceptances received during the present ICNAF meeting.
4. Under Plenary Item 11, Actions to Eliminate Obstruction to the Commission's Conservation Proposals, the meeting agreed to refer the matter to the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations for exploration of the difficulties due to the use of topside chafing gear.
5. Under Plenary Item 15, Exchanges of National Inspection Teams, Capt. Almeida (Portugal) reported on the exchange of Portuguese and Spanish inspectors (Comm. Doc. 66/12). He reported that Portugal and Germany had agreed to an exchange. He stressed the valuable experience gained by the Portuguese and Spanish teams. Dr Needler (Canada) reported that Canada had written to both Poland and France proposing an exchange of inspection teams and no reply had been received to date. France and Poland reported they have agreed in principle.
6. Under Plenary Item 16, Form of International Inspection System, Mr Kamentsev (USSR) and Mr Aglen (UK) both suggested that ICNAF use the experience of NEAFC in this problem as many countries are members of both NEAFC and ICNAF and the system should be one common to the whole North Atlantic. Mr Aglen said that the report of the NEAFC Special Committee on International Control (Comm. Doc. 66/14) had been studied by NEAFC at its Fourth Meeting in May 1966, which had agreed that a special meeting of NEAFC should be held in October or November 1966 to settle a number of outstanding questions. It was thought that NEAFC would like to have Canada, USA, and Italy, the non-NEAFC countries, join in the deliberations. Mr Aglen then suggested that since mesh measuring was the important problem for solution in any form of international inspection scheme, and it was being considered by the ad hoc Committee (Plenary Item 14), there would perhaps be helpful information coming from the ad hoc Committee. The Item was,

(over)

therefore, deferred until the ad hoc Committee had dealt with it.

7. The Chairman suggested that Plenary Item 17, Possible Conservation Actions, be deferred until after the Special Meeting of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics on economic aspects in fisheries management. The Meeting agreed.

8. The Chairman called for consideration of Plenary Item 19, Fishing and Navigation Practices, and referred to Comm. Doc. 66/15, the Report of the Fisheries Policing Conference, 1966. Mr Aglen (UK) reported that the Conference considered the draft Convention Articles and gave provisional agreement to some Articles but needed more time for thorough consideration of all Articles. The Conference agreed to a further meeting starting October and lasting at least two weeks hoping to complete adoption of a Convention. The Meeting agreed to take note of the Conference report and to follow closely the progress of the Conference.

9. The Meeting adjourned at 1330 hr.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of First Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and AdministrationTuesday, 7 June, 1300 hr.

- F&A Item 1. The Chairman, Mr R. Green (USA), welcomed Commissioners and their advisers from the member countries.
- 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 18, Harp and Hood Seals, referred to it by the First Plenary Session.
- F&A Item 4. Auditor's Report. The Auditor's Report for the fiscal year ending 30 June 1965 and Schedule I showing details of the "transfer to Working Capital Fund from General Fund in accordance with the revised Financial Regulations effective 12 June 1965" and Schedule II "Statement of Assets and Liabilities after incorporating the transfers to the Working Capital Fund", as published in Ann. Proc. 15, p. 9-11, and Comm. Doc. 66/3, were presented by the Executive Secretary and recommended by the Committee for adoption by the Commission. It was agreed that Schedules I and II should be published in Annual Proceedings Volume 16.
- F&A Item 5. Administrative Report and Financial Statements for 1965/66. The Administrative Report and Financial Statements (Comm. Doc. 66/2) were reviewed by the Executive Secretary. The Committee found the Report and Statements in order and recommended they be adopted by the Commission.
- F&A Item 6. Panel Memberships. The Executive Secretary reviewed Comm. Doc. 66/1 "Panel Memberships as at 1 June 1966" and reported no change in panel membership. He drew attention to the table showing current exploitation by member countries in subareas of the Convention Area during late years. Commissioners for Denmark, Germany and Norway informed the Committee they would report panel membership in relation to current exploitation in subareas to their governments for consideration.
- Plenary Item 18 Harp and Hood Seals. Following statements from the Commissioners from Canada, Denmark and Norway, the Committee agreed to
- recommend to the Commission
- that Canada, Denmark and Norway participate in a panel on harp and hood seals, such a panel to be known as Panel S.
- F&A Item 10. Office accommodation. The Executive Secretary reported that a letter had been sent to the Canadian Commissioners requesting that representation be made to the appropriate Canadian Government Department to extend the lease of office accommodation in Bedford Institute of Oceanography from 1 August 1966 to 1 August 1969. The Canadian Commissioners stated that

(over)

extension had been approved for a period of one year to 1 August 1967 and would then be considered again.

- F&A Item 11. Assistant Executive Secretary. The Committee noted the appointment of Dr B. J. Kowalewski as Assistant Executive Secretary.
- F&A Item 12. Salary Revisions. The Executive Secretary reviewed Comm. Doc. 66/6, Canadian salary revisions affecting ICNAF. He pointed out that salary revisions effective 1 October 1965 were granted by the Canadian Government for the Clerk 2, Clerk 3, Clerk 4, Editor 2 and Administrative Officer 7 grades, appointments in which were authorized by the Commission at its 1965 Annual Meeting for Secretariat personnel (Ann. Proc. 15, p. 15-16). Revisions effective 1 July 1965 were granted for the Senior Officer 1 grade.

The Committee, after considering the item,

not recommended

- (1) that the salary of the Clerk Typist (Clerk 2) within the new Canadian salary range of \$3,214-\$3,682 for 1966/67 be \$3,214;
- (2) that the salary of the Clerk-Stenographer (Clerk 3) within the new Canadian salary range of \$4,056-\$4,524 for 1966/67 be \$4,368;
- (3) that the salary of the Senior Secretary (Clerk 4) within the new Canadian salary range of \$4,586-\$5,054 for 1966/67 be \$5,054;
- (4) that the salary of the Editorial Assistant (Editor 2) within the new Canadian salary range of \$6,017-\$6,962 for 1966/67 be \$6,206;
- (5) that the salary of the Assistant Executive Secretary (Administrative Officer 7) within the new Canadian salary range of \$11,554-\$13,038 for 1966/67 be \$11,554;
- (6) that the salary of the Executive Secretary (Senior Officer 1), within the new Canadian salary range of \$16,500-\$20,500, for 1966/67, be \$18,250.

The Committee reviewed Section 2 of Comm. Doc. 66/6 regarding retroactive salary for Secretariat personnel due to the salary revisions since 1 July 1965. The Committee

recommended

- (1) that retroactive salary be granted to the Secretariat personnel covering the period 1 July 1965 to 30 June 1966 as follows: Clerk-Typist, \$62.00; Clerk-Stenographer, \$121.50; Senior Secretary, \$141.00; Editorial Assistant, \$215.25; Assistant Executive Secretary, \$272.50; and Executive Secretary, \$2,000.00.

and

- (2) that the retroactive salary totalling \$2,812.25 be taken from the unobligated balance of 1965/66 salary appropriations of \$6,803.19.

F&A Item 13. Canadian Income Tax as it applies to ICNAF. The Executive Secretary referred to Section 3 of Comm. Doc. 66/3, Matters arising from Auditor's Report 1964/65. The Canadian Commissioners reported that efforts were continuing to provide financial relief for the Commission in the Canadian income tax field. The Committee took note of the Canadian efforts and hoped they would be successful. It was further agreed that if the efforts were successful, financial regulations covering allocation of such funding should be set up at the 1967 Annual Meeting when more details of the administrative procedures involved were known.

F&A Item 14. Crediting of other Commission Income. The Executive Secretary referred to Section 2 of Comm. Doc. 66/3, Refund of previous year's expenditures. The Commission's Financial Regulations do not specify the Fund to which refunds of direct expenditures made during previous financial years should be allocated. To relieve this situation, the Committee

recommended

that Section 7.1(b) of the Commission's Financial Regulations be amended to read "Refund of direct expenditures made during the current and previous financial years".

The meeting adjourned at 1400 hr.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of Second Meeting of CommissionersTuesday, 7 June, 0915 hr.

1. The Chairman, Mr T. Fulham (USA), opened the meeting. All member countries were represented.
2. Under Plenary Item 17, Possible Conservation Actions, the Chairman read the recommendation from the Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics concerning economic criteria in fishery management (Section 1(f)).
3. Dr J. Crutchfield, fishery economist from the University of Washington, Seattle, USA, was introduced and asked to speak to the recommendation. Dr Crutchfield pointed out that there were no simple solutions to international fishery management but one can try to lend precision to some matters of fishery economics that bear directly on the problems of Northwest Atlantic fisheries. He pointed out that economic analysis in no way diminishes the primary role of the fishery scientist. He said overfishing results from economic motives are not as obvious as they seem, that any effort to prevent overfishing has economic effects, that in time some kind of total catch limit will be needed and asked can we do it in ways that will give economic gain to all. He discussed the economic effects of open fishing, giving examples, and suggested elements of a program for the Northwest Atlantic. He reviewed the salient points in the FAO paper on economic aspects of fishery management (Res. Doc. 66/19) and the UK Commissioners' paper on the regulation of fishing effort (Comm. Doc. 66/17). Mr Popper (FAO) referred to the Research and Statistics recommendation that a working group be set up to lay the groundwork for an economic and biological assessment and outlined how it might be implemented and might operate.
4. Mr Lund (Norway) agreed that the economists and biologists should get together but he felt that there was need for stating the problem rationally and preparing a plan which could be understood by all. He hoped this problem would not delay mesh regulations as he felt this management tool had not been fully used yet.
5. Mr Løkkegaard (Denmark) felt the problem was too wide and difficult to do an assessment but that data should be compiled and reviewed to point out the further steps to be taken.
6. Dr Needler (Canada) agreed there might be more consideration of what to do. He had no objection to the study so long as it was based on what the problem really is. He pointed out that the fishery was still expanding and not stable, that new species and stocks were being utilized and that the resource as a whole must be examined. He pointed out that there are differences in economic levels of member countries and that they will continue to change. He felt anything ~~done to stabilize~~ was restricting and not in the best interests of communities as a whole. He said there was a need for an increase in useful knowledge and a need for a broadly based term of reference.
7. Dr Cain (USA) said biological, economic, social, historic and other considerations are all needed for decisions on conservation regulations. He recommended that a working group collect, analyse and report on data on economic aspects.

(over)

8. Mr Aglen (UK) said that the United Kingdom agreed that the economic aspects of conservation measures were of great importance. This applied in particular to measures to regulate or limit fishing effort since when there was heavy pressure on stocks of, for example, cod or haddock, there were clearly economic advantages to be gained from effort limitation as well as increases in total yield. The full realization of these economic advantages for the operators concerned depended on action within each country and he agreed that there was room in this context for much more economic study of fishing operations and this had already been initiated in the UK. At the international level he did not think, however, that further economic studies were needed to demonstrate the economic advantages of effort limitation; they were already sufficiently clear from the biological assessments which had been made. The obstacles to international agreement to the adoption of measures for effort limitation in situations in which the scientists had shown they were desirable were of a different character. However, in the light of the discussion which showed that others felt that economic studies would be helpful, he was willing to agree to further joint study by biologists and economists of the kind proposed provided that the area of study was limited and strictly defined and did not involve the collection of more detailed statistics of an economic character.

9. The Meeting agreed to set up a small group to frame a resolution based on the discussions and the recommendation of R&S.

10. The Meeting adjourned at 1030 hr.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of Meeting of Panel AWednesday, 8 June, 1230 hr.

1. The Commission Chairman, Mr Fulham (USA), called the meeting to order and requested that the members of the Panel (Canada, Denmark, Norway) appoint a Chairman. The Norwegian delegation, supported by the Danish delegation, proposed that Canada provide a Chairman. Dr Needler (Canada) took the chair.
2. The Chairman proposed the following agenda:
 1. Selection of Rapporteur
 2. Adoption of Agenda
 3. Report on the status of the catch and research carried out
 4. Review of conservation measures and requirements
 5. Date and place of next meeting
 6. Other business
 7. Approval of Panel Report
 8. Adjournment
3. Dr Sprules (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
4. The agenda proposed by the Chairman was adopted.
5. Representatives from all Panel members were present with their advisers.
6. Dr Needler referred to the Canadian paper on seal research and statistics (Res. Doc. 66/61) and stated that this paper would probably require some amendment as it had been prepared in a hurry after receiving advice that the harp and hood seal Protocol had come into effect on 29 April 1966.

Mr Lund (Norway) pointed out that Norway had not had time to prepare a summary of research after receiving notification that the seal Protocol was in effect, but that he was prepared to make such information available now if it would be of value to the Panel discussion.

It was agreed that each member country should prepare summary papers of research, statistics and domestic regulations relating to the harp and hood seal fisheries and circulate these to the other member countries for review as soon as possible, but not later than early September.
7. It was agreed that no proposals for conservation measures and requirements could be made at this time.
8. After some discussion it was agreed that the next meeting of the Panel should be held in the fall of 1966, at a time and place convenient for the representatives of the member countries and the Secretariat. The Chairman will circulate proposals for a suitable meeting time and place within the next few weeks.
9. The Executive Secretary advised the Panel that sufficient funds for Secretariat representation at a meeting in Europe in the fall of 1966 were

(over)

available in the 1966/67 budget.

10. It was agreed that the Rapporteur should prepare the minutes of the meeting and circulate them for approval.

11. The meeting adjourned at 1250 hr.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Report of Second Plenary Session

Wednesday, 8 June, 1825 hr.

1. The Chairman opened the meeting and asked the Executive Secretary to read the Report of the First Plenary Session (Proc. 6). The Report was adopted as read.
2. Under Plenary Item 22, Reports of Panels, the Chairman of the Commission requested Panel Chairmen or representatives to present their reports. Reports of Meetings of Panels 2, 3, 4 and 5 were adopted without change. The Report of the Meeting of Panel 1 was adopted with the removal, at the request of Spain, of her reservation with regard to the recommendation to introduce a minimum mesh size of trawl codend of 130 mm (manila) in Subarea 1. Dr Needler (Canada) reiterated Canada's concern about the effect of the West Greenland salmon fishery on the Canadian fishery. He hoped research efforts would be intensified and that the Commission would take any necessary steps to avoid damage to the Canadian catch.
3. Mr F. Popper (FAO) explained that he had to return to FAO and thanked the Commission on behalf of FAO for the invitation to send observers to the meeting. The Chairman thanked Mr Popper for his interest and his contribution to the discussions on economic aspects of fishery management.
4. The meeting adjourned at 1915 hr.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of Second Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and AdministrationWednesday, 8 June, 1140 hr.

1. The Chairman, Mr R. Green (USA), opened the meeting with all member countries represented. The Report of the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Proc. 10) was adopted with minor changes.
2. Under F&A Item 15, Integration Commission Pension Plan with Canada Pension Plan, the Executive Secretary reported that integration of the Commission pension plan with the Canada Pension Plan for all members of the Secretariat had been completed at no extra cost to the Commission, as approved by majority vote of Head Commissioners from member countries.
3. The Executive Secretary was asked to speak to F&A Item 16, Production of Statistical Bulletin 14 for 1964. He reported that he had contracted with FAO Fisheries Division to produce the manuscript of the Commission's Statistical Bulletin Volume 14 for the year 1964 for \$1,200. The work was completed and the Bulletin is in press. Special thanks were expressed to Mr D. Gertenbach of Fisheries Division, FAO, for his excellent cooperation and efforts.
4. The Executive Secretary reported under F&A Item 17, Participation of Economists at 1966 Annual Meeting, that at the request of the Assessment Subcommittee and with the approval of the Chairmen of the Commission and of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, he had contracted for the services of Dr James Crutchfield of the University of Washington, Seattle, USA, to speak to an open meeting of R&S on the economic aspects of fishery assessment and management during the 16th Annual Meeting of the Commission. The cost to the Commission would be about \$1,000.
5. Under F&A Item 18(a), Distribution Lists for ICNAF Publications, the Executive Secretary requested that those member countries who had not yet submitted their lists for distribution of Commission publications, meeting documents and circulars, should do so at their earliest possible convenience. The meeting agreed that F&A Item 18(b), Printing of National Research Reports, the question of whether the national research reports should be published in the Annual Proceedings instead of the Redbook, should be deferred pending a possible recommendation from the R&S on this matter.
6. Under F&A Item 19, Date of Billing, the meeting agreed that the date of billing for the fiscal year 1966/67 should be 15 August 1966.
7. Under F&A Item 20, Time and Place of 1968 Annual Meeting, Mr Aglen (UK) expressed the wish of the Government of UK to have the 1968 Annual Meeting of the Commission in London. However, arrangements had not yet been completed for meeting space and the proposal was to be regarded as tentative pending confirmation in two or three weeks.
8. The meeting adjourned at 1215 hr.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Report of Special Plenary Session

Wednesday, 8 June, 1045 hr.

1. A Special Session of the Plenary was convened by the Chairman, Mr T. Fulham (USA), to consider Plenary Item 18, Harp and Hood Seals.
2. The Chairman reported that the Second Meeting of Finance and Administration (Proc. 14) and the Third Meeting of Commissioners (Proc. 16) had recommended that Canada, Denmark and Norway participate in a Panel to be set up under the authority provided by the entry into force of the Protocol relating to Harp and Hood Seals on 29 April 1966, the panel to be known as Panel S. The meeting adopted the recommendation with an amendment that the name of the Panel will be Panel A.
3. The meeting adjourned at 1050 hr.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of Third Meeting of CommissionersWednesday, 8 June, 1030 hr.

1. The Chairman, Mr T. Fulham (USA), opened the meeting. Commissioners and advisers from all member countries were present.
2. The Report of the First Meeting of Commissioners (Proc. 9) was read and approved with minor changes.
3. Under Plenary Item 18, Harp and Hood Seals, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration reported that the First Meeting of the Committee recommended Canada, Denmark and Norway for participation in a Panel to be set up on harp and hood seals, such a panel to be called Panel S (Proc. 10).

Since Plenary approval of these recommendations was required before the Panel on harp and hood seals could meet, the Chairman's proposal to resolve the Third Meeting of Commissioners into a Plenary Session was accepted at 1045 hr.

The Chairman reconvened the Third Meeting of Commissioners after the Plenary Session was adjourned at 1050 hr.
4. Further consideration was given to Plenary Item 17, Possible Conservation Actions. A draft statement was presented to the meeting. The statement suggested further terms of reference for the ad hoc group on economic aspects of fishery management proposed by the Research and Statistics Committee and requested further national consideration of the problems involved in limiting fishing effort for review at the 1967 Annual Meeting (Appendix I).

Following considerable discussion, the delegates expressed their agreement, in general, with the statement. At Mr Aglen's (UK) suggestion, the meeting agreed that the statement could be helpful to the Commission and should be forwarded to Plenary for consideration with the recommendation of the Research and Statistics Committee on economic criteria in fishery management.
5. Further to Plenary Item 15, Exchange of National Inspection Teams, Mr Aglen (UK) stated that UK was interested and would like to exchange inspectors but limited accommodation on fishing vessels created practical difficulties in completing arrangements. He asked if other countries would like to work out an exchange arrangement. Dr Needler (Canada) was thanked for suggesting that Canada could provide transportation for inspection teams from member countries wishing to arrange an exchange.
6. The meeting adjourned at 1110 hr.

Statement on Economic Aspects of Fishery Managementpresented to Third Meeting of Commissionersand approved by the Commission in Final Plenary Session, 10 June 1966

With respect to the recommendations of R&S for the establishment of an ad hoc group, including biologists and economists, the Commission resolves that the group carry out an examination of the problems of assessing the economic effects of possible conservation measures in time for the 17th Annual Meeting of the Commission. The group will be expected to utilize available biological and economic information and to supplement this by clearly stated assumptions in order to estimate the likely economic effects of possible conservation measures, taking into account the possible redistribution of fishing effort.

The Commission expresses the hope that member countries will give further consideration to the problems involved in limiting fishing effort so that the Commission at its 17th Annual Meeting will be able to review the whole matter in the light of the results of the work of the ad hoc group, and will be able to decide what further actions should be taken.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of First Meeting of ad hoc Committee on Trawl RegulationMonday, 6 June, 1600 hr.

1. The Chairman, Mr Aglen (UK), opened the meeting and noted the items from the Plenary agenda referred to the ad hoc Committee. It was proposed by the Chairman and agreed to by the Committee to deal with
 - (i) Item 12, Infringements, at this first session
 - (ii) Items 10b, 11, 13(a) and (b), Topside Chafers, at the second session of the Committee
 - (iii) Items 14 and 16, Mesh Measuring, at the third session of the Committee.
2. The Chairman referred to Comm. Doc. 66/4, Annual Returns of Infringements, and asked member countries if there were any errors or omissions to the summaries of national reporting that they would like to indicate. Poland gave figures on the number of inspections and stated that there were no violations.
3. Portugal referred to the report on exchange of enforcement officers described in Comm. Doc. 66/12. In the course of these exchanges it was discovered that some side trawlers were using chafers contrary to the returns in Comm. Doc. 66/4, even though they were of the type approved by ICNAF. It was, however, their intention to strongly advise the captains concerned not to use chafers in future. The Portuguese statement was noted.
4. No other points were raised on the return of infringements.
5. The Committee adjourned.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of Third Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and AdministrationFriday, 10 June, 1135 hr.

1. The Chairman, Mr R. Green (USA), opened the meeting. All member countries were represented.
2. The Report of the Second Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Proc. 14) was read and adopted.
3. Under F&A Item 7, Estimates for 1966/67, the Chairman of R&S presented the following items from the Research and Statistics Committee which involved expenditures:

(1) Additional cost of publication of FAO/ICES/ICNAF index of scientific publications of the North Atlantic	\$350.00 in 1966/67
(2) 2 meetings of a working party of economists and biologists	\$5,000.00 in 1966/67
(3) support for Symposium on Trophodynamics of marine communities, last half of 1968	\$5,000.00 in 1968/69
(4) ICNAF representative to FAO/ICES/ICNAF mid-year meeting on statistics, Copenhagen	\$600.00 in 1968/69
(5) ICNAF representation at FAO/ICES/ICNAF CWP on Statistics, Reykjavik, Iceland, March 1967	\$500.00 in 1966/67
(6) Publication of National Research Reports in Annual Proceedings	\$2,500.00 in 1966/67

An additional item of expenditure was reported as follows:

Mr Aglen (UK) reported that the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations were considering the possibility of setting up a Working Group to resolve the mesh measuring problem. It was suggested that if member countries did not pay expenses of their participants to the Group, the cost would be estimated roughly to be \$3,500.00 to the Commission in 1966/67

The following actions were taken regarding the above items of expenditure proposed for the 1966/67 fiscal year.

A proposal by Mr Aglen (UK) was adopted. It

recommended

that National Research Reports be not published in the Annual Proceedings and that the amount in the Publications item in the proposed estimates for 1966/67 be reduced by \$2,500.

(over)

The Executive Secretary pointed out that travel expenses for the Secretariat representative to a possible October meeting of Panel A in Copenhagen could be met from the amount for Travel in the 1966/67 estimates.

The Executive Secretary reported that amounts covering expenditures in 1966/67 had been included in the proposed estimate for 1966/67 in the case of the FAO/ICES/ICNAF Index (\$350) and CWP Meeting on Statistics, Iceland (\$500).

Considerable discussion took place regarding the proposed expenditure of \$5,000 for the Working Party of economists and biologists. The Executive Secretary then reviewed the 1965/66 Financial Statements showing an amount of over \$18,000, less almost \$3,000 for retroactive salary, leaving about \$15,000 in the Working Capital Fund. Dr Needler (Canada) proposed, and the meeting adopted, the following

recommendation

that an amount of \$1,664 be added to the Travel item in the estimates for 1966/67, and that \$2,000 be appropriated from the Working Capital Fund to give a total of \$3,664 for travel expenses for Working Group members as required.

Regarding possible expenses for the Mesh Gauge Working Group, Mr Kamentsev (USSR) and Mr Lund (Norway) proposed, and the meeting agreed, to

recommend

that the expenses of members of the proposed Mesh Gauge Working Group be met by member countries provided all member countries can join the Working Group if they wish.

The Meeting, in order to meet the 1966/67 estimated expenditures (Appendix I), agreed to

recommend

- (1) that the appropriations for ordinary expenditures of the Commission for the fiscal year 1966/67 be \$87,010 and
- (2) that \$2,000 be appropriated from the Working Capital Fund to help defray expenses in connection with meetings of the Working Group of economists and biologists.

4. Under F&A Item 8, Forecast for 1967/68, the Executive Secretary reviewed the budget forecast for 1967/68. The meeting, in order to meet the 1967/68 forecast of expenditures (Appendix II) then agreed to

recommend

that the Commission give consideration at the 1967 Annual Meeting to authorizing appropriations from member governments for ordinary expenditures for the fiscal year 1967/68 of \$91,221.

5. Under F&A Item 22, Other Business, there was no other business raised.

6. Mr R. Green (USA) was unanimously elected Chairman of the Committee for the year 1966/67.

7. The meeting adjourned at 1315 hr.

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

1. Personal Services	
(a) Salaries	a) \$48,646
(b) Superannuation	1,200
(c) Additional help	1,200
(d) Medical plan	300
2. Travel	6,664
3. Transportation	500
4. Communications	3,000
5. Publications	13,000 b)
6. Other Contractual Services	4,000
7. Materials and Supplies	3,500
8. Equipment	1,000
9. Annual Meeting	3,000
10. Contingencies	<u>1,000</u>
Total ordinary expenditures	\$87,010
Additional expenditure to be obtained from Working Capital Fund	\$2,000 c)

a) Executive Secretary	\$18,250
Assistant Executive Secretary	11,554
Editorial Assistant	6,206
Senior Secretary	5,054
Clerk Stenographer	4,368
Clerk Typist	<u>3,214</u>
	\$48,646

b)	Annual Proceedings Vol.16	\$1,500
	Statistical Bulletin Vol.14	4,500
	Research Bulletin No.3	5,000
	Sampling Yearbook Vol.10	500
	Redbook 1966	500
	List of Vessels for 1965	<u>1,000</u>
		\$13,000
c)	Expenditures in connection with 1966/67 meetings of <u>ICNAF Working Group on Joint Biological and Economic Assessment of Conservation Actions</u>	\$2,000



1967/68 Expenditures to be Covered by Appropriations of \$91, 221

1. Personal Services	
(a) Salaries	a) \$49, 521
(b) Superannuation	1, 200
(c) Additional help	1, 200
(d) Medical plan	300
(e) Salary contingencies	1, 500
2. Travel	6, 500
3. Transportation	500
4. Communications	3, 000
5. Publications	12, 000
6. Other Contractual Services	4, 000
7. Materials and Supplies	3, 500
8. Equipment	1, 000
9. Annual Meeting	6, 000
10. Contingencies	<u>1, 000</u>
Total ordinary expenditures	\$91, 221

a) Executive Secretary	\$18, 250
Assistant Executive Secretary	11, 978
Editorial Assistant	6, 395
Senior Secretary	5, 054
Clerk Stenographer	4, 524
Clerk Typist	<u>3, 370</u>
	\$49, 521

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of Second Meeting of ad hoc Committee on Trawl RegulationsWednesday, 8 June, 1700 hr.

1. The Chairman, Mr Aglen (UK), opened the meeting with all members present.
2. The Chairman proposed that at this session the Committee should consider those matters referred to it by the Plenary or Commissioners relating to codend protection or topside chafers, namely Plenary Agenda Items 10(b), 11, 13(a) and (b); and that the remaining matters relating to methods of mesh measurement, namely Plenary Agenda Items 14 and 16, should be left over for consideration at the Committee's next session on Friday. This was agreed.
3. The Chairman recalled that at earlier sessions of the Plenary and Commissioners' meeting attention had been drawn to the fact that many of the recommendations made by the Commission at previous meetings were still pending because certain countries had entered reservations relating to the provisions they contained on the question of codend protection. These recommendations had been set out in Comm. Doc. 66/20. In their latest form these recommendations would allow the use of devices attached to the upper side of the codend in such a manner that they will not obstruct the meshes of the codend provided that they are approved by the Commission on the basis of scientific advice that they do not obstruct the meshes or reduce significantly the selectivity of the codend. As mentioned in the notes appended to the Plenary Agenda, three types of topside chafer had been approved by the Commission. At the Commission's meeting in 1965 it was noted that certain countries were continuing experiments on the effect of other types of chafer in use in their countries with a view to submitting scientific evidence to the Commission. The results of experiments on the effect of one such chafer in Poland had been reported in Res. Doc. 66/21 and these had been considered by the Research and Statistics Committee. The report of that Committee recorded that on the basis of the evidence submitted it appeared that this type of chafer with a mesh size at least twice as large as the codend mesh size and a width at least as great as that of the codend had a negligible effect on the codend selectivity (Report of Standing Committee on Research and Statistics Section 3(d)). The Committee was informed that this passage in the report had been approved by the R&S Committee and the Chairman asked whether, in the light of this information, the Committee considered it appropriate to recommend any action to the Commission.
4. Mr Lund (Norway) said that in his opinion the use of topside chafers should be prohibited altogether, as there was evidence, e. g. from the North Western Working Group of ICES, that the topside chafers in use in some areas had the effect of reducing the effective codend mesh by about 20%. He thought it should be possible to devise other means of securing the objects for which topside chafers were used. However, as it seemed unlikely that such a proposal would receive support, he suggested that the confused situation arising from the reservations to the pending regulations should be resolved by laying down simple general rules for the use of chafers, namely that the meshes of the chafers should be an exact multiple of the meshes of the codend, and that the chafers should be attached to the codend in such a way as to secure that its meshes exactly overlapped the meshes of the codend.
5. Mr Kamentsev (USSR) regretted that many of the Commission's recommendations were still pending though the Soviet Union enforced all these

(over)

Recommendations without delay on board all the Soviet vessels fishing in the Northwest Atlantic. For the purpose of simplifying the procedure of the entry into force of ICNAF proposals on 2 December 1965, a Soviet representative signed an appropriate Protocol to the Convention. The Soviet delegation pointed out that according to the Convention, the Depositary Government shall transmit any ICNAF proposal to the Contracting Governments for their consideration. The Convention does not prevent the Contracting Governments from making reservations to the Commission's proposals. However, the Depositary Government transmits such reservations to the Contracting Governments for their approval as the Commission's proposals, notwithstanding the fact that this action is beyond the powers of the Depositary Government stipulated by the Convention and this delays the entry into force of ICNAF proposals. At its request the Soviet Party sent to the Depositary Government the Fishery Rules for the Soviet fishermen operating in the ICNAF area in order to show groundlessness of assumptions that the Commission's regulations allegedly do not apply to large-sized stern trawlers. It is possible to solve easily the problem of entry into force of regulations, - for this purpose it is needed that all the countries which approved the UK reservations should act the same way in regard to the Soviet reservations. In future one will have probably to adhere strictly to all the provisions of the Convention until they are amended in an established way. The Soviet Party submitted annual information on technical problems of the use of chafers on stern trawlers. As can be seen from Soviet materials, stern trawlers operating in the ICNAF area use mesh size in codend larger than that defined by the Convention (the same as for NEAFC area), which allows, even when applying Soviet type of chafer, to attain a higher selection factor than determined for the ICNAF area. Apart from these, the Soviet delegation supports the proposal by Poland regarding the application of chafers with mesh size twice as big as that in codend, which naturally will take some time. As to withdrawal of reservations to fishery regulations, after perhaps the entry into force of a proposal regarding the chafer of Polish type, the need of such reservations will be eliminated. Such a withdrawal should obviously be effected not by Commissioners but by appropriate Governments which transmitted their reservations to the Depositary Government.

6. Dr Chrzan (Poland) said that Poland would also be prepared to withdraw her reservations if the Polish type chafer were approved, and Dr Cole (UK) confirmed that the UK reservations would similarly be withdrawn.

7. The Committee took note of these statements and on the proposal of Dr Needler (Canada), seconded by Mr Mocklinghoff (Germany), the Committee agreed to

recommend to the Commission

that the Polish type topside chafer should be approved for the purpose of the Commission's recommendations which had not yet entered into force; further, that the specifications of the chafer (supplemented with details of the twine which the Polish representative undertook to supply) should be precisely recorded in readily available form.

Following further proposals by Mr Mocklinghoff (Germany), the Committee also

recommended

that the specifications of the topside chafer previously approved by ICNAF should be set out in a document that was readily accessible; that other chafer previously approved by the Commission should be retained and that scientific advice on which they are retained should be kept under review. In this connection note was taken of Res. Doc. 66/29.

8. Mr Lund (Norway) said he was disappointed that the approved chafer still included some with the same mesh size as the codend and suggested that in order to secure uniformity the earlier approvals should be reviewed. It was noted that it was open to the Commission to review such approvals at any time.

9. It was recalled that at the 1965 Annual Meeting information had been requested about the looseness with which chafers used by Icelandic and Faroese vessels were attached. Mr Løkkegaard (Denmark) informed the Committee that so far as the Faroese were concerned the type of chafer referred to would not be used after this season.

10. The Committee adjourned at 1600 hr.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of Third Meeting of ad hoc Committee on Trawl RegulationFriday, 10 June, 0915 hr.

1. The Chairman, Mr Aglen (UK), opened the meeting to consider Plenary Agenda Items 14 and 16, Mesh Measurement, referred to the ad hoc Committee. He referred to the Notes to these Agenda Items and to 1965 Meeting Proceedings No. 9 with its annex which included a general agreement in ICNAF that a standard measuring device for both ICNAF and NEAFC areas was desirable. He noted that the NEAFC Special Committee on International Control had considered mesh measuring problem and their report was available to ICNAF as Comm. Doc. 66/14. This report had been considered at the last meeting of NEAFC.
2. The Chairman also noted that action taken in Panel 5 to propose approval of the mesh size equivalents and gauges set out in Annual Proceedings Vol. 14, Section 9, X, page 17, might require action by the ad hoc Committee and asked for guidance from the meeting.
3. Mr Kamentsev (USSR) pointed out that Article VIII of the Convention provides that all regulatory methods in ICNAF will be based on scientific advice. The Commission has discussed the question of mesh measuring at various recent meetings and the only gauge authorized in the ICNAF recommendations was the ICNAF gauge. The USSR believes that unless a better type can be found the ICNAF type gauge should be used.
4. Dr Needler (Canada) said that if one simplifies the ICNAF regulations they simply define the mesh to be enforced. They don't appear to confine governments to any particular type of gauge. He pointed out that Canadian courts will not accept evidence from a spring-loaded gauge and Canada must use a "simple" gauge similar to that proposed for NEAFC regulations. The Canadian delegate pointed out that if an international policing system is adopted it would be most important to find a gauge that would be standard for both inspection and enforcement. If such a gauge was spring-loaded there would have to be duplicate inspection with a simple gauge if evidence obtained internationally were to be accepted in Canadian courts.
5. The Chairman proposed that before considering the position in Subarea 5 the Committee should deal with the more general items and reported on the various steps which had been carried out in considering mesh measuring problems and international enforcement in the NEAFC area. Its Special Committee had not been able to agree on a standard methodology and had based a draft proposal on the current NEAFC regulations. The Liaison Committee of ICES proposed the ICES gauge as both a research and international inspection gauge. These proposals were considered at the recent NEAFC meeting. Member countries had expressed a variety of opinions. Some countries felt strongly that it was more important to adopt a single standard gauge for international inspection free from operator bias, and that the ICES gauge would be appropriate for this purpose. Other countries attached most importance to having the international inspection gauge similar to that used by nationals for enforcement, particularly if reports from international inspectors are to be used in national courts. It had been difficult to reconcile these two views because it was thought that spring-loaded gauges could not be used for court proceedings in some countries. As a compromise, NEAFC appeared to be shaping toward a Norwegian proposal that international inspectors should use three types of

(over)

gauges. The Chairman then read the pertinent paragraph in the draft report from the last NEAFC meeting (not available to the ad hoc meeting). The whole problem will be discussed again at the next NEAFC meeting.

6. Countries were asked to express their points of view on the above topic for guidance of the ad hoc Committee. Mr Lund (Norway) pointed out the importance of clarifying the gauge problem. He supported the Canadian view that the problem is looked at too much as methodology. He believes that there are three separate parts of the problem:

- (1) Definition of the mesh size
- (2) Finding out a method of inspection (for which Norway would propose the ICES gauge)
- (3) The need for a simple gauge and rules to follow which could be used and understood by fishermen.

7. Mr McKernan (USA) expressed sympathy with the viewpoints of the USSR and Norway. The USA uses the ICNAF gauge as prescribed but also recognizes that a simple gauge can be used effectively for enforcement. The USA believes the current position to be that since the 1964 recommendation has gone into effect the Commission is required to adopt and accept the equivalents and gauges set out in Annual Proceedings Vol. 14, Section 9, X.

8. The meeting then considered the more specific problems arising in Sub-area 5. The Chairman then posed three questions on this item:

- (1) Has the Commission approved the mesh equivalents for alternative gauges
- (2) Has the Commission already approved the alternative gauges
- (3) Does the Commission need to spell out the method of use for these gauges if they are approved.

9. After further discussion it was agreed to defer consideration until a draft resolution was available.

10. Dr Cain (USA) made a statement (Appendix I) concerning a previous statement made by the USSR at the Second Meeting of the ad hoc Committee (Proc. 19).



Statement of US delegation in reply to USSR delegation statement to the
Second Meeting of Ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation

On Wednesday, 8 June 1966, the Soviet delegation spoke about the failure of the Commission to implement effectively many of the conservation regulations which have been proposed over the course of several years. As we understood the Soviet delegation, they made two arguments as to why the regulations had not been implemented effectively.

First, they stated that the United States had acted improperly as Depositary Government, in dealing with the reservations from member governments, when the United States circulated such reservations and asked for acceptance by the contracting governments.

Second, the Soviet delegation implied that the conservation measures adopted during previous meetings would have been in effect if all the member governments had accepted the regulations with the reservations of the USSR, Poland and the UK, and would have been effective.

The United States disagrees with the interpretations of the Soviet Union.

In the first instance, the United States believes that it acted properly as Depositary Government, and we would welcome debate on this issue, in the Commission, a special committee, or any other forum. The Depositary Government had followed such procedure on several occasions beginning in 1959, without objections from member governments.

As to the second point, we all know that the principal reason, in fact the only important reason, that the Commission's recommendations for conservation have not come into effect and been effective is because of the reservations of the USSR, Poland and the UK as to the topside chafer.

For other countries to implement these regulations in the absence of effective regulations of the large stern-ramp trawlers, would be unrealistic and useless for conservation objectives.

It follows, therefore, that before the Commission's conservation measures can be implemented effectively, we must find a solution to the topside chafer problem.

The United States believes that the use of any topside chafer reduces the effectiveness of the mesh regulations and, as a consequence, would be pleased to eliminate all topside chafers from the ICNAF area.

Since agreement on this matter seems remote, we are willing to accept the Polish chafer as the best compromise now apparent.

We hope that those countries using topside chafers will study the matter further and that they can soon provide means for the elimination of all topside chafers. In this regard, we noted with great interest the statement of the Soviet government in the summary record of the Fourth Meeting of the NEAFC in response to Agenda Item 10, The Use of Topside Chafers. In this document the Soviets stated that they hoped that by the end of 1968 a way would be found to prohibit chafers altogether. We sincerely hope that this same goal is applicable to ICNAF area so that this important matter can be resolved.



Serial No. 1736
(B. g. 11. 66)

Proceedings No. 21

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Report of Fourth Meeting of ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation

Friday, 10 June, 1345 hr.

1. Under Plenary Items 14 and 16, Mesh Measurement, the meeting considered a draft resolution regarding mesh measuring which had been circulated. The Chairman pointed out that the resolution was intended to incorporate the suggestions made at the Third Meeting of the ad hoc Committee (Proc. 20)
2. Concerning paragraph (i) of the draft, Mr Kamentsev (USSR) said that he could not agree to the approval of the ICES gauge. Mr Lund (Norway) said that in his view it would be a pity to leave out the ICES gauge which had been adopted as the best gauge free from operator bias for scientific purposes throughout the North Atlantic. It was agreed that the reference to the ICES gauge should be left in the draft but put in square brackets so that the Plenary could consider the matter further.
3. Concerning paragraph (ii), Mr Lund (Norway) said that he hoped the question of mesh differentials would be among the questions referred to the Working Group. It was pointed out that this question was kept under review by the Research and Statistics Committee in the light of fresh scientific evidence as it became available. After further discussion paragraph (ii) was approved without alteration.
4. It was agreed to amend paragraph (iii) by deleting the words "of experts" in line 1 and substituting "in which all member countries could participate if they so wish".
5. It was agreed to insert a new paragraph (iv) in the following terms:

"(iv) that arrangements should be made for a meeting of the Working Group in London immediately after the Special Meeting of NEAFC in November 1966".
6. Paragraph (iv), renumbered (v), was agreed to subject to placing the whole of subparagraph (a) in square brackets.
7. The Committee agreed to present the resolution as amended to Plenary. Text of the Resolution as finally adopted by the Third Plenary Session (Proc. 25) is attached hereto as Appendix I.
8. The Committee adjourned for lunch at 1410 hr.
9. On reconvening at 1600 hr. the Committee considered the draft Report of the Second Meeting of the ad hoc Committee (Proc. 19). Mr Lund (Norway) asked that the word "radical" should be deleted in line 8 of paragraph 4. This was agreed.
10. Mr Kamentsev (USSR) said that paragraph 5 did not fully represent the views he had expressed. He read a revised passage and it was agreed that this statement should be substituted for paragraph 5 in the draft.

(over)

11. Concerning paragraph 7, Mr Mocklinghoff (Germany) said that he had made some additional points. It was agreed to add at the end of the paragraph the following passage:

"Mr Mocklinghoff (Germany) also proposed that the chafers previously approved by the Commission should be retained and that scientific advice on which they were based should be kept under review. In this connection note was taken of Research Document 29."

12. Mr Lund (Norway) said that paragraph 8 did not quite represent what he had said. It was agreed to alter the paragraph by deleting the words "number of" in line 2 and substituting for the latter "still included some with the same mesh size as the codend". This was agreed.

13. It was agreed to delete the last four words of paragraph 9 and substitute "would not be used after this season". The minutes as altered were agreed.

14. The Committee considered the draft Report of the First Meeting of the ad hoc Committee (Proc. 17) and approved it with the following alterations:

paragraph 1(ii) - after "items" insert "10(b) and 11"
paragraph 3 - delete "Portuguese vessels" in line 3 and insert "side trawlers". Add at the end of line 4 "though they were of the type approved by ICNAF".
paragraph 4 - delete "arranged" and substitute "raised".

15. It was agreed that a further meeting of the Committee would be arranged as soon as possible.



Resolution of ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation
regarding Mesh Measurement
as adopted by Third Plenary Session (Proc. 25)

The Committee

recommend

- (i) that as a temporary arrangement until the time of the 17th Annual Meeting, the Commission approve the ICES gauge and the simple gauge described in the Redbook for 1964, Part III, page 145, as alternatives to the ICNAF gauge for the purpose of the recommendation now in force in Subarea 5 and any other recommendation which may come into force in other subareas;
- (ii) (a) that the method of use of the ICES gauge shall be the same *mutatis mutandis* as that laid down for the ICNAF gauge but under an applied pressure of 8.8 lbs. ;

(b) that the method of use of the simple gauge shall be that the gauge must pass easily through the meshes when wet after use.
- (iii) that the Commission reaffirms the approval of the mesh size equivalents set out in the Annual Proceedings Vol. 14, page 17; and
- (iv) that a Working Group in which all member countries may participate if they so wish, should be set up to study the whole question of mesh definition and method of measurement in the light of further discussion in NEAFC of international inspection arrangements with a view to further consideration being given at the 17th Annual Meeting to the question of adopting a single gauge of uniform application;
- (v) that arrangements be made for a meeting of the Working Group in London immediately after the Special Meeting of NEAFC in November 1966.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Report of Fourth Meeting of Commissioners

Friday, 10 June, 1700 hr.

1. The Chairman, Mr T. Fulham (USA), opened the meeting. Commissioners and advisers from all member countries were present.
2. The Reports of the Second (Proc. 11) and Third (Proc. 16) Meetings of Commissioners were read and adopted with minor changes.
3. Commissioners agreed that the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation should present its reports covering Plenary Item 11, Eliminating Obstacles to Commission Proposals, and 16, International Inspection, directly to the Plenary rather than to a Meeting of Commissioners from which these Items had been referred.
4. The meeting adjourned at 1750 hr.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR



RESTRICTED

THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 1739
(B. c. 66)

Proceedings No. 23

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Report of Fourth Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration

Friday, 10 June, 1830 hr.

1. The Chairman, Mr Green (USA), opened the meeting. All member countries were represented.
2. The Report of the Third Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Proc. 18), proposing 1966/67 appropriations of \$87,010 from Contracting Governments and \$2,000 from the Working Capital Fund and 1967/68 appropriations of \$91,221 from Contracting Governments was approved for recommendation to the Plenary.
3. The meeting adjourned at 1850 hr.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Report of Fifth Meeting of ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation

Friday, 10 June, 1900 hr.

1. The Chairman, Mr Aglen (UK), called the meeting to order with representatives from all member countries present.
2. The Chairman drew attention to the need for amendments to the Commission's pending 1961 and 1965 recommendations regarding trawl regulations in view of the recommendation by Panel 1 (Proc. 2) that a minimum mesh size for trawl codends of 130 mm (manila) be introduced in Subarea 1.
3. Following discussion, recommendations (Appendix I) for amendments to the pending 1961 and 1965 ICNAF trawl regulations were accepted by the Committee for presentation to the Plenary.
4. The meeting adjourned at 1925 hr.



Recommendations from ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation for amendments to pending 1961 and 1965 trawl regulations for Subarea 1 as adopted by the
Third Plenary Session (Proc. 25)

A. The Commission

recommends

that, as from 1st June 1967, or the date on which the recommendation for Subareas 1, 2 and 3 (Ann.Proc.1961, Vol.11, p.15) comes into force, whichever date is later, paragraph 1 of the recommendation be amended by striking out the words "in Subareas 1, 2 and 3" and by striking out the words "less than 114 mm. or 4 1/2 inches", and inserting in place of the latter the words "less than 130 mm. or 5 1/8 inches in Subarea 1, or less than 114 mm. or 4 1/2 inches in Subareas 2 and 3"; the Commission further

recommends

that references in the said recommendation to 114 mm. or 4 1/2 inches wherever they occur shall be interpreted accordingly.

B. The Commission

recommends

that as from 1st June 1967, or the date on which the recommendation for Subarea 1 (Ann.Proc.1965, Vol.15, p.17) comes into force, whichever date is later, paragraph 1 of the recommendation shall be amended by striking out the words "114 mm. or 4 1/2 inches" and inserting the words "130 mm. or 5 1/8 inches".

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966Report of Third Plenary Session

Friday, 10 June, 1800 hr., 1855 hr., 1930 hr.

1. The Chairman, Mr T. Fulham (USA), opened the meeting with representatives from all member countries and observers present.
2. Under Plenary Item 20, Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, Dr W. Templeman (Canada), Chairman of the Committee, presented the Report with corrigenda, addenda and appendices. Following discussion, it was agreed that the approved full report of the ICES/ICNAF Working Party, on North Atlantic Salmon should be distributed as a 1966 Annual Meeting Research Document to meeting participants. The Plenary accepted, unanimously, the complete Report of the Standing Committee. The Chairman of the Commission thanked Dr Templeman and the scientists for their fine work.
3. The Chairman referred to the Reports of the First (Proc. 9), Second (Proc. 11), Third (Proc. 16) and Fourth (Proc. 22) Meetings of Commissioners which had considered Plenary Item 10, Status of Proposals, 15, Exchange of Inspection Teams, 17, Possible Conservation Actions, 18, Harp and Hood Seals, and 19, Fishing and Navigational Practices. The Reports were accepted unanimously.
4. Under Plenary Item, Harp and Hood Seals, the Plenary approved the Report of a Special Plenary Session (Proc. 15) which established Panel 'A' with Canada, Denmark and Norway as members to deal with the harp and hood seal problem.
5. Under Plenary Item 22, Reports of Panels, the Chairman referred to Plenary Item 18, Harp and Hood Seals, and asked for consideration of the Report of Panel A (Proc. 12), the recently formed harp and hood seal panel. The Report was received and approved by Plenary.
6. Under Plenary Item 23, Reports by Commission Observers, the Executive Secretary referred the Plenary to the written reports of the Commission's observers to meetings of INPFC, NEAFC, ICES, FAO, IOC, SCOR, as presented in the Research and Commissioners' Document series.
7. The Chairman's proposal that the Plenary recess in order that the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration could meet and consider its report for presentation to Plenary was accepted. Plenary recessed at 1825 hr.
8. The Third Plenary Session was reconvened at 1855 hr. Under Plenary Item 21, Report of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, Mr Green (USA), Chairman of the Committee, presented the Reports of the First (Proc. 10), Second (Proc. 14), Third (Proc. 18) and Fourth (Proc. 23) Meetings of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration. The Plenary reviewed the Working Capital Fund and noted the balance as presented by the Chairman of the Standing Committee. The proposed 1966/67 and 1967/68 financial items were then reviewed. The Reports were received and approved unanimously by the Plenary.

(over)

9. The Plenary agreed to recess at 1900 hr. to allow the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation to consider its Report for Plenary.

10. The Third Plenary Session was reconvened at 1930 hr. The Chairman then requested consideration of Reports of the First (Proc. 17), Second (Proc. 19), Third (Proc. 20), Fourth (Proc. 21) and Fifth (Proc. 24) Meetings of the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation. The Chairman of the ad hoc Committee, Mr Aglen (UK), referred to the four matters presented to the Committee for resolution.

The first matter involved Plenary Item 12, Infringements to Trawl Regulations, which was considered at the First Meeting of the ad hoc Committee (Proc. 17).

The second matter included Plenary Items 10(b), 11 and 13(a) (b), Codend Protection. Here, Mr Aglen pointed out that approval by the Commission of the Polish type chafer recommended by the Second Meeting of the ad hoc Committee (Proc. 19) would result in withdrawal of reservations to proposed Commission regulations affecting topside chafing gear in use on stern trawlers by Poland, USSR and UK and permit early ratification of pending trawl regulations.

The third matter included Plenary Items 14, Mesh Measuring, and 16, International Inspection. Mr Aglen pointed out the importance of mesh definition and methods of measurement in international inspection arrangements and drew attention to the Committee's recommendation to the Commission regarding mesh measurement (Appendix I to Proc. 21). The Chairman of the Commission called for resolution of the draft recommendation. Following discussion, the following amendments were agreed to:

- (1) remove the square brackets in paragraphs (i) and (v) (a)
- (2) insert after "arrangements" in paragraph (i) line 1 "until the time of the 17th Annual Meeting"
- (3) renumber paragraph (v) to paragraph (ii)
- (4) add "but" after "for the ICNAF gauge" in line 3 of new paragraph (ii) (a)
- (5) add "by the Executive Secretary" after "made" in line 1 of new paragraph (v).

The fourth matter is a recommendation to the Commission from the Fifth Meeting of the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulation (Appendix I to Proc. 24) detailing pending trawl regulations due to the new 130 mm (5 1/8 inch) minimum mesh size for trawls as proposed for Subarea 1 by Panel 1 (Proc. 2). Following discussion, it was agreed to delete all after "5 1/8 inches" in paragraph B of the recommendation.

The Plenary adopted unanimously the Reports of the five meetings and the recommendations of the ad hoc Committee as amended above. The Chairman of the Commission conveyed the Commission's thanks to Mr Aglen and the members of the ad hoc Committee for their excellent work.

11. The Plenary agreed that a simpler codification of the Commission's trawl regulations should be an item for the agenda of the 17th Annual Meeting and welcomed the proposal of the United States to present a paper for the item.

12. Under Plenary Item 24, Commission observers, it was agreed that the Chairman of the Commission and the Executive Secretary should make any appointments necessary.

13. Under Plenary Item 25, Other Business, the Observer for Japan, Mr Uchimura, expressed the appreciation of his country for the invitation to attend the meeting and congratulated the Commission on its valuable work. The Chairman then thanked the Government of Spain for its good facilities and excellent hospitality and congratulated the meeting participants and observers for their contributions to the success of the meeting.

14. The Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Commission adjourned at 2030 hr.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1966

Officers

Chairman of Commission - Mr T.A.Fulham (USA)
Vice-Chairman of Commission - Mr V.M.Kamentsev (USSR)
Executive Secretary - Mr L.R.Day (ICNAF Secretariat)

Panels

Chairman, Panel 1 - Dr H.A.Cole (UK)
" Scientific Advisers - Dr P.M.Hansen (Denmark)
Chairman, Panel 2 - Mr A.J.Aglen (UK)
" Scientific Advisers - Dr A.W.May (Canada)
(for Dr A.S.Bogdanov (USSR))
Chairman, Panel 3 - Dr O. Rodriguez Martin (Spain)
" Scientific Advisers - Dr H.W.Graham (USA)
Chairman, Panel 4 - Mr R.H.Letaconnoux (France)
(for Mr J. Rouge (France))
" Scientific Advisers - Dr J.L.Hart (Canada)
Chairman, Panel 5 - Mr V.M.Kamentsev (USSR)
(for Dr A.S.Bogdanov (USSR))
" Scientific Advisers - Dr S.A. Studenetsky (USSR)
Chairman, Panel A - Dr A.W.H.Needler (Canada)

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.W.Green (USA)

