

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
17TH ANNUAL MEETING
1967
----CONTENTS

- Proceedings No.1 - Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, with Appendices (published as Redbook 1967, 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 2, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.4 - Report of Meeting of Panel 3, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.5 - Report of Meeting of Panel 4, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.6 - Report of Meeting of Panel 5, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.7 - Report of Meeting of Panel A (Seals), with Appendix
- Proceedings No.8 - Report of Ceremonial Opening Meeting
- Proceedings No.9 - Report of the First Plenary Session, with Appendices
- Proceedings No.10 - Report of First Meeting of *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations
- Proceedings No.11 - Report of First Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration
- Proceedings No.12 - Report of Second Plenary Session
- Proceedings No.13 - Report of Second Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration
- Proceedings No.14 - Report of the First Joint Meeting of Panels 1-5
- Proceedings No.15 - Report of Second Meeting of *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations
- Proceedings No.16 - Report of Meeting of Special *ad hoc* Committee on Fishery Management
- Proceedings No.17 - Report of Third Meeting of *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations, with Appendix
- Proceedings No.18 - Report of Third Plenary Session
- Proceedings No.19 - Report of Third Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, with Appendices
- Proceedings No.20 - Report of Fourth Plenary Session
- Proceedings No.21 - Report of Fourth Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration
- Proceedings No.22 - Report of Second Joint Meeting of Panels 1-5
- Proceedings No.23 - Report of Fifth Plenary Session

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Index to Major Items

Annual Meeting 1968 and 1969	Proc.19
Budget	
1967/68	Proc.19, App.I
1968/69	Proc.19, App.II
Conservation	
Possible conservation actions	Proc.9, 12, 16
Greenland cod	Proc.2
North Atlantic salmon	Proc.14
Seals	Proc.7
Special <i>ad hoc</i> Committee on Fishery Management	Proc.12, 16
Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures	Proc.16
UN Resolution on Marine Resources	Proc.18
Convention Articles	
Status	Proc.23
Financial Regulations	
Amendments	Proc.11
Revision	Proc.11
Fishing Practices	Proc.18
Salaries	Proc.13
Trawl Regulations	
Infringements	Proc.15
International Inspection	Proc.9, 23
Mesh Measuring	Proc.10, 15, 17, 22
Mesh size equivalents	Proc.15, 17, 22
Simple Codification	Proc.15, 17
Status	Proc.20
Topside Chafing Gear	Proc.15, 17, 22



Serial No.1927
(B.e.67)

Proceedings No.2

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Meeting of Panel 1

Tuesday, 6 June, 1400 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr H.A.Cole (UK). Representatives of all member countries of the Panel were present, and representatives from Canada and the USA attended as observers.
2. Rapporteur. Mr B.B.Parrish (UK) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda as circulated was adopted.
4. Panel Membership. No changes in Panel membership were proposed.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. The Chairman of the Scientific Advisers, Dr P.M.Hansen (Denmark), presented a summary of the status of the fisheries and researches carried out in Subarea 1 (Res.Doc.67/119) and introduced the Report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers to the Panel (Appendix I). Dr Hansen was thanked by the Chairman for his excellent and informative summary. The Panel also noted that Dr Hansen had now retired from the position of Chairman of the Scientific Advisers and expressed warm appreciation of the very valuable work he had done during his long term in office. The Chairman drew the Panel's attention to the sections of the Report of the Committee on Research and Statistics of special relevance to its work. The Panel endorsed the recommendations in this Report concerning the publication of the Report of the Joint ICES/ICNAF Working Party on North Atlantic Salmon, its future work, and the need for more detailed and complete statistics on salmon catch and fishing effort. It also noted the results of the further assessment of the effects on cod catches of an increase in trawl mesh size in the subarea.
6. Review of Conservation Measures and Requirements. The Panel noted with regret that the 130 mm (manila) mesh size regulation recommended by the Commission at its last meeting was not yet in force. It strongly urges all countries to introduce the new mesh size with the least possible delay. The Danish delegate reminded the Panel of his country's proposal at last year's Annual Meeting regarding the prohibition of trawling on Store Hellefiske Bank (Div.1B). He intimated that he did not wish to request further consideration of this proposal at this year's meeting but that he might wish to do so in the future.
7. Future Research. The Panel noted the items of future research in the Subarea referred to in the Report of the Scientific Advisers and endorsed their recommendation concerning the need for further studies of the distribution and abundance of the pre-recruit age-groups of cod, and for increased sampling of commercial catches.
8. Date and Place of Next Meeting. It was agreed that the Panel should meet during the 18th Annual Meeting of ICNAF.
9. Other Business. There was no other business.
10. Approval of 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.
11. Election of Chairman. The Panel expressed its appreciation of the excellent services of the retiring Chairman, Dr Cole, during the past two years. Mr Lund (Norway) was unanimously elected Chairman of the Panel for the ensuing two years.
12. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.



Serial No.1927
(B.f.67)

Proceedings No.2
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 1

Saturday, 3 June 1967, 0900 hrs

1. The Chairman, Dr P.M.Hansen (Denmark), opened the meeting. Mr S. Horsted (Denmark) was appointed Rapporteur. All countries members of the Panel were represented except one. Representatives from Canada also participated in the discussion.

2. The Chairman read the "Summary of Research and Status of Fisheries in Subarea 1, 1966" (Res.Doc.67/119) compiled from national reports of all Panel 1 member countries plus Canada. The Chairman noted with appreciation that national research reports were of a rather high standard.

Small amendments to the summary report were noted.

3. In the discussion following the Chairman's presentation of the summary report, Dr Meyer (Germany) drew attention to some documents (Res.Doc.67/27, 67/59, 67/64) in which the environmental factors in Subarea 1 are reviewed and pointed out that such studies could lead to a better understanding of the fluctuations in cod year-class strength and of the interrelationship between various species. Dr Meyer was of the opinion that studies of the atmospheric circulation and its influence on water currents was of special interest. The Panel Advisers urged that such studies be continued.

Dr Cole (UK) asked whether the small cod caught in pound nets by Greenlanders and used for fish meal production were included in the statistics. The Chairman thought they were not included but it was pointed out that fish meal is produced in only two Greenland factories.

The Chairman pointed out that the 1963 cod year-class in West Greenland seems to be better than expected from the NORWESTLANT Survey and thought that the explanation for this was that cod fry from East Greenland spawning areas in certain years contribute very much to the Southwest Greenland cod stock. It was therefore desirable to carry out studies on cod fry and small cod in East Greenland waters and their transportation by the current to West Greenland.

It was also pointed out that studies on absolute year-class strength and year-class fluctuations are most important for setting catch quotas as a possible conservation measure (Res.Doc.67/104). In order to provide sufficient material for such studies, the Panel 1 Advisers strongly

recommend

that trawling experiments with covered codend be carried out in all divisions and that sampling for age composition of catches from commercial vessels be continued and improved.

It was especially noted that samples from gears other than trawl are poorly represented in present samples.

4. Attention is paid to relevant sections of the 1967 Report of the Subcommittee on Assessments. In this report it is especially noted:

- (a) that further information presented in Res.Doc.67/55 confirms the conclusions of last year's assessments that long-term gains in Subarea 1 cod fisheries would result from an increase in mesh size to 150 mm. Such a measure would not only increase the total catches, but also lead to a substantial reduction in the proportion of the catch discarded or utilized for industrial purposes.

(over)

- (b) that the effective average mesh size in use in the West Greenland trawl fishery may be rather smaller than that used (100 mm - manila) in earlier assessments. This indicates that the long-term gains that would follow the introduction and proper enforcement of an effective mesh size of 130 mm would be rather greater than those estimated in last year's assessment.
 - (c) that additional information on salmon seems to confirm that 70% is the critical exploitation rate in home waters of fish which have been to West Greenland and that for any greater percentage the effect of the West Greenland fishery would result in a decrease in the total salmon catch.
5. Concerning the fishery in 1967, Dr Meyer reported that the normal German trawl fishery for spawning cod schools west of Banana Bank had been prevented by the severe ice conditions in the Davis Strait. A rather good fishery on spawning cod off East Greenland was reported by Germany and Iceland.
6. Dr Hansen asked to be allowed to retire as Chairman. Dr Arno Meyer was unanimously elected Chairman of the Panel 1 Advisers. Dr Cole, on behalf of the Advisers, expressed a grateful thanks to Dr Hansen for his excellent service as Chairman of the Panel 1 Advisers over the years since their first meeting.
7. The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 a.m.



Serial No.1930
(3.e.67)

Proceedings No.3

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Meeting of Panel 2

Tuesday, 6 June, 1115 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Commission Chairman, Mr Fulham (USA), who asked for nominations for a Panel Chairman in the absence of Mr Aglen (UK). Mr Tame (UK) was elected Chairman of the Panel.
2. Rapporteur. Dr A.W.May (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda as circulated was adopted.
4. Panel Membership. Representatives of all member countries of the Panel were present. Panel membership was reviewed, and there were no proposals for additional membership.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr Bogdanov (USSR) presented his summary report on status of the fisheries and research in Subarea 2 during 1966 (Res.Doc. 67/117) and the report of the meeting of Scientific Advisers to the Panel (Appendix I). In discussion of the former report, the attention of the Panel was drawn to the important papers presented this year to the Environmental Subcommittee of Research and Statistics, particularly those papers on environment and fish stocks in Subarea 2.
6. Review of Conservation Requirements and Future Research. Dr Bogdanov (USSR) noted that the Scientific Advisers had made no specific proposals regarding research in Subarea 2 during the coming year, but that he hoped that present avenues of investigation would be continued. The Panel endorsed this hope.
7. Date and Place of Next Meeting. It was agreed that the next Panel meeting should be held during the week of the 1968 Annual Meeting of the Commission.
8. Approval of Panel Report. It was agreed that the Report of the Panel meeting be prepared by the Chairman and Rapporteur, in consultation with Panel Members as necessary.
9. Election of Chairman. Mr Tame (UK) was elected Chairman for the next two years.
10. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1230 hrs.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR



THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.1930
(B.f.67)

Proceedings No.3
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 2

Saturday, 3 June, 1030 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr Bogdanov (USSR). Advisers were present from the following member countries of the Panel: Canada, Germany, Poland, Portugal, Spain, UK and USSR.
2. Dr A.W.May (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The agenda followed was similar to that of the Panel agenda.
4. The Chairman presented his summary report on status of the fisheries and research carried out in Subarea 2 during 1966 (Res.Doc.67/117). The report was discussed and several amendments made, following which it was adopted for presentation to the Panel.
5. The Advisers took note of the most recent conclusions of the Assessments Subcommittee regarding the cod stock of Subarea 2, which also extends into Div.3K and 3L. Assessments for that portion of the stock fished in Subarea 2 reinforced the preliminary conclusions of last year that fishing intensity has probably reached the level giving maximum sustainable yield per recruit. Annual variations in catch-per-unit-effort in this Subarea may, however, be expected to be relatively high there to variability of environmental factors which affect both distribution and availability of cod and efficiency of fishing operations.
6. It was agreed that the next meeting of Scientific Advisers should be held on the Saturday preceding the 1968 Annual Meeting.
7. It was agreed that the report should be prepared by the Chairman and Rapporteur in consultation with other Advisers as necessary.
8. Dr Bogdanov (USSR) was re-elected Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel 2 for the following year.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR



THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.1929
(B.e.67)

Proceedings No.4

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Meeting of Panel 3

Tuesday, 6 June, 1115 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr O. Rodriguez Martin (Spain). Representatives of Canada, France, Poland, Portugal, Spain, USSR, UK and USA were present.
2. Rapporteur. Mr J.A.Posgay (USA) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda was adopted without change.
4. Panel Membership. The Federal Republic of Germany informed the Panel that it would become a member in 1968.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. The Chairman noted that 1966 catches from the Subarea were available in Res.Doc.67/10.

Dr Graham (USA) read the summary of research and status of fisheries in Subarea 3 (Res.Doc.67/120) and the Report of the Meeting of the Scientific Advisers to Panel 3 (Appendix I). The Chairman complimented Dr Graham on his clear and valuable presentation and the various countries for their increased research efforts.
6. Review of Conservation Requirements and Future Research. There were no remarks on these items.
7. Next Meeting. The Panel agreed that the next meeting would be held in conjunction with the 1968 ICNAF Meeting at the time and place arranged.
8. Other Business. There was no other business.
9. Approval of Report. It was agreed to circulate the report of the meeting among the members for approval.
10. Election of Chairman. Mr Green (USA) nominated Dr Chrzan (Poland) as Chairman for the next two years. This nomination was seconded by Capt. Almeida (Portugal) and supported by Mr Tame (UK). Dr Chrzan was then elected unanimously.
11. Adjournment. The meeting was closed at 1200 hrs.



Serial No.1929
(B.f.67)

Proceedings No.4
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 3

Saturday, 3 June, 1330 hrs

1. The Chairman, Dr H.W.Graham (USA), opened the meeting. Representatives of the following member countries were present: Canada, Poland, Portugal, Spain, USSR, UK and USA. Observers were present from FAO, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and the Netherlands.
2. Dr J.L.Hart (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The agenda as prepared was adopted.
4. The Chairman presented a summary of research and status of the fisheries for the Subarea. After discussion and minor amendments, the summary was approved for presentation to the Panel as Res.Doc.67/120.
5. Panel countries present were invited to comment upon research plans in the Subarea:
 - Canada reported its intention to continue with current programs.
 - Poland will have the R/V *Wiesno* again in the Subarea and will sample commercial catches.
 - Portugal will continue as at present and will in addition carry out experiments with topside chafers.
 - Spain will continue sampling from commercial vessels.
 - USSR also will continue its current program including age and size compositions of catches, hydrographic studies, sampling young fish and tagging.
 - UK will sample commercial catches and the recorder surveys. It is hoped to complete a plankton atlas for the North Atlantic. It is possible that a charter boat with a commercial vessel may extend into Subarea 3.
 - USA will continue a modest program as in the past with attention on redfish. Hydrographic observations will be made in connection with the work of the International Ice Patrol.

It was agreed that a pre-recruit survey for cod as discussed by the Assessment Subcommittee was desirable in the Subarea.

It was also agreed that participating countries should be urged to provide ample information on sampling, length/age relationships, mesh sizes in actual use and particularly on discards.
6. The next meeting will be arranged by the ICNAT Secretariat in connection with the 1968 meeting.
7. Dr H.A.Cole was elected Chairman for the ensuing two years.
8. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.



Serial No.1931
(B.e.67)

Proceedings No.5

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Meeting of Panel 4

Tuesday, 6 June, 1600 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Mr Rougé (France).
2. Rapporteur. Dr A.W.May (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The Panel adopted the agenda as distributed.
4. Panel Membership. Representatives of all member countries of the Panel, with the exception of Italy, were present. There were no proposals for additional membership.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr J.L.Hart (Canada) presented his summary report on status of the fisheries and research carried out during 1966 (Res.Doc.67/121) and the Report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers (Appendix I) held on 3 June. These were adopted by the Panel without change.
6. Conservation Requirements and Future Research. There were no proposals regarding further conservation actions and no further comments regarding research plans as circulated by member countries.
7. Next Meeting. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Panel should be held at the same time and place as the next meeting of the Commission.
8. Approval of Panel Report. It was agreed that the report of the Panel Meeting be prepared by the Rapporteur in consultation with Panel Members as necessary.
9. Election of Chairman. Captain Almeida (Portugal) was elected Chairman of the Panel for the following two years.
10. Adjournment. There being no further business, the Panel Meeting adjourned at 1645 hrs.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 4Saturday, 3 June, 1500 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr J.L.Hart (Canada). Participants from Canada, Portugal, Spain, USSR and USA were present. There were observers from ICES, UK, Fed. Rep. Germany and Japan.
2. Mr J.A.Posgay (USA) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The Chairman proposed to follow the Panel 4 agenda as far as appropriate, and it was agreed to do so.
4. The Chairman read Res.Doc.67/121, Summary of Status of the Fisheries and Research carried out in Subarea 4 in 1966.

The Advisers agreed to accept this Summary with minor editorial and typographical corrections and some rewording of Section 6 - Haddock, Section 12 - Argentines, and Section 16 - Seals.
5. Assessment of Stocks. At the request of the Chairman, Mr Parrish, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Assessments, reviewed briefly sections of the Assessment Subcommittee Report of interest to Panel 4. These sections are entitled Atlantic Salmon, Northern Gulf of St. Lawrence, Div.4T and 4V (spring) Cod, Subarea 5 Haddock, and Seal Fisheries in the ICNAF Area.
6. Dr McCracken pointed out that last year the Advisers had asked that there be increased sampling for haddock length and age by all countries. Mr Parrish observed that while the Assessment Subcommittee had not been able to conduct a detailed review of the haddock stocks in Subarea 4, they had done so for the haddock stocks of Subarea 5 and had emphasized the need for length and age data of all removals from all stocks. These data are particularly needed when there is a sudden large increase in fishing effort on a stock to take advantage of newly recruited, large year-classes.
7. Research Plans. There were no changes in plans for future research as circulated.
8. Date and Place of Next Meeting. The next meeting will be held in conjunction with the 1968 ICNAF Meeting as arranged by the Secretariat.
9. Other Business. There was no other business.
10. Election of New Chairman. Dr Graham (USA) commended the present Chairman for his years of service and proposed Dr Monteiro (Portugal) as the new Chairman. Dr Monteiro was elected by unanimous vote and said in acceptance that he hoped that he would be able in the future to conduct the meeting at the same high standard set by his predecessor.
11. The meeting was closed at 1630 hrs.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967Report of Meeting of Panel 5Wednesday, 7 June, 1030 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr A.S.Bogdanov (USSR).
2. Rapporteur. The Chairman proposed and the Panel agreed that Dr G.F.M. Smith (Canada) should act as Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The Chairman proposed and the Panel agreed to the adoption of the agenda as circulated.
4. Panel Membership. The Chairman welcomed Romania as a new member of Panel 5. The Panel membership is therefore now Canada, Romania, USA and USSR.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. The report of the meeting of the Scientific Advisers to Panel 5 (Appendix I) was read. This report also covers the requirements and proposals for future research and plans for an environmental survey of the Georges Bank-Gulf of Maine area (Res.Doc.67/115). The report was accepted by the Panel.
6. Review of Exemptions. Review of the 10% annual exemption for cod and haddock caught in small mesh nets. It was pointed out that Res.Doc.67/36 is pertinent to this matter. There was no further discussion.
7. Review of Conservation Requirements. The USA drew attention to the remarks in the Scientific Advisers' Report which indicate that the present mesh regulations are not sufficient to ensure that the haddock stocks are not exploited too heavily and rapidly and are thus producing less than their maximum yield. It suggested supplementary regulations, in addition to mesh regulations, to obtain a more rational utilization of the stocks. The Panel and the Scientific Advisers were requested to address attention to this important consideration.
8. Next Meeting. The Chairman suggested that the next Panel meeting be held at the time of the 1968 ICNAF meeting. Agreed.
9. Approval of Panel Report. It was agreed that the Panel Report be approved by the members on circulation of a draft for comments and changes without further meeting.
10. Election of Chairman. Mr T.A.Fulham (USA) was unanimously elected Chairman of Panel 5 for the next two years.
11. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 1050 hrs.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 5

Friday, 2 June, 1605 hrs

1. The Chairman, Dr S.A.Studenetsky (USSR), opened the meeting with representatives from the member countries, Canada, USA and USSR in attendance. Observers from Federal Republic of Germany and Japan were also present.
2. Mr J.B.Skerry (USA) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The Agenda as noted by the Chairman was adopted.
4. The Chairman presented his summary report outlining the status of fisheries and research studies carried out during 1966 (Res.Doc.67/118). The following points were noted:
 - (a) Total catch of all species decreased from 889,919 metric tons in 1965 to 839,094 metric tons in 1966.
 - (b) Romania did fish in Subarea 5 in 1966. Catches made by her two trawlers are included with catches reported by non-member countries. No research was carried out in 1966.
 - (c) The small amount of herring taken by Canada is a by-catch; no substantial fishery was conducted in 1966.
 - (d) Herring. The catches of the USSR increased due to increased fishing effort. The US catch of small-sized herring was noted to be the second lowest in 20 years. Poland's catch increased from 1,447 tons in 1965 to 14,473 tons in 1966.
 - (e) Silver Hake. Due to a decrease in catch by the USSR, total landings decreased by about 50 percent. The US carried out age and growth studies, the USSR the enumeration of juveniles, and Poland size composition of their catches.
 - (f) Haddock. Total landings for 1966 were down about 20 percent from the high catch of 1965. Research studies by the US showed the 1963 year-class made up 60 percent of the catch. The USSR sampling indicated the 1962 year-class to predominate in their catches. It was noted that a study of length frequencies would be helpful in ageing studies.
 - (g) Red Hake. The total 1966 catch increased about 20 percent over that of 1965. It should be noted that the catch by the USSR increased from 58,546 metric tons to 82,889 tons, while the US catch declined from 13,493 metric tons to 3,681 tons.
 - (h) Sea Scallops. The total 1966 catch decreased. The Canadian catch increased, while the US catch decreased, the lowest in the past five years. A scallop fishery was more fully developed south of the Convention Area. Canada studied the distribution of sea scallops during the cruise of a research vessel.
 - (i) Industrial fish. The US reported a decline in 1966 landings of about 18%. No industrial fish catches are reported by other countries.
 - (j) Special Research. The US reported that stratified estimates of catch per tow of haddock by age groups for the nine seasonal ground-fish survey cruises 1963-66 have been completed. A preliminary analysis of these data show effect of heavy fishing offshore. There are, however, several aspects of these data that will require study.

5. Research programs of member countries for the forthcoming year

USSR. The 1967 program has already commenced. Oceanographic studies are being conducted to determine hydrographic effects on the commercial fishery. In addition, zooplankton studies, enumeration of eggs and larvae of silver hake and herring will be carried out. Age and size composition of silver hake, red hake, herring, and haddock studies will be made from samples collected by research and scout vessels. Dr Studenetsky explained that collections made by scout vessels were representative of catches made by commercial trawlers. A cooperative research program will be carried out with the US. Detailed research plans for the USSR are set forth in Res.Doc.66/115.

USA. Sampling of groundfish, herring, and sea scallops. Special studies concerning plankton collection will be made. Benthos studies in the Georges Bank-Gulf of Maine area, ageing studies of silver hake, and the research of Atlantic salmon and of the American lobster will continue. Cooperative studies with Canada and the USSR will be carried out.

Canada. Plankton and hydrographic studies already underway in Div.4X will be extended into Subarea 5. Sampling of groundfish landings will continue. Research sampling of silver hake and Argentine will be carried out. Studies of pelagic species will be the same as in 1966.

Canada suggested that the Executive Secretary be requested to circulate size composition data so it would be available prior to publication. The availability of the data might be useful in age determinations.

Federal Republic of Germany will conduct a fishery for haddock, pollock and some cod in 1967, but does not expect to conduct any research in the Subarea.

6. Exchange of views on other items

- (a) Advisers to Panel 5 wish the Panel to note that Div.5Z is being divided into two subdivisions - 5Ze and 5Zw. The US proposed the divisions along the 70°00 west longitude line based on natural division of stocks. The USSR pointed out that there was no actual separation of the fishing banks at this point and it would be very difficult to comply with the proposal. Countries should submit statistics separately for 5Ze and 5Zw where possible.
- (b) The Advisers also wish to draw the Panel's attention to that part of the Research and Statistics report dealing with reassessments of Georges Bank haddock. It was noted in that report that fishing effort more than doubled during 1965 and 1966 and that the bulk of the haddock catch was composed of the 1962 and 1963 year-classes. The Assessment Subcommittee noted that, "If the fishing effort in 1965 and 1966 had remained at the lower, earlier level, the yield from the 1962 and 1963 year-classes during their life span would have been greater, and also this yield would have been spread out over a longer period. The difference may be up to 20-30 percent if the effort returns to a low level, but less if heavy fishing continues. The catches in 1965 and 1966 would have been less if the effort had not increased in 1965-66, but the rich year-classes would have been able to contribute strongly to the catches in 1967-69 and hence balance the effects of the later weak year-classes."

7. 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.

8. Election of Chairman. Dr G.F.M. Smith (Canada) was elected Chairman.

9. The meeting adjourned at 1740 hrs.



Serial No.1928
(B.e.67)

Proceedings No.7

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Meeting of Panel A (Seals)

Tuesday, 6 June, 1645 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr A.W.H.Needler (Canada). All member countries were represented and observers from FAO and Japan were present.
2. Rapporteur. The Chairman proposed and the Panel agreed that Dr W.M. Sprules (Canada) should act as Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda as circulated was adopted with the understanding that Mr Scott and Mr Hughes, representing animal welfare organizations, would address the meeting before the major agenda items were considered.

The Chairman introduced Mr Trevor Scott and Mr J.C.Walsh of the International Society for the Protection of Animals and Mr T. Hughes, Manager of the Ontario Humane Society. The Chairman reminded the meeting that following receipt of a request from Mr Scott, the Chairman of the Commission and representatives of the Panel members had agreed that Mr Scott should be permitted to present a brief on behalf of ISPA at the meeting of Panel A. Although Mr Hughes had not made prior application to the Executive Secretary to address the Panel on behalf of the Ontario Humane Society, the Panel members agreed that he be permitted to address the meeting.

Mr Scott thanked the Commission and the Panel members for the opportunity to present the animal welfare point of view with regard to the methods used in the seal fisheries and read the following brief submitted by the International Society for the Protection of Animals:

- "1. This Brief is presented on behalf of ninety-five member organizations in forty countries that comprise the ISPA membership.
2. As an animal welfare organization ISPA continues to be very concerned about sealing in the Northwest Atlantic (Gulf and Front areas). ISPA's position in June 1967 is basically the same as stated in the ISPA Brief presented to the Seal Panel Meeting in Copenhagen during October 1966 (Appendix 'A') in conjunction with which this submission should be considered.
3. ISPA Field Officer John Walsh attended the 1967 hunt in the Gulf area. His report and certain independent inquiries and interviews form the basis for these further observations.
4. A 16 mm film was shot by Field Officer Walsh and this film is available for viewing in untouched form in support of this Brief.
5. The ISPA Field Officer states that there is still evidence to support our contention that a great deal of suffering is probably experienced by many of the seals hunted, although it appeared to our observer that conditions were less severe than during the 1966 hunt.
6. The Canadian Government had obviously taken additional steps to maintain greater control over the hunt this year, the most noticeable of which was the provision of extra Fisheries Officers to supervise killing.
7. ISPA maintains that in any hunting based industry the possibility of suffering is ever present. Sealing is no exception. It is, therefore, necessary to reiterate the view of the ISPA Directors, expressed in paragraph 15 of our previous Brief, that 'the ultimate solution to the cruelty lies in the abolition of the hunt and the cessation of the industry in its present form'. From the animal welfare point of view, the achievement of economic, social or political objectives cannot justify the deliberate imposition by mankind of suffering upon the seals of the Northwest Atlantic.
8. It is recognized as unlikely that the seal hunt will cease immediately due to a number of reasons which are mainly of a social, economic or political nature.

9. If the hunt is to continue in the ISPA view it is within the competence of Canada and Norway, the two countries with nationals involved in this particular hunt, to considerably reduce the incidence of suffering and this organization requests that the most urgent attention be given to the following suggestions.

10. The position in the Front area could be much improved if -

- (i) The Norwegian Government would endeavour to control the hunt from Norwegian registered ships by Norwegian nationals (Letter Norwegian Minister of Fisheries Appendix 'B').
- (ii) Norwegian Fisheries Officers should be on board these vessels to ensure compliance.

The following recommendations apply to both the Front and the Gulf areas -

- (iii) There should be an education program before the hunt takes place for the purposes of - (a) illustrating the most humane method of killing the pups and (b) to explain the regulations to the hunters.
- (iv) Fisheries Officers on each ship and Fisheries Officers at aircraft landing points should be required to check the club of each operator before the men depart to the seal hunt. The Officers should mark each club as checked to save the time of other law enforcement personnel during the hunt.
- (v) Every licensed hunter should also be issued with a copy of the current regulations.
- (vi) There should be an effective communication system between all Fisheries Helicopters and their base at the Magdalen Islands. This would tend to reduce the stress under which sealers undoubtedly operate.
- (vii) The quota of fifty thousand seals per year should apply to the landmen who are not currently bound by present quota regulations.
- (viii) The quota of seals to be caught annually in the Northwest Atlantic should be based on international assessment and should be applicable to all involved in the sealing industry.
- (ix) It might be helpful to the parties participating at this Seal Panel if an independent scientific survey could be carried out by experts, including veterinary pathologists, to ascertain beyond all reasonable doubt the particular circumstances in the hunt in which the seals are most likely to suffer. The survey team should also be asked to make recommendations with particular reference to humane methods by which greater efficiency of stunning could be achieved and suffering consequently reduced (the independent survey might be jointly sponsored by government, industry and animal welfare interests).

11. The Directors of ISPA wish to state clearly that ISPA's sole concern in the seal hunt is to eliminate suffering to the seals. Acknowledgement is hereby made for the assistance given to our investigators this year by the Prime Minister of Canada, the Canadian Department of Fisheries, and the many individuals who have volunteered evidence in support of our representations on behalf of seals."

The Chairman then recognized Mr Hughes who stated that the primary concern of the Ontario Humane Society was to ensure that animals were killed in a humane way. Although the Ontario Humane Society is not a member of ISPA, Mr Hughes said that he expected application for membership would be made in the near future and at this time he was pleased to support the brief read by Mr Scott. He advised the meeting that in his opinion he was speaking on behalf of the majority of the responsible organizations associated with the Canadian humane movement.

Mr Hughes referred briefly to recent measures introduced by the Canadian Government related to the use of humane killing methods by Canadian seal hunters and expressed the hope that other nations participating in commercial sealing operations would follow the Canadian lead and enforce similar regulations on their own nationals. He expressed appreciation of the close cooperation which had been developed in Canada between the humane and conservation organizations and the government and sealing industry.

Mr Hughes stated that, in his opinion, an independent team of international observers, consisting of qualified experts, including veterinarians and pathologists, should be appointed and arrangements made for them to conduct experiments and inspect sealing operations. He referred to the possibility of over-exploiting the resource and suggested that consideration should be given to taking the annual crop only from the young with the adults completely protected. Mr Hughes said that he had witnessed sealing operations this season in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and that, if properly used, a club was an effective and humane device for killing seal pups. He pointed out that the public, however, feel that a better mechanical killing device could be found, and he stressed the need for research designed to develop a new and better mechanical tool for killing young seals. He referred to recent discussions he had had with representatives of the company in Birmingham, England, which produces the captive bolt pistol and said that that company was prepared to try to develop a new mechanical killing tool for seal pups and a new and more efficient bullet for killing older seals. Mr Hughes concluded his remarks by thanking the Panel members for providing him with this opportunity to present his views.

The Chairman thanked Mr Scott and Mr Hughes for their presentations and pointed out that under the terms of the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, the Commission can only deal with matters related to conservation and realization of sustainable yields from the fisheries carried out in the Convention Area. Action with regard to humane considerations would have to be taken by the governments outside the Commission.

Dr Needler, speaking as a Canadian member of the Panel, briefly outlined the Canadian measures which relate to the use of humane killing methods. He said that the Minister of Fisheries has stated on several occasions in the Canadian House of Commons that he could not propose abolition of sealing by Canadian fishermen because of its important contribution to the Canadian economy, especially in certain areas of Canada where alternative employment opportunities were limited and incomes low. In addition, the Minister of Fisheries has expressed his intent to do everything possible to ensure the use of humane killing methods by Canadian seal fishermen and to continue to cooperate with representatives of the Canadian humane societies in developing more effective regulations for the future.

Mr Lund read the following statement concerning Norwegian seal killing methods and future control measures:

"The Norwegian seal hunt in Newfoundland waters is an important part of the Norwegian fishing industry. For a number of years the mean catch of seals has amounted to about 150,000 animals at a first-hand value of about 2 million dollars. Usually 12-15 ships from Norway participate in the seal hunt on 'The Front' east of Newfoundland.

"According to our 'gentlemen's agreement' with Canada, the hunt has in recent years started on March 12th and ended on April 30th. Early in the season the new-born harp seal pups are the main object of the hunt.

"The hunters are generally distributed in a sector of the ice in front of the vessel. When a young pup is found it receives a heavy blow on the forehead with a special sealer's pick-hammer which has a handle of 110-150 cm long, 3-5 cm diameter with an iron shoe at the end weighing about 1 pound. This iron shoe has a toe 12-18 cm long and a blunt heel 25-50 mm long. The skull of the pup is crushed by the blunt hammer so that the pup dies immediately. Thereafter the skinning is done. The whole process from start to finish takes only 1-1 1/2 minutes. Before skinning, the animal must be completely dead. Oblique or crooked cuts which may happen if the animal should move during the skinning will ruin the fur which will result in a low price for the crew.

"Norwegian experiments have shown that the killing method described above is both effective and humane. In 1954 a Cash bolt pistol, as used in the slaughter houses, was, in cooperation with the Norwegian Society for Protection of Animals, tried on seal pups. It was found that the bolt pistol had no killing effect on new-born pups, probably due to the softness of the cranium of the pups. A report of this experiment was published by the society.

"In regard to the hunting of adult seals in the moulting patches, these large animals are shot with expanding bullets in the head. In the Norwegian vessels hunting off Newfoundland there are generally 3 expert hunters on each ship. None of the ordinary crew are allowed to fire a gun while in the hunt. Much of the profit of the hunt depends upon the marksmanship of the hunter. The animal must be hit in the head region in order not to spoil the skin which is paid according to quality.

"To the Norwegian sealing industry it is, therefore, of the greatest importance to perform a rapid and accordingly also a humane killing of the seals.

"In recent years various societies for the protection of animals all over the world have shown a great interest in seal hunting and the killing methods and they have used various kinds of publication means in order to make their viewpoints in this matter known.

"The Norwegian Delegation appreciates this interest and the concern by the societies for the protection of animals and their endeavour to ensure a humane hunting. I think there is no difference in principle between the Norwegian authorities and the sealing industry on the one side and the animal protection societies on the other that one should avoid any kind of cruelty and unnecessary suffering of these animals.

"It is certainly the duty of the authorities generally to ensure a humane behaviour when natural living resources are utilized. On the other hand, it is also their duty to protect important industries and the livelihood of people depending on these industries.

"We are, and always have been, prepared to have a good cooperation with the animal protection societies which perform an important task, and we will follow their advice as far as practicable and reasonable.

"But, having said this, it is, in my opinion, important that both parties use fair means, especially in addressing the public. It is my impression that some of the recent press articles going through the world press and some films shown lack sufficient objectivity. I therefore sincerely hope that the cooperation in the future, which we regard essential, can be based upon real facts and realistic observations.

"In a letter from one of the societies concerned, it has been pointed out that Norway has not the same provisions concerning killing of seals which recently have been introduced in Canada. Even if we haven't regarded it necessary to introduce legal regulations in this field, we are nevertheless prepared to meet the request and introduce similar provisions, especially as these would be in conformity with the existing practice of Norwegian sealers.

"We are also prepared to consider the establishment of special inspections even if such inspections will cause practical difficulties for us because the sealing takes place far away from Norway. We are further prepared to discuss with the Canadian authorities the question of a practical cooperation as regards inspection on a mutual basis.

"We have been informed that the Canadian authorities have arranged for representatives of societies for protection of animals to visit the hunting field in order to see how the hunt really takes place. I am sure that the Norwegian authorities and the Norwegian sealing industry as well are prepared to make similar arrangements as regards the Norwegian sealing activity on the Front, if this should be asked for and if it can be practically arranged.

"It has further been suggested that there should be an education program before the hunt takes place. We will consider that suggestion with the organizations of the industry. We are also prepared to consider any suggestion as regards an independent scientific survey of the Norwegian hunting practice."

Dr Needler referred to certain items contained in the brief presented by Mr Scott and said that Canada would intensify its program of educating seal hunters regarding the proper methods of killing seals; would continue to make copies of the sealing regulations available to all Canadian sealers; and would continue to have enforcement officers inspect the mechanical killing tools used to insure that they conform with the Canadian sealing regulations.

Mr Scott thanked the Panel members for their attention and expressed his pleasure at hearing the summaries of action taken by Canada and Norway to prevent cruelty in the seal fisheries and the offers to cooperate with the animal welfare organizations.

Mr Hughes said that he was concerned about the misinformation on sealing operations which had been published in certain quarters and hoped that the factual information considered by the Panel at this meeting would be widely publicized.

4. Panel Membership. All panel members were represented, and there were no new applications for membership.

5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr Rasmussen (Norway), who succeeded Dr Hansen (Denmark) as Chairman of the Scientific Advisers to Panel A, presented the Report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel A (Appendix I). Dr G.F.M. Smith (Canada) presented the report of the *ad hoc* Seal Assessment Working Group which had been accepted by the Scientific Advisers to Panel A (Annex I to Appendix I).

During the discussion of these reports, it was made clear that the reference to the provision by Canada of statistics of the catches of harp and hood seals taken from parts of the Northwest Atlantic outside the ICNAF Area, contained in Item 6 of the Report of the *ad hoc* Seal Assessment Working Group, referred to catches made within Canadian territorial waters. Canada agreed to supply these statistics.

The Panel members expressed interest in the report of several tags recovered from the Front ice catches in 1967 which had been placed on harp seal pups in the Gulf of St. Lawrence in 1966. Dr Sergeant (Canada) explained that yearling harp seals migrate southward later than the older seals and, in his opinion, certain of these animals may have been unable to enter the Gulf of St. Lawrence from the north because of ice conditions. He stated he hoped to obtain additional evidence in the future to determine whether or not this was an annual occurrence and if it applies to other age groups.

The Panel agreed that steps should be taken to ensure that a coordinated research program is developed and

recommended

that seal scientists from Canada, Denmark and Norway meet in Hamburg at the time of the next ICES meeting to consider research requirements and formulate a coordinated program to provide the data required for determination of population estimates and sustainable yields.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 9:35 a.m. 8 June.

6. Review of Conservation Measures and Requirements. The Chairman pointed out that it was necessary to give consideration under this agenda item to the agreement reached at the Copenhagen meeting of the Panel with regard to conservation measures to be recommended to the Commission (Comm.Doc.67/7) and to the Canadian proposal for an earlier closing date for sealing in the Front Area (Comm.Doc.67/2). After full discussion of the important matters under consideration, the Panel reached agreement and

recommends

1. that the open season for taking or killing harp and hooded seals in the Front Area for the 1968 season only shall be from 6:00 a.m. local time on the twelfth day of March to 12:00 p.m. local time on the twenty-fifth day of April;
2. that the killing of adult seals in whelping patches shall be prohibited.

The Panel members recognized that certain regulations, including a prohibition against the use of helicopters or other aircraft in sealing operations and a requirement to remove seal skins from the ice to the base of operations within 24 hours from the day the seals are killed, which had been in force during the 1967 sealing season as the result of an Exchange of Notes between governments, could not be recommended to the Commission within the provisions of Article VIII of the Convention. It was confirmed, however, by the Panel members that their governments would retain these regulations for the 1968 season and that this decision should be brought to the attention of the Commission.

Mr Lund (Norway) proposed that arrangements should be made for international inspection of sealing operations and suggested that consideration be given to developing a joint enforcement agreement between Canada and Norway. The Panel agreed with this proposal and

recommends

that representatives of Canada, Denmark and Norway meet in Hamburg at the time of the ICES meeting next fall to give serious consideration to sealing regulations both from the conservation and humane points of view and to discuss international inspection and possible joint enforcement procedures.

7. Future Research. It was agreed that this agenda item had been dealt with in the recommendation recorded in Item 5 of this report and that documents containing any new data should be prepared and sent to the Executive Secretary for distribution to Panel members before the proposed Hamburg meeting.

8. Next Meeting. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Panel should be held at the same time and place as the next meeting of the Commission.

9. Other Business. All Panel members expressed concern about the widespread unfavourable publicity directed to commercial sealing operations in the Convention Area in recent years and wished to advise the Commission that serious consideration has been given to the humane killing problem. Good cooperation has been developed among representatives of government, industry and animal welfare agencies.

10. Approval of Report. It was agreed that the report of the Panel meeting be prepared by the Rapporteur and made available to Panel members for approval.

11. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.



Serial No.1928
(B.f.67)

Proceedings No.7
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel A

Saturday, 3 June, 1630 hr

1. The meeting was called to order by Dr B. Rasmussen.
2. Dr G.F.M.Smith was elected as Rapporteur.
3. The Chairman briefly reviewed the meeting of Panel A in Copenhagen, 13 and 14 October 1966.
4. The documents relating to this meeting are Contributions 1 to 8 inclusive of the Copenhagen meeting, a brief from the International Society for the Protection of Animals (ISPA), ICAF Res.Docs.67/11, 67/83, 67/86 and 67/112 and ICAF Comm.Doc. 67/7.
5. Dr Rasmussen added the following 1967 Norwegian catch statistics at the Front to Table 1 of Contribution 6, 1966:

<u>Expedition</u>	<u>Harp Seals</u>			<u>Hooded Seals</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>Pups</u>	<u>Older</u>	<u>Sum</u>	<u>Pups</u>	<u>Older</u>	<u>Sum</u>	
15	148,500	31,000	179,500	8,000	6,700	14,700	194,200

and the following total catches for Canada and Norway at the Front for 1967:

	<u>Harp Seals</u>			<u>Hooded Seals</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>Pups</u>	<u>Older</u>	<u>Sum</u>	<u>Pups</u>	<u>Older</u>	<u>Sum</u>	
	189,604	41,842	231,446	8,655	7,285	15,940	237,386

6. A discussion of the documents and comments on current investigations showed the following important information:
 - (a) There seems to have been a real decline in harp seal stocks at the Front over the last 15 years but this cannot be accurately quantified.

Some harp seals tagged in the Gulf in 1966 were taken one year later on the Front.
 - (b) The hood seals in the Gulf and the Front appear to be one stock. There has been no decrease in the stock. There is some evidence from size data that the Newfoundland hood seals may be separate from those in Greenland and/or that there are parts of the Newfoundland hood seal population north of the fished area. There are large variations in the annual catches of hood seals. This may be to a large extent due to differences in ice conditions rather than seal abundance.
 - (c) The practical difficulties in estimating seal population abundance by tag and recapture methods and by air photographs were discussed. The tagging method suffers from non-uniform distribution of tagged seals and the sealing fishing effort and also that some of the pups are born after the tagging is completed. The air photograph method gives low estimates, as a proportion of the seals may be in the water when the photographs are taken and also all the pups may not be born yet.
7. On the suggestion of Dr Sprules, it was agreed that this committee had three main duties as follows:
 - (a) To assess the population dynamics of the seal herds, relying on the expert assistance of an *ad hoc* group from the Assessments Subcommittee of the Committee on Research and Statistics.

(over)

- (b) On the advice of the *ad hoc* assessments group, to state the form and detail of statistics needed for adequate population dynamics evaluations.
 - (c) To advise Panel A regarding the utilization of seal stocks.
 - (d) To advise the Panel regarding the Canadian proposal for closure of the fishing season at the Front five days earlier than at present, *i.e.* on 25 April.
8. The meeting reconvened at 0830, 5 June.
9. It is noted with satisfaction that Canada and Norway have been cooperating on seal research and that this will continue.
10. The report of the *ad hoc* Seal Assessment Working Group was examined and after discussion, with minor revisions, accepted. This report is attached here as Annex I.
11. The meeting adjourned at 0915.

Serial No.1928Proceedings No.7
Appendix I
Annex IANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967Seal Assessments Working Group1. Separation of Stocks

As noted in the report of the Copenhagen meeting, the two breeding groups of harp seals - in the Gulf and on the Front - can probably be considered as separate stocks for management purposes. The harp seals caught at West Greenland and in the Canadian Arctic also come from the same stocks, though the proportion of Gulf and Front animals in these catches is not accurately known. The continuation of studies on stock separation is very desirable.

It appears that the Front stock of harp seals shows signs of depletion and, therefore, the working group concentrated its attention on the Front herd.

2. State of the Front Stock

The working group agreed that there had been a substantial reduction in this stock since the late 1940's, though they could not express this decline in precise quantitative terms. While it was also impossible to determine the precise position of the stock relative to the level giving the maximum sustainable yield, any further reduction in stock will not result in any appreciable increase in sustainable yield and is likely to result in an appreciable decrease.

3. Present sustainable yield

The sustainable yield depends on the stock abundance, the mortality rates, the age at first maturity, and the reproductive rate of the adult females. Some of these change with changes in stock abundance and are not known very precisely. The sustainable yield, in terms of numbers, also depends on whether pups, immature or mature animals, and whether males or females are caught.

Within the probable range of these population parameters, even when there is no catching of older seals, at least 60% of the pups must survive the first few weeks of life in order to maintain the breeding stock. That is the sustainable yield, if taken as pups, is less than 40% of the number of pups produced.

Because of the mortality before maturity, a catch of 100 pups will cause less reduction to the mature stocks than catches of 100 immature (between 1 and 5 years old), or 100 mature animals. For the probable annual natural mortality rates of 20%, a catch of 100 pups is equivalent to a catch of 33 adults or 67 immatures, assuming equal numbers of males and females. Less damage is done to the breeding stock if fewer females are taken.

The average production of pups from the Front herd between 1960 and 1966 has been estimated from photographic survey and tagging as 230 to 250 thousand; from these estimates the sustainable yield in this period is, therefore, less than 100,000 pups. The actual average annual catches were 143,000 pups and 64,500 older seals; assuming the latter are half mature and half immature, these catches were equivalent to 145,000 pups - a total of 288,000 "pup equivalents". That is, very nearly three times the estimated sustainable yield has been taken. This difference between the catch and the sustainable yield is so great that, although there is some doubt about the precise size of the present stock and of the sustainable yield from it, there is no doubt that very much more than the sustainable yield is now being taken. Most recently even greater over-exploitation may have taken place, since it appears that substantially more than half the pups may have been caught, judging by the scarcity of post-moulting pups on the ice and the scarcity of immature animals in some samples of Front seals.

If these catches are continued, it is certain that the breeding stock and production of pups will decline; probably due to recent high catches of pups,

(over)

the breeding stock will decline for the next four years whatever catches are taken in the future. The recovery of a depleted stock will be slow, not more than about 15-20% per year even if no catches are taken.

4. Effect of changed closing dates

Through the course of the season for moulting adult and immature seals, the proportion of adults and the proportion of females in the catch increase. Therefore, the same catch, taken early in the season, will have a less harmful effect on the future breeding stocks. Also, if the number of vessels in the fishery does not alter, an earlier closing date will reduce the total catch. Therefore, an early closing date will result in a larger future stock of breeding females than there would be with a late closing date.

5. Other measures

The working group noted that certain measures other than the proposed closing date of April 25th are already in force by agreement between the governments concerned - an opening date on the Front of March 12th, a closing date of April 30th, and protection of females in the whelping patches. All these will give some benefit and should result in bigger future stocks of breeding females than would have occurred without them. However, these, plus the April 25th closing date, cannot guarantee that no more than the sustainable yield is taken. In fact, at present, the catch of pups alone is probably greater than the stock can sustain, and any catch of older females will accelerate the decline of the stocks.

6. Statistics

The group recognized that the provision of adequate statistics is essential to better understanding of the state of the stocks. It, therefore,

recommended

that the following statistics should be reported to and published by ICNAF:

- (a) Harp seals. Total catch, divided according to
 - (a) Area (Gulf or Front; West Greenland; by districts)
 - (b) Age and type of pelt (whitecoats; ragged jackets; beaters; immatures; matures).
- (b) Hood seals. Total catch, by the same area breakdown, and by pups and older animals.

Canada should also be asked to report catches of harp and hood seals taken from parts of the Northwest Atlantic outside the ICNAF Area.



Serial No.1933
(E.b.67)

Proceedings No.8

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Ceremonial Opening Meeting

Monday, 5 June, 1000 hrs

The opening session was convened in the Old South Meeting House, corner of Washington and Milk Streets, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, on 5 June 1967. The Chairman, Mr T.A.Fulham (USA), welcomed the Commissioners, Advisers, Observers and Guests to the 17th Annual Meeting as follows:

"It is pleasing to note the presence of distinguished delegations from Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Soviet Union, United Kingdom and USA. With some prejudice I am sure your visit to Boston will be a happy one.

"It is always interesting when considering the subject of conservation to review the historical background and the events leading up to the necessity for conservation of the resource in question. It goes without saying that there would be no need for conservation programs on the schedule now contemplated if the resources in their primary use had been considered as capable of depletion. However, this is never the case. It is interesting to read the remarks of the original settlers of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. One Francis Higgenson remarked in 1630, 'The abundance of seafish are almost beyond believing,' and about the same time Thomas Morton wrote, 'Multitudes of cod, in addition to sturgeon, salmon, herring, eels, smelts, shad, halibut, flounder and bass, as well as lobsters are there, infinite in store in all parts of the land, and a great store of oysters in the entrance of all rivers.' He further speaks of mussels, clams, razorfish, cockles and scallops. I'm sure that Mr Higgenson and Mr Morton never dreamed that the people who occupy the land adjacent to these vast resources would one day be faced with the problem of foreseeable depletion and be contemplating a program of planned harvesting lest there be nothing left for future generations. This, then, is our task - only not several towns, but 14 nations; not 160 vessels, but hundreds of thousands; not several million pounds, but 3,000,000 tons. Our task is very great, but not beyond the combined willingness to accomplish the job."

Mr Theodore W. Schulenberg, Commissioner of Commerce and Development of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and Mr Daniel J. Finn, Commissioner of Housing and Building Development for the City of Boston, welcomed the Commission to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the City of Boston respectively.

The Chairman then requested the Honourable Stanley A. Cain, Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, to present his remarks to the meeting. The following is the text of Dr Cain's address to the meeting:

"It is my great pleasure to speak for Secretary Udall and to welcome you to the United States for this 17th Annual Meeting of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. Most of you have gathered together before, but for the first time representatives of the newest ICNAF member, Romania, are present, and we extend an especial welcome to them.

"It is fitting that the Commission should return periodically to the US for its Annual Meeting since the Convention was originally drafted at a conference in Washington in January 1949 and the first Annual Meeting of the Commission was held in Washington in 1951. Two other meetings have been held in the US since that time.

"This is the first meeting of the Commission in Boston, however, which is a most appropriate site for an ICNAF meeting. Fishing is one of the oldest New England industries and New England is one of the oldest regions in the Americas. That this meeting should be held in this historic structure is indicative of our link with the past.

"Fishing is still an important industry in New England and we expect that it will remain so in the future. The first plenary meeting of the Commission will convene at noon today in the new John F. Kennedy Federal Building. This

location symbolizes the vibrant new spirit to be found in New England, in which we hope the fishing industry will share. We hope this lofty setting will also be symbolic of the achievements at the meeting.

"Boston is one of the leading fishing ports, not only in the ICNAF Area, but also in this country and, for that matter, in the world. But there are also other important fishing ports in this part of the country, and we hope the participants in this meeting will have an opportunity to visit some of them during your stay in the US.

"The fisheries of the Northwest Atlantic Ocean are the oldest in the Western Hemisphere, having been prosecuted for more than five centuries. It was recognized during the 1940's that some of the stocks of fish in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean, particularly off the New England coast, were showing signs of depletion. Recognition of the problem of reduced abundance and potential depletion of the fisheries of the North Atlantic led to the convening of several international conferences. Ultimately, it was decided to separate the North Atlantic into eastern and western sections for conservation purposes, and in 1949 a conference was held which led to the organization of this Commission in 1951. The Commission moved promptly to propose a 4 1/2-inch minimum mesh size for the haddock trawl fishery in Subarea 5 at its Second Annual Meeting, and this regulation entered into force in 1953. In 1955 the Commission proposed further regulation for cod and haddock in Subareas 3, 4 and 5, and these regulations have been in force since 1957. In 1961 the Commission proposed extending the regulations to Subareas 1 and 2 and extending the regulations in Subareas 3 and 4.

"Unfortunately, these regulations have not yet entered into force. However, the Commission does have other achievements to its credit. Principal among these is a vast increase in scientific cooperation among the members of the Commission, which has led to a marked increase in knowledge of the stocks of fish in the ICNAF Area and their environment. This scientific cooperation serves as an excellent example of the benefits to be derived from gathering together and examining problems on a cooperative and friendly basis. The Commission has also led to a great improvement in communications among the governments and fishing industries of the nations involved.

"I mentioned the fact that the Commission's 1961 proposals which would greatly increase the scope of the ICNAF minimum mesh size regulations, have not yet entered into force. But the Commission is also faced with another major, perhaps even more serious, problem; that is the tremendous increase in fishing effort during the last few years. The Commission's scientists have concluded that additional regulatory action is necessary to supplement the minimum mesh size regulations when and if they enter into force. You are now giving urgent study to this very critical problem.

"As you face this new and troublesome problem for the Commission, I would like to review briefly the possible courses of action open to fishing nations, and the world fishing situation. Historically, fishing nations have been faced with two alternative courses of action: first, is international cooperation designed to relieve problems on a mutually agreeable basis and to enhance high seas fishing activities. ICNAF is an example of this course of action. The second alternative is that of greater national control of coastal waters; that is to say, jurisdiction of the coastal nation over the stocks of fish found close to its shore. Claims of two hundred miles of jurisdiction by several nations are examples of this course of action. More recently, a third choice has been introduced and is receiving interest on the part of some persons; that is, international ownership or control of the resources.

"The ICNAF members have been in the forefront of the nations who have been actively promoting use of the first alternative as the best method of solving international fisheries problems. In fact, almost every strong advocate of this solution is represented in this Commission.

"We are all keenly aware of the vast and continuing increase in fisheries throughout the world, which is highly desirable because of protein dietary deficiencies for millions of people. With this increase we have seen a growing concern of coastal fishermen and coastal nations for the conservation of the fishery resources and for the livelihood of the coastal fishermen. In the face of this concern, an

increasing number of coastal nations are taking or considering action in the form of extension of jurisdiction. These nations are actively advocating this alternative as the best solution for all nations, and they are watching for any sign of failure of international cooperative action to provide them with additional arguments with which to persuade other nations to follow their course of action.

"The US shares this growing concern about possible depletion of stocks of fish in the Northwest Atlantic and particularly off its coast and is also deeply concerned about the livelihood of its coastal fishermen. This is particularly true in the important fishing areas of the ICNAF Area. We have noted the lengthy process that is often required to reach agreement on the necessary conservation action. While we recognize that many difficult problems are involved and that there are many diverse points of view about the nature of the problems and the best course of action for their solution, we are also keenly aware that modern technological developments no longer permit a leisurely approach to fisheries conservation measures. We have reached the stage in technological development where a fishery can be seriously depleted if adequate conservation measures are not taken expeditiously; and yet, as I have mentioned, the additional mesh size regulations which the Commission found necessary for much of the Convention Area six years ago are not yet in force.

"This demonstrates that there remain serious problems before the Northwest Atlantic Commission. While ICNAF has achieved much in the fields of scientific cooperation and improved communications between governments and fishermen, it has not overcome some of the technical problems of regulating this complex fishery, nor has it overcome government slowness in accepting the recommendations of the Commission.

"If ICNAF is to succeed as an important world force in conservation, it must accelerate its pace, and it must do so quickly. Unless we are able to achieve the desired ends through agents such as this international cooperative mechanism, then the other alternatives will unquestionably be explored, to conserve the stocks and to protect the interest of the fishermen.

"I am aware that the member governments of this Commission are among the most sophisticated fishing nations in the world and the foremost advocates of international cooperative action to solve fishery problems. They are parties to many other agreements for this purpose. It seems quite apparent that if this Commission does not achieve its goal of cooperation in the field of conservation, it will seriously diminish the possibility that it can lead the world towards unanimous agreement that international cooperative action is by far the most effective way of providing for the reasonable use of the living resources of the high seas.

"We have a grave responsibility. We have in our hands the possibility of taking action which will make this situation brighter. If we take a positive stance on this problem, we can set an example that will lead the world toward a reasonable solution to fisheries today. The USA looks on this as a most important undertaking.

"The USA is happy that you were able to come here for your Annual Meeting and sincerely hopes that significant progress can be made during this week. Beside the hard work of the Commission, we hope that you will have an interesting and happy time."

The Chairman expressed his personal appreciation to those present and asked for standing applause. He then declared the 17th Annual Meeting of the Commission open.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of the First Plenary Session

Monday, 5 June, 1210 hrs

- Item 1. Opening. The Chairman of the Commission, Mr T.A.Fulham (USA) called the First Plenary Session to order. He welcomed the delegates from the 14 member countries of the Commission, as well as the Observers from FAO, ICES, NEAFC, The Netherlands, IOC, Japan and Ireland. He welcomed particularly the Romanian delegation headed by Mr C. Nicolau who expressed his Government's pleasure on joining the Commission (Appendix I). The Chairman then presented his opening remarks (Appendix II) which outlined the problems before the Commission and emphasized the necessity for their early and satisfactory solution.
- Item 2. Agenda. The agenda was adopted with the addition of consideration of Comm.Doc.67/22 which contained the text of a USSR resolution to set up an IOC Working Group to look into the legal aspects of scientific research in the high seas.
- Item 3. Publicity. The Chairman, in accordance with past practice, appointed a Committee on Publicity consisting of the Chairman of the Commission, the Chairmen of the Standing Committees on Research and Statistics and on Finance and Administration, with the Executive Secretary.
- Item 17. Report of Standing Committee on Research and Statistics. The Chairman of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, Dr W. Templeman (Canada), was asked to present a provisional report of the result of the deliberations of the members of the Standing Committee. The Chairman of Research and Statistics explained that a Provisional Report of the Committee with reports of six of its subcommittees had been prepared and distributed to the meeting participants and that a full report with all appendices would be presented to the Plenary for approval after the last meeting of the Committee. Dr Templeman then reviewed the Provisional Summary Report.
- The Chairman of the Commission thanked Dr Templeman for his full and clear account.
- Item 4. Status of Commission Proposals. The Chairman referred to the report of the US State Department on the status of proposals adopted by the Commission for changes in the Convention and for international regulation of fisheries (Comm.Doc.67/10). There were no comments.
- Item 5. Returns of Infringements, 6. Simplification of Regulations, 7. Top-side Chafers, and 8. Mesh Measuring. These Items were referred to the *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations with Dr A.W.H.Needler (Canada) as Chairman.
- Item 9. Exchange of Inspection Officers. Dr Rodriguez-Martin (Spain) reported that Portugal and Spain had conducted an exchange of inspectors again in 1967 and that a joint Portuguese-Spanish report will be presented for distribution as Comm.Doc.67/27.
- Item 10. International Inspection Scheme. The meeting agreed that the international control scheme agreed to at the Fifth Meeting of NEAFC (Annex D of Comm.Doc.67/18) could provide a good basis for discussion of a possible scheme for ICNAF. It was agreed that the Item should be considered again by the Plenary when the *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations had concluded its deliberations on mesh measuring under Agenda Item 8.

Captain Almeida (Portugal) drew attention to the statement under International Control on page 24 of Annual Proceedings Vol.16 which

could be interpreted as suggesting that all Commissioners had agreed to the need to develop a scheme for international control which would be common to both NEAFC and ICNAF. He explained that Portugal considered the conditions in the NEAFC and ICNAF Areas to be different and might therefore require different schemes.

Item 11.

Possible Conservation Actions. Dr Cain (USA) said that the US delegates had read with great interest the report of the Working Group on Joint Biological and Economic Assessment of Conservation Actions, which certainly had given much food for thought. Although there were undoubtedly many grave problems to overcome if action were to be taken in this field, the US delegates were impressed by the recommendations of the Working Group. In addition, the Report of the Subcommittee on Assessments had provided further insights into the problem. He said there was also very much concern that the Commission take expeditious action on the findings of the scientists that additional conservation actions were necessary beyond the minimum mesh size regulations; and there was very much concern about the heavy fishing in the ICNAF Area. This was particularly true concerning the overfishing of the haddock stocks in Subarea 5, which is so critical to the American fishing industry. He concluded that the Commission had no alternative but to propose to member governments a system of quotas that would take care of these problems. It was urgent that levels be determined and brought into force. He proposed that the Research and Statistics Committee be instructed to give further urgent consideration to the Report of the Working Group and to possible quotas in the Convention Area, and that this question also be referred to the various Panels. He hoped that when they reported back later in the week, the future course of action for the Commission would be much clearer.

Mr Lund (Norway) stated that the Research and Statistics Committee should assess how much of a stock the fishery can take, not how much will be taken.

Mr Tame (UK) was puzzled as to what the Research and Statistics Committee and the Panels should do. His country considered the problem more than a scientific one and that there was the need for a special feasibility study in a smaller area. He questioned if the Research and Statistics Committee was the right body to carry out such a task.

Dr Cain (USA) pointed out that the Committee was in the best position to estimate possible quotas applicable to the various areas. Since mesh size alone was not adequate regulation, the Commission must explore the possibility of regulation by a system of quotas.

Mr Løkkegaard (Denmark) said he did not fully understand the US proposal but that he recognized the urgency of the US. He believed studies by the Panels would be a waste of time and that the Committee should evaluate ways and means and the consequences of these ways and means. He believed that it was too early to say that there was a need for new means when the results of the existing measures were not yet known. He agreed with the UK delegate that the Commission should give specific and detailed terms of reference to the body exploring regulations by catch quotas. He felt strongly that the matter was too serious to take any quick action.

Mr Kamentsev (USSR) understood that the Commission can establish maximum sustainable catch on the basis of scientific evidence. Therefore, there was a need for intensive and thorough research studies. He pointed out that, under Article VIII(1), the Commission cannot divide catch quotas. He supported the position of Denmark that the problem was too serious to take any quick decision.

Dr Rodriguez-Martin (Spain) believed that it was necessary to see the full effect of the enforcement of the regulations not yet ratified before the need for other kinds of regulations were considered.

Mr Lund (Norway) explained that his country does not have a negative attitude to this problem but that the scientists should first establish how much can be taken before any consideration can be given to establishing catch quotas.

Dr Cain (USA) said that, by Article VIII(1)(e), the Commission has the power to set global quotas and that it should ask its scientists if the information required to set catch quotas is now available. He pointed out that recommendations for global quotas and regulatory actions comes from the Panels and that they should therefore give consideration to the problem. He suggested that the Commission set up a Committee to seek this information. The Meeting agreed to reconvene at 0900 hrs, Tuesday, 6 June, in order to give further consideration to Agenda Item 11.

The meeting adjourned at 1340 hrs.



Serial No. 1934
(B.b.67)

Proceedings No. 9
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Opening Statement at the First Plenary Session of ICNAF

by the Chairman, Mr T. Fulham

Those of you who participated in the 1966 Annual Meeting in Madrid will remember my opening remarks on the problems facing the Commission. I will not go into them again at this time, but I will remind you that I felt then that the Commission was undergoing a very critical period - that its long-term success or failure could well hinge on its ability at that meeting to break out of the chafing gear impasse which had been blocking the Commission's minimum mesh size proposals for years. This was not the only problem facing the Commission, but it was the one problem that the Commission focused on during last year's meeting in hopes of getting it out of the way once and for all so that the Commission could go on to devote its time to the other grave problems it faced.

After some difficulties apparently we reached a solution to the chafing gear problem with the approval of a fourth type of chafing gear - the tight-fitting, large-mesh or the so-called Polish-type - to be used under the 1963 proposal when it entered into force. It was recognized at that time that a certain period would be necessary to equip stern trawlers with the new chafing gear, in those countries which desired to use it. This meant that the reservations would not be removed immediately. It was hoped, however, I am sure, by all participants, that we would be able to place the conservation regulations for Subareas 1 and 2 and the revised conservation regulations on Subareas 3 and 4 into force for the 1967 fishing season. However, nothing has happened. To date no reservations have been removed. If all of them were to be removed today, the regulations would still not enter into force until the 1967 fishing season was almost over because of the built-in delay in the Convention. As it stands, we do not know when the reservations will be removed. With the fishing problems facing us, we must ensure that at least the minimum mesh size regulations, which the Commission found necessary up to six years ago, enter into force for the 1968 fishing season so that we can build other necessary regulations on this base.

Since the Commission began formulating its minimum mesh size regulations, it has found it necessary to propose substantial regulations or amendments in most years. I will not try and list the proposals or amendments which are currently pending entry into force. This is well documented in Comm.Doc.67/10. I will remind you, however, that there are no conservation regulations in force in Subareas 1 and 2. In Subarea 3, we have a 4-inch minimum mesh regulation for cod and haddock only. In 1961 the Commission found that this minimum size should be increased to 4-1/2 inches. The Commission has found also that a number of other species should be added to the list of those regulated. In Subarea 4 the Commission has found that the 4-1/2 inch minimum mesh size should be expanded to include flounders. And yet these changes in the regulations for Subareas 3 and 4 have never entered into force. Only in Subarea 5 do we have in force all of the minimum mesh regulations that the Commission has found necessary. But even so, I can testify from my own personal experience that the fisheries in Subarea 5 are in grave danger. The amount of time that this Commission has had to devote, and continues to devote, to the technical problem of chafing gear inhibits its ability to attack these new and serious problems.

I have been associated with this Commission for many years and with the American fishing industry for many more years. My tour of duty as your Chairman has given me some additional invaluable insights into the problems which are facing the Commission and the fishermen who operate in the Convention Area. I am most grateful for this experience as Chairman because it has given me a new perspective on its problems.

This Commission is one of the largest multilateral fishery commissions in the world, and conserves some of the richest fishing grounds in the world ocean. It has been in existence for 16 years and it must now in a relatively short time find solutions to problems of great magnitude. Other nations of the world have a right to expect us to be among the leaders in finding new and practical measures to conserve effectively the fishery resources of the Northwest Atlantic. I am less than satisfied with our current progress and I urge each delegate to expend renewed effort and to join me in overcoming all obstacles to success in our objectives.

There are a number of critical problems facing the Commission at this Annual Meeting. We must use our time wisely during these next few days so that we can make significant progress in resolving all of them.

First, there is the chafing gear problem which has taken up so much of our time during the past several years. If there are any problems remaining after the action we took last year, we must resolve them now or set up a mechanism to resolve them so that all of the recommended minimum mesh size regulations may enter into force during the 1968 fishing season.

Secondly, we must give urgent attention to bringing into force for the ICNAF Area a joint inspection or enforcement system. We are grateful to the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission for enabling members of ICNAF who are not members of that commission to participate in their discussions on this subject. This has contributed materially to a closer relationship between the two commissions, and it has saved a great deal of time and effort for ICNAF. We hope that this cooperation will enable us to take care of this matter quickly. I might note that we have invited the members of NEAFC who are not members of ICNAF to attend this meeting, and I assure them that the invitation was extended with the expectation that they would participate in the discussion of those topics, such as enforcement, which are of mutual concern to the two commissions. We urge them to do so.

Third, we are aware that much additional research effort is needed on the stocks of fish in the Convention Area and on their environment. We must accelerate the pace of research if we are to keep abreast of the rapid development of fishing.

Fourth, we must consider what action is possible for the Commission to take in view of the rapid and continuous increase of fishing effort in the ICNAF Area. Many of us realize that, in the face of this increased effort, minimum mesh size regulations by themselves are inadequate. We must take some kind of additional action to meet this grave problem. We are grateful to those who have contributed so much to the understanding of this matter through the report of the Working Group on Bio-Economic Assessments. We are not sure what we should do, but we realize that we do not have much time to consider and act on this problem of increased effort.

These, of course, are not the only problems facing the Commission during this meeting but they are grave ones and they do illustrate the magnitude of our task. We must move forward resolutely in solving them.

The cost of failure is high. We can measure it in terms of reduced return on our investments, reduced earnings for our fishermen, and increased costs to our consumers. These costs are becoming more and more apparent to the industries which are our responsibility. But beyond this, the world is witnessing a grim race between rapidly growing populations and less rapidly growing food supplies. We have it in our power to influence the outcome. We may not ignore this opportunity.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR



THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 1934
(B.f.67)

Proceedings No. 9
Appendix II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

The Statement of the Head of Delegation for Romania

Mr G. Nicolau

at the First Plenary Session of ICNAF

Mr Chairman, Mr Executive Secretary, Gentlemen:

On behalf of the delegation of the Romanian Socialist Republic, I have the honour to address my thanks to Mr T.A.Fulham, the Chairman of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, for his special welcome extended to the delegates from Romania, which becomes the fourteenth member country of the Commission.

The presence of Romania at this session is the consequence of our interest in the fishing in the Convention Area, and underlines our permanent policy for international cooperation based on the respect of sovereignty and independence among the States.

Romania is pursuing an active and multilateral policy, intensifying and extending its relations with all States irrespective of their social order.

By this way of cooperation, Romania gives its contribution to the confidence and friendship among the peoples in order to create an international détente.

Romania is very interested in fisheries research, protection and conservation for the purpose of facilitating and realizing high catches. For this reason, my country fully supports the Convention and consequently all the Declarations and Proceedings adopted until now.

Up to the present we are fishing in Subarea 5, and our catches are rather small and composed mainly of herring and other pelagic species.

In the future, our fishing vessel fleet on the High Seas will grow sensibly in accordance with our developing plans and consequently our experience in the matter will have the same effect.

Our Research and Designing Institute will create, this year, a station for fisheries research and technical and economic information for the activity on the High Seas. The collaboration in all directions of this Institute with the ICNAF Research Committee will be an important task and this collaboration, I am sure, will be fruitful.

Once again I am addressing my thanks to the Chairman, the Honourable T.A.Fulham, and to all here present for the attention given to the Romanian delegation, with our best wishes for the continued success of ICNAF.



Serial No.1936
(B.g.11.67)

Proceedings No.10

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of First Meeting of *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations

Monday, 5 June, 1600 hrs

1. The Chairman, Dr Needler (Canada), opened the meeting and noted the items referred to the *ad hoc* Committee from the Plenary agenda. He proposed and the Committee agreed to deal with the items in the following order:

- (i) Plenary Item 8, Mesh measuring
- (ii) Plenary Item 7, Topside chafer
- (iii) Plenary Item 6, Simplification of international trawl regulations
- (iv) Plenary Item 5, Annual return of infringements

2. Under Plenary Item 8, Mesh Measuring, the Chairman referred to a resolution of the *ad hoc* Committee accepted by the Commission in June 1966 setting up a Working Group to study problems of mesh gauges and measuring and the Working Group's Report contained in Comm.Doc.67/6.

3. Mr Parrish, Rapporteur of the Working Group, reviewed its Report stating that the terms of reference were to consider the mesh measuring problem in the light of further discussion in NEAFC and with a view to consideration at the 17th Annual Meeting of adopting a single gauge. The Working Group considered two gauges: (a) a so-called USSR gauge with thickness and taper as prescribed by ICNAF regulations and with pressure applied by using a weight. They recommended this as a standard ICNAF gauge but proposed further tests with the gauge. Some of these have been carried out and reported to the Research and Statistics Committee. The Working Group also considered (b) a modified NEAFC gauge with both tapered and parallel sided sections, which allows measurements as prescribed by ICNAF and would also meet NEAFC requirements. The Working Group did not recommend against alternate gauges. It considered the number of meshes to be measured but was not prepared to advise. However, the meeting of the Gear and Selectivity Subcommittee of the Research and Statistics Committee has provided some advice.

In an exchange of views, Mr Volkov (USSR) stated that Soviet inspectors commonly use the ICNAF gauge without a weight and that the weight is only applied when the inspector has reason to believe that meshes are below minimum size.

Mr Tame (UK) referring to a memorandum by the UK delegation on mesh measuring (Comm.Doc.67/26) pointing out that, if the *ad hoc* Committee sought to move toward a single gauge, then a modified NEAFC gauge with tapered sections and parallel sided sections is the only one meeting regulations on both sides of the Atlantic.

The Chairman asked concerning tests between gauges and accepted the report from the Gear and Selectivity Subcommittee that tests had shown negligible differences when the different gauges were used by trained operators.

The Chairman in attempting to sum the discussion pointed out that to meet ICNAF regulation requires (1) definition of the taper and thickness of the gauge, (2) ability of the gauge to measure meshes and (3) capability of the gauge to be employed with a pressure or pull. His view was that the gauge with interrupted taper (the modified NEAFC gauge as proposed by UK) is capable of meeting these requirements.

After considerable discussion about definition of mesh size, use of the gauge by fishermen, the lack of a defined measuring method in NEAFC and the methods proposed for international enforcement, it became clear that one of the main difficulties in standardization of gauge and methods of measuring lay in the difference between ICNAF and NEAFC regulations.

(over)

It was concluded that, for the ICNAF Area, the regulations in force specify the thickness and taper of a gauge and that, instead of a range of pressures or pulls as now stated in the ICNAF regulation, one specific pressure should be designated (possibly 5 kg).

It was then

recommended

that the *ad hoc* Committee suggest to the Commission that it attempt to arrange joint consideration by ICNAF and NEAFC of their respective regulations with a view to devising a single procedure and gauge for measuring meshes.

The meeting adjourned at 1730 hrs.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967Report of First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and AdministrationMonday, 5 June, 1405 hrs

F&A Item 1. Opening. The Chairman welcomed Commissioners and their Advisers from thirteen member countries. Italy was not represented.

F&A Item 2. Rapporteur. The Executive Secretary was appointed Rapporteur.

F&A Item 3. Agenda. The agenda was adopted without changes.

F&A Item 4. Panel Memberships. The Executive Secretary reviewed Comm.Doc.67/1 and reported the addition of three members to Panel A, bringing the total panel memberships to 40. Panel memberships in relation to current exploitation in subareas were reviewed. The Federal Republic of Germany reported that it proposed to apply for membership in Panel 3 in 1968; Norway, possibly Panel 2 or 3 in 1968; Denmark, considering Panel 3 membership in 1968; Poland, Panel 5 membership in 1968; Iceland, considering Panel 3 membership. The People's Republic of Romania asked that consideration be given to their application for membership in Panel 5. F&A

recommends

that the People's Republic of Romania be admitted to membership in Panel 5.

F&A Item 5. Auditor's Report. The Auditor's Report for the fiscal year ending 30 June 1966 with Appendix I as published in Annual Proceedings Vol.16, p.10-13, was presented by the Executive Secretary and recommended by the Committee for adoption by the Commission.

F&A Item 6. Administrative Report and Financial Statements for 1966/67. The Executive Secretary reviewed the Administrative Report and Financial Statements (Comm.Doc.67/8), pointing out that there were expenditures of \$3,775.42 in excess of the appropriations for 1966/67. After discussion of the presentation of the Financial Statements and following a proposal by Mr W. Sullivan (USA), F&A

recommends

that a supplementary appropriation of \$550 to the budget be made from the surplus but unappropriated funds available in miscellaneous income (see Financial Statement #2),

and

recommends

that a supplementary appropriation of \$3,240.55 be made from the Working Capital Fund to cover the extra cost of Environmental Symposium Report, noting that this amount will be recovered and returned to the Working Capital Fund in accordance with Financial Regulation 7.1(b).

F&A Item 9. Status of Working Capital Fund. The Secretary reviewed the Working Capital Fund in accordance with Financial Regulation 6.6. Following the review, it was agreed that the Committee should consider the item later when all possible expenditures for 1967/68 were accumulated from the Research and Statistics Committee and the Commission. It was generally agreed that a rough range for the ceiling amount of the Working Capital Fund should be from \$10,000 to \$25,000.

(over)

F&A Item 10. Review of Financial Regulations, 13, Relief from Canadian income tax. These items were considered together as they deal with crediting Commission income. Following discussion, F&A agreed

- 1) that, for the 1967/68 billing, the income from bank interest be credited to the Member States;
- 2) that the Romanian billing for its contribution to the Working Capital Fund on joining the Commission 21 March 1967 be made on the basis of a \$10,000 Working Capital Fund;
- 3) that the second sentence of Financial Regulation 6.2 be revised to read as follows:

"The sources of monies of the Working Capital Fund shall be advances from the Member States and the sale of publications; advances from new Member States shall be 750 Canadian dollars;"
- 4) that a subcommittee consisting of one member from each of Canada, USA (and other member countries if they so desire) with the Executive Secretary, be set up
 - a) to review the financial regulations including consideration of the bank interest question and the crediting of Canadian income tax, if the Canadian Government action is favourable, and
 - b) to consider a Norwegian proposal that the size of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration be reduced.

F&A Item 11. Office Accommodation for Commission's Secretariat. The Executive Secretary reported that rapid expansion at the Bedford Institute of Oceanography had created considerable demands on the office space made available to the Commission's Secretariat in August 1963. Accommodation is just adequate with assurance that there will be no further demands.

The meeting adjourned at 1550 hrs.



Serial No.1938
(B.b.67)

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Second Plenary Session

Tuesday, 6 June, 0900 hrs

1. The Chairman opened the meeting and asked for comments on the Report of the Ceremonial Opening Meeting (Proc.8). The Report was accepted without comment.
2. The Chairman asked the Executive Secretary to read the Report of the First Plenary Session (Proc.9). The Report was adopted with minor alterations.
3. The Chairman agreed to a request from Captain Almeida (Portugal) that Plenary Item 4, Status of Proposals, which was discussed at the First Plenary Session, be reopened. Captain Almeida then reported that information from his country was that the Protocol relating to Measures of Control adopted by the Commission at the 1963 Annual Meeting and the Protocol to facilitate Entry into Force of Proposals adopted by the Commission at the 1964 Annual Meeting had been accepted by Portugal. He also reported that Portugal was preparing legislation which would take into account all ICNAF regulations, regardless of whether they were in force.

Dr Chrzan (Poland) reported that there was no apparent objection to proposals but that necessary governmental procedures were slowing ratification. Mr Kamentsev (USSR) reported that the USSR had sent its acceptance of the 1966 recommendation for Subarea 1 to Depositary Government in May of 1967.

4. The Chairman then called for continued consideration of Plenary Item 11, Possible Conservation Actions. Mr Tame (UK) said that he would like to make some general comments regarding the Bio-Economic Report (Comm.Doc.67/19) and suggest possible Commission procedure. He said that the Commission was indebted to the Group for this study and that his country accepts the general conclusions which are in line with the UK stand in this matter as presented in their memorandum to the meetings of NEAFC and ICNAF in 1966. He supported three conclusions of the Working Group:

- 1) that in certain stocks catch could be maintained or even increased with less effort;
- 2) increase in effort will produce an eventual decrease in catch, and
- 3) that mesh regulations are not sufficient.

The Report had also shown that there was no need to wait for sophisticated economic analysis, although economists have provided valuable quantifications which show large savings in money. He said that the biological and economic grounds for limiting fishing were now established and that the next step was how to bring it about.

He considered that not all of the Report's detailed findings were completely convincing. In particular there was the question whether there should be limitation of fishing by limiting catch or by limiting effort. The UK had made proposals last year for limiting effort which avoided some of the difficulties in the Report. The UK did not wish to press these proposals, however, and he agreed that the Commission might go ahead on the basis of limiting catch, though his country may want to return to limiting effort if great difficulties were encountered. He pointed out that there was now need for an attack on the practical problems of catch limits and that he could see five questions for study before the Commission could take any decision to establish quotas:

- 1) The determination of catch quotas. He agreed that there was a need to ask R&S if it has the information available to work out quotas. This was in line with a similar request made by NEAFC to their North East Arctic Group. But there were also practical problems for the administrators regarding the application of the scientists' recommendations.

- 2) The species problem. Whether, for example, cod and haddock should be dealt with separately or together; and the effect on fishing for other species.
- 3) Although the Convention did not cover the division of quotas between countries, this matter could not be ignored in any consideration of practical problems. An examination should be made of the factors that might arise in this connection.
- 4) Similarly, the question of national administration of quotas might need to be discussed in case it had any implications for the Commission. The help of economists would be valuable here.
- 5) The question of enforcement. There is need for international confidence in the enforcement of any regulations.

He thought that a feasibility study should be made in a specific area. This study would work out in detail how limitation of catch would be applied and uncover the practical problems. He thought that the area for this pilot investigation should be reasonably small and should not include the whole of the ICNAF Area and Region 1 of NEAFC, as suggested by the Working Group. He proposed, therefore, that a further Working Group be set up with fisheries administrators, biologists, and economists to work out such a study. At this stage, he saw no advantage in the piece-meal kind of discussion such as would occur if the matter were referred to Panels.

Dr Cain (USA) then elaborated further on the US proposal made at the First Plenary Session on the subject of additional conservation measures in the ICNAF Area. He recalled the US proposal that the Commission take seriously the Report of the Working Group on Joint Biological and Economic Assessments and the Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics wherein the view was expressed that additional conservation actions beyond mesh regulations are necessary in the ICNAF Area. Careful study by the USA of the various reports that have been made available in ICNAF over the past several years from various sources, including reports of NEAFC, has led to the conclusion that the Commission should work toward a system of global quotas in the North Atlantic which might well lead to a system of country quotas.

He said that his country was as well aware of the ramifications of this proposal as anyone and knew full well action must await the resolution of scientific as well as social, political, and economic differences among the member countries. He stressed that no precipitous action was sought but believed that some relatively prompt consideration was called for.

He pointed out that the US proposal called for a two-pronged approach to the problem. First, as intimated in the reports of the Commission scientists, further guidance should be given to them and they should be asked: (a) if it is possible to set global quotas for the various species and stocks in the North Atlantic; (b) if information is now available to set such quotas on one stock or all stocks found in the ICNAF Area or the entire North Atlantic; (c) if further study or analysis is needed, how long it will take to accomplish the task. Second, it is appropriate for the members of the five subarea panels to consider the practical problems of conservation within their geographic region. The Convention calls for recommendations of regulations to be initiated within the panels. He felt that lively debate should be expected and welcomed on the need for further regulations within the subareas with appropriate comments to the Commission after panel deliberations.

Then, he said, it would be the view of the US delegation that the most that could be expected from the meeting this year might be an agreement in principle that further regulations beyond mesh size are needed; that the global quota is one appropriate way of accomplishing this; and that a special Committee of Commissioners be set up to give this matter further study, including the various practical barriers to the implementation of a quota system. He then suggested the following terms of reference for a study by the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics:

1. Estimate of optimum reduction in effort required for maximum sustained yield.
2. Research required to establish annual catch quotas.
3. Precision that can be achieved with available data and effect of the errors in annual quotas on yield.

4. What are the magnitudes of the year-to-year adjustments in quota necessary to take into account for each stock, year-class fluctuation, recovery of the stock due to conservation measures, error in setting previous quotas, etc.
5. Estimation of appropriate global quotas for 1968 (also 1969--) to achieve part or all of reduction in 1.
6. Timetable.

Captain Almeida (Portugal) said how much his delegation appreciated the Report of the Bio-Economic Working Group and the competence of its work but that it was not yet prepared to present the viewpoint of Portugal. He pointed out that the Report refers to the possibility of fixing, as from 1968, the annual total of catches that shall be allotted to Member Countries. He believed that it was too early to start a study of the criteria to be adopted for the establishment of the shares of each country as the task was a very delicate and serious one for each country. He stressed that the Portuguese catch is not enough for his people's consumption and any reduction in the catch would cause serious economic and social problems. He said his country was ready to collaborate fully in developing any management scheme, but reminded the meeting that the Commission needs, primarily, to know what effects the ICNAF regulations, not yet in force, will have on the problem.

Mr Lund (Norway) believed that the statement of the scientists and economists on this important and complicated problem was clear and that the problem must be studied thoroughly. He pointed out that all countries wanted to develop their fisheries and that the problems created by the rapid development of fishing techniques should be brought under international control. He suggested that NEAFC and ICNAF might consider it possible to find a practical way of coordinating their discussions of the common problem of regulating their fisheries.

Dr Bogdanov (USSR) said that he was pleased to have been a member of the Working Group on Bio-Economics and to have heard the discussion of its subject matter in the meeting. He could see no great difference in points of view presented. He said that establishment of a strong global quota might lead to good results though not all scientists would agree. He believed that the first and most difficult task is to establish the quota size and that this problem is mainly biological. He suggested that there be

- (1) assessment of the state and value of the stocks using all methods available;
- (2) assessment of the maximum sustained catch;
- (3) study of the question of global quotas with economists.

He stressed the need for more support for the biological programs necessary to provide adequate assessments.

Mr Løkkegaard (Denmark) suggested that the problem needed parallel study by scientists, and administration and economists. He agreed with the UK delegate that the area chosen for a feasibility study should be small but believed that it should also be one containing as many of the problems as possible and that before detailed studies were started, there was a need for outlining cooperative actions with NEAFC. He agreed that there should be well-defined terms of reference for the scientists of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics but that the non-biological study should have equally clear terms.

Mr Popper (FAO) stressed the general aspects of the problem, pointing out that many nations were looking to the Commission for leadership. He said that FAO was very interested in providing assistance as appropriate and as required by co-operating with and contacting other nations to bring them into the problem.

The Chairman then suggested that a Special Committee on Fishery Management be set up to plan an attack on the problem, to recommend a course of action, and set up clearly defined terms of reference for future study groups.

Dr Needler (Canada) supported the Chairman's proposal. He considered that the problem was of a very serious nature. He agreed that mesh regulation was not adequate, although he believed it had not had a fair trial and that it was clear other measures were necessary to obtain maximum sustainable yield. He felt that more consideration should be given to the validity of the suggestions in the report of the Working Group. He supported the need for a forum for serious discussion which would provide an outline of the problems for solution, the answers required, and suggestions as to how the answers were to be sought. He believed that the Commission was not yet close to knowing the form and nature of regulations the Commission should adopt.

Mr Möcklinghoff (Federal Republic of Germany) agreed that a special committee should be set up which could work out, during the year, approaches to the problem and that NEAFC and ICNAF should coordinate its efforts. He agreed that there was much more information needed before any decision could be reached on regulation.

Dr Rodriguez Martin (Spain) pointed out that under the authority of Article VIII, there were other types of regulation that the Commission might investigate.

Mr Nicolau (Romania) supported the need for more scientific research and agreed to the establishment of a special committee.

With the unanimous agreement of the meeting, the Chairman named Mr V. Kamentsev (USSR) Chairman of a Special Committee on Fishery Management to decide on terms of reference for studies by the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics and by administrators and economists of the problem of adequate regulation for the fisheries, the Special Committee to meet at a time and place set by its Chairman.

5. Under Plenary Item 12, Canadian Proposal to Prohibit Fishing for Atlantic Salmon on the High Seas, the Plenary unanimously accepted a proposal by the UK delegation that the proposal be considered in a joint meeting of Panels 1-5 to be convened later during the Annual Meeting.

6. The meeting adjourned at 1050 hrs.



Serial No.1939
(B.c.67)

Proceedings No.13

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Second Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration

Wednesday, 7 June, 1215 hrs

1. The Report of the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Proc.11) was adopted with the deletion of "and/" in line 6 under F&A Item 4.

2. Under F&A Item 12, Review of Salaries, the Executive Secretary reviewed Comm.Doc.67/9 "Canadian Government salary revisions affecting ICNAF", pointing out that the Canadian Civil Service Commission had re-evaluated the ICNAF grades in accordance with 1966 announced changes in the classification standards and their application and the revisions effective 1 October 1965 and 1 October 1966.

F&A

recommends

- (1) that the salary of the Clerk Typist (CR2) within the new Canadian salary range of \$3,653-4,013 for 1967/68 be \$3,773;
- (2) that the salary of the Clerk-Stenographer (ST5) within the new Canadian salary range of \$4,529-\$4,976 for 1967/68 be \$4,976;
- (3) that the salary of the present Senior Secretary (ST7) within the new Canadian salary range of \$5,808-\$6,384 for 1967/68 be \$5,808, with the provision that any new appointment to the position would be taken on at level ST6 in the Secretariat stenographic typing classification;
- (4) that the salary of the Editorial Assistant (IS1) within the new Canadian salary range of \$5,552-\$8,168 for 1967/68 be \$7,514;
- (5) that the salary of the Assistant Executive Secretary (AS6) within the new Canadian salary range of \$11,967-\$13,599 for 1967/68 be \$13,055;
- (6) that the salary of the Executive Secretary (AS9) within the new Canadian salary range of \$17,270-\$20,802 for 1967/68 be \$20,017;
- (7) that retroactive salary be granted to the personnel of the Secretariat covering the period 1 October 1965 to 30 June 1967 as follows: Executive Secretary, \$797.00; Assistant Executive Secretary, \$385.88; Editorial Assistant, \$1,388; Senior Secretary, \$669.50; Clerk-Stenographer, \$626.25; and Clerk-Typist, \$552.00.

Captain Almeida (Portugal) pointed out that he agreed to the recommendations but that the Commission's expenditures are growing each year and that he had strict instructions from his country about the budget. He noted that in 1952/53 expenditures were less than \$33,000 with 25 panel members and 10 member countries, and the contribution from Portugal was then about \$3,500. On the other hand, the proposed estimates for 1967/68 amount to about \$102,000 and Portugal must pay about \$10,000 with 40 panel members and 14 member countries.

3. Under F&A Item 14, Increased Benefits to ICNAF Employees, the Executive Secretary reported that the Schedule of Annuity Benefits provided by the International Fisheries Commissions Pension Society (IFCPS) had been extended from Class 30 (\$14,500 and over salary ceiling) to Class 40 (\$24,000 and over salary ceiling) with effect from 1 October 1966. Retroactive possibilities for the Executive Secretary covering the years 1964/65 and 1965/66 had been approved by correspondence by a two-thirds majority of the member countries on 4 January 1967. He also reported that the IFCPS had developed a Group Insurance Plan which became effective for participation by members of the Secretariat on 1 April 1967.

4. Under F&A Item 16, Date of Billing, the meeting agreed that the date of billing member countries for the fiscal year 1967/68 should be 15 August 1967.

5. The meeting adjourned at 1240 hrs.



Serial No.1940
(B.e.67)

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of the First Joint Meeting of Panels 1-5

Tuesday, 6 June, 1520 hrs

1. The Chairman of the Commission asked for consideration of Plenary Agenda Item 12, Canadian Salmon Proposal. Dr Needler (Canada) reviewed Comm.Doc.67/17 "Canadian Proposal to prohibit fishing for Atlantic salmon on the High Seas in the Convention Area". He expressed Canada's concern about the possibility of the development of major high seas fisheries for salmon in the Northwest Atlantic which, in the opinion of Canada, would reduce the numbers of salmon available to Canadian Atlantic salmon fishing operations. He drew attention to the high cost to Canada of keeping salmon production high and of keeping the rivers accessible to salmon. He commended the ICES/ICNAF Joint Working Party on North Atlantic Salmon (Res.Doc. 67/5) and looked forward to further reports on additional data. He hoped that the Commission would give favourable consideration to the Canadian proposal.

Mr Lassen (Denmark) expressed understanding of the Canadian concern but considered the proposal too big a step to take at this time in view of the expressed request of the scientists for more research to provide additional data for assessment purposes.

Dr Chrzan (Poland) suggested protection might be effected through the use of possible other measures such as minimum mesh size or fish length regulation.

Dr Rodriguez Martin (Spain) supported the Canadian proposal.

Mr McKernan (USA), in support of the Canadian proposal, described the reasoning behind the US prohibition of High Seas fishing for Pacific salmon.

Mr Tame (UK) stated that UK was sympathetic with the Canadian concern and also with the Danish request for action based only on sound scientific evidence. He noted that, at present, the High Seas fishery was small and that, if the Canadian proposal was accepted, there would be no damage to the present fishery.

Following suggestions by Mr Løkkegaard (Denmark) and Dr Bogdanov (USSR) for further research on which to base a decision regarding the proposal, Dr Needler (Canada) reviewed the Canadian proposal pointing to the soundness of the Canadian argument and said that the proposal would be resubmitted. He expressed the hope that in the meantime the Commission would press actively for further scientific investigations and a firm background of evidence on which to base a decision.

2. The Chairman noted the decision of the Canadian delegation to withdraw its proposal for the time being and declared the meeting adjourned at 1630 hrs.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967Report of Second Meeting of ad hoc Committee on Trawl RegulationsWednesday, 7 June, 0900 hrs

1. The Chairman, Dr Needler (Canada), opened the meeting with all members present.
2. The Report of the First Meeting of the ad hoc Committee (Proc.10) was adopted without change.
3. Continuing with Plenary Item 8, Mesh Measuring, the Committee
recommends
that the pressure or pull specified for ICNAF mesh measuring regulations be 5 kg.
4. The Chairman noted that three gauges were approved as alternative at the 1966 ICNAF Meeting, as a temporary arrangement for one year (1966 Meeting Proc.21, Appendix I). It was agreed that if the Commission accepted the proposal for a single gauge the need to approve alternate gauges and corresponding mesh equivalents would disappear.
5. The need to establish mesh size differential for nets of different materials to meet the 130 mm regulation in Subarea 1 was noted from Comm.Doc. 67/6. The pertinent recommendation of the Research and Statistics Committee was reviewed and the Committee
recommends
that mesh differentials for Subarea 1 be the same as for those in Region 1 of NEAFC, namely 110 mm for seine nets, 120 mm for such part of any trawl net as is made of cotton, hemp, polyamide fibers or polyester fibers and 130 mm for such part of any trawl net as is made of any other material.
In making this recommendation the *ad hoc* Committee noted the plea by Mr Lund (Norway) that the need for mesh differentials be kept under continuing review. It also recorded that the USSR proposes to put forward, at the 1968 meeting, documents about selectivity of capron, which suggest differences between this polyamide and the current differential for polyamide.
6. The Chairman noted that current ICNAF regulations call for measuring 50 meshes in the codend. He read the NEAFC proposals (Annex I of Comm.Doc.67/18) for international enforcement which specifies 20 meshes, and noted that the Gear and Selectivity Subcommittee of the Research and Statistics Committee had indicated probably minor differences in error for means, using either number of meshes. The *ad hoc* Committee
recommends
that the ICNAF standard of 50 consecutive meshes used in measuring a codend be changed to 20 consecutive meshes.
7. Under Plenary Item 7, Topside Chafer, the notification concerning authorized topside chafers (Comm.Doc.67/12) and the recommendation from the Research and Statistics Committee on the Polish-type chafer were considered. Dr Chrzan (Poland) informed the Committee that use of this chafer by the Polish fleet had proved effective in strengthening codends. Research showed no effect on selectivity. The Committee
recommends
that specifications of the Polish-type chafer be modified to allow it to extend the whole length of the codend if this is needed for additional strength to the codend.

Mr Lund (Norway) informed the Committee that the possibility of permitting use of the Polish-type chafer, only, is being considered by NEAFC. He also wished to underline the recommendation of the Research and Statistics Committee that experiments on means of eliminating the need for topside chafers be pressed.

8. Under Plenary Item 6, Simplification of Trawl Regulations, various countries expressed appreciation to the US for their work in preparing a simplification of ICNAF fishery regulations and proposals (Comm.Doc.67/4). Some suggestions for improvements were made. After discussion it was agreed that this simplification should not be adopted to replace the basic regulations at this time but should be termed a guide and prepared and brought up to date at each Annual Meeting. Mr Sullivan (USA) and the Rapporteur were asked to revise the draft guide (Comm.Doc. 67/4) for consideration at the final *ad hoc* Committee meeting. Anyone having changes to suggest were advised to contact them.

9. Under Plenary Item 5, Annual Return of Infringements, reports of infringements in 1966 (Comm.Doc.67/11) were considered. Additional information was given by Poland and Iceland reporting orally on inspections performed and recording that no infringements were found.

10. The Chairman noted that all items referred to the *ad hoc* Committee by the Commission had been considered. There being no other business, the meeting adjourned.



Serial No.1942
(B.g.17.67)

Proceedings No.16

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Meeting of Special ad hoc Committee on Fishery Management

Wednesday, 7 June, 1045 hrs

1. The special *ad hoc* Committee, set up at the Second Plenary Session (Proc. 12) met with Mr V. Kamentsev (USSR) in the chair. Mr B.B.Parrish (UK) was appointed Rapporteur.
2. In opening the meeting, the Chairman referred to the discussions under Plenary Item 11, Possible Conservation Actions, in the two earlier Plenary sessions and drew attention to the statement made there by the US delegate, a copy of which had been circulated to Commissioners. He considered that this formed a satisfactory basis for consideration by the Committee of its difficult task of defining the next steps which the Commission might take toward the development of regulatory measures controlling the size of the catch. He indicated that the preliminary discussions had shown that in order to define a system of global quotas for the fisheries in the Convention Area, it was first necessary for biologists to define the maximum sustainable yields for the exploited stocks on the basis of scientific evidence; so the first task was a biological one and it was necessary for the Research and Statistics Committee to work out the required research program for this purpose. However, there were also important administrative and economic problems to be tackled, and it would be necessary for a group of experts to consider these problems as well.
3. The Chairman also drew the Committee's attention to the fact that according to Article VIII of the Convention, the Commission has no power to allocate quotas between countries. He also stated that although the importance of additional conservation measures was recognized fully, the preliminary discussions showed that the scientific and practical problems involved were very formidable and complex and he did not see a quick solution to them. Nevertheless, an exchange of ideas and the clarification of the problems involved would obviously be advantageous at this stage.
4. In the ensuing discussion, the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany suggested that, because of the large and difficult problems to be solved before the stage for positive regulatory action by the Commission could be reached, a very small expert working group, consisting of an administrator, a biologist, an economist, and a technologist should be set up. It should work more or less continuously for about a year to make a detailed feasibility study of different possible regulatory systems of catch limitation. The small expert group should be guided from time to time by a larger committee composed of ICNAF Commissioners as well as representatives of other international bodies. The results of this study would then be considered in detail by the Commission and the decisions of future action decided in the light of them. The small group might be organized by FAO on the basis of some satisfactory system of cost sharing between the organizations concerned. He estimated that the cost would be in the region of \$60,000-\$80,000.
5. A number of representatives doubted whether the establishment of such a group was appropriate at this stage. In particular, the UK representative considered that such an expert group might get out of touch with the practical problems involved within countries. Instead, he proposed that the biological aspects of the matter should be handled by the existing Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, while the administrative, economic and practical aspects should be considered by a special committee consisting of administrators, economists, and representatives of industry, to be set up by the Commission in conjunction with other relevant international organizations. Should this Committee, in the course of its work, wish to explore particular problems in greater depth than they were able to do, these could be referred to small expert groups. The terms of reference for the work of the Research and Statistics Committee on the biological aspects of the problem and for the special committee for its practical aspects should be specified by this Commission. He considered that the suggested terms of reference set out in the circulated statement by the US delegation provided a satisfactory basis for the former. These were as follows:
 1. Estimates of optimum reduction in fishing effort required to achieve the maximum sustainable yield.
 2. Research required to establish annual catch quotas.

3. Precision that can be achieved with available data, and effects of the errors in annual quotas on yield.
 4. What are the magnitudes of the year-to-year adjustments in quotas necessary to take into account for each stock, year-class fluctuation, recovery of the stock due to conservation measures, errors in setting previous quotas, etc.
 5. Estimation of appropriate annual global quotas to achieve part or all of reduction in 1.
 6. Timetable.
6. With regard to the Committee's terms of reference for the administrative, economic, and practical aspects, the UK representative proposed the following:
1. Procedure of fixing annual catch quotas.
 2. The nature of the quotas to be fixed with respect to species and area.
 3. Problems of enforcement.
 4. Principles of distributing quotas between countries.
 5. Administration of quotas within countries.
7. The representatives of a number of countries expressed general support for these proposals, although the USSR representative doubted whether representatives of international organizations other than ICNAF should be included in the membership of the special Committee. He also drew attention to the Chairman's statement that the Commission has no power to decide on the distribution of quotas between countries. On this point, the representative of Norway saw no reason why the Committee should be prevented from considering measures which were not currently covered by the Convention articles. He also considered that the terms of reference of the special Committee should not be too strictly defined since new matters requiring its consideration may arise during the course of its work.
8. The representative of the USA proposed that the special Committee should be a Standing Committee of the Commission, concerned with handling regulatory measure problems. This was supported by the representative of Canada, who expressed concern at the possibility of moving toward action by the Commission in this important matter too quickly. He considered that some of the conclusions stated in the Report of the Bio-Economic Working Group (Comm.Doc.67/19) were open to serious question; in particular, the conclusion that "global" quotas could be set for cod and haddock throughout the North Atlantic was not, in his view, substantiated. He considered that the proposed Standing Committee should (a) be responsible for defining the terms of reference of the scientific work to be carried out under this heading by the Research and Statistics Committee; (b) should consider the practical problems, as set out by the UK representative, and (c) should frame proposals on the Commission's future program of fishery regulation work. He further considered that membership of the proposed new Standing Committee should not necessarily be confined to Commissioners; each country should nominate one member whom it considered most suitable for the work of the Committee. This was supported by the US representative, who considered that the Committee should start its work as soon as possible and, if necessary, should hold its first meeting in mid-term. After further discussion it was decided to recommend to the Commission:
- (i) that a Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures be set up;
 - (ii) that each member country should be invited to appoint an appropriate representative to the Committee;
 - (iii) that the Standing Committee should meet in the near future to consider its program of operations and its future work on the economic and administrative aspects of the problems of introducing regulation measures and those of the Research and Statistics Committee on the scientific aspects of these problems in accordance with the guidelines set out in paragraphs 5 and 6;
 - (iv) that the new Standing Committee should present a preliminary report of its activities to the next ICNAF meeting.
9. The meeting adjourned at 1115 hrs.



Serial No.1943
(B.g.11.67)

Proceedings No.17

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Third Meeting of *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations

Thursday, 8 June, 1500 hrs

1. The Chairman, Dr Needler (Canada), opened the meeting with all members present.
2. The various items in the Report of the Second Meeting of the *ad hoc* Committee (Proc.15) were reviewed. Under Item 4 of Proc.15, which dealt with adoption of a single mesh measuring gauge, considerable discussion developed. The consensus about the interpretation of this item appeared to be: (a) that use of a single gauge for international and national enforcement is most desirable, (b) that the gauge with thickness, taper and pressure specified by ICNAF is to be used in international inspections, (c) that it is to be the final criterion for ensuring that minimum mesh sizes are being enforced by nationals. However, adoption of the single gauge should not completely stifle development of any better method and gauge for enforcement. It should allow nationals some leeway in enforcing regulations to make sure that mesh sizes are as large or larger than those obtained by using the prescribed ICNAF methods.

It was agreed that this particular item should be reviewed next year.

The Report of the Second Meeting of the *ad hoc* Committee was adopted.

3. Continuing with Plenary Item 6, Simplification of Trawl Regulations, Mr Sullivan (USA) reviewed the Simplified Guide and pointed out pertinent revisions included at the request of the Second Meeting of the *ad hoc* Committee (Item 8 of Proc.15). A few editorial changes were adopted. The amended version is attached to this Proceedings as Appendix I.

Mr Tame (UK) pointed out that the ICNAF regulations call for a gauge thickness of 2.3 mm and that proposed for international control through NEAFC called for 2 mm. While recognizing that for practical purposes they were probably the same, he suggested that standardization was desirable. After discussion concerning possible repercussions in national regulations and procurement of gauges if the change was made, Mr Sullivan (USA) proposed to defer consideration until the 1968 meeting. This was agreed.

A brief discussion of the proposed Annex I (Mesh size equivalents) and Annex II (Approved topside chafers) to the Simplified Guide (Appendix I) gave suggestions concerning their drafting.

4. The Chairman thanked participants and Mr Sullivan and the Rapporteur for the revision of the Simplified Guide to Regulations.
5. There being no other business, the Third and final session of the *ad hoc* Committee was adjourned.



Serial No.1943
(8.g.11.67)

Proceedings No.17
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Simplified Guide to ICNAF Fishery Regulations, 1967/68

NOTE: This simplified guide is prepared for the benefit of those who need an easy reference to the ICNAF trawl regulations. It does not have the force of law; those with questions of a legal nature must refer to the actual ICNAF regulations in force and national implementing laws and regulations. Proposals adopted through the 1967 Annual Meeting are included; footnotes indicate provisions relating to mesh size and species, not in force at time of preparation.

The Contracting Governments to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (hereinafter referred to as the Parties) have agreed as follows:

(1) To prohibit persons or vessels under their jurisdiction from using a trawl net or seine net for catching the species mentioned in paragraph (2) of these regulations which has a mesh size less than that mentioned in or determined under paragraph (3) except as provided in paragraph (8).

(2) These regulations shall apply to the following species:

- (a) In Subarea 1
(*)
- cod (*Gadus morhua* (L.))
 - haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus* (L.))
 - redfish (*Sebastes*)
 - halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus* (L.))
 - witch (*Glyptocephalus cynoglossus* (L.))
 - American plaice (*Hippoglossoides platessoides* (Fab.))
 - Greenland halibut (*Reinhardtius hippoglossoides* (Walb.))
- (b) In Subarea 2
(*)
- cod (*Gadus morhua* (L.))
 - haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus* (L.))
 - redfish (*Sebastes*)
 - halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus* (L.))
 - witch (*Glyptocephalus cynoglossus* (L.))
 - American plaice (*Hippoglossoides platessoides* (Fab.))
 - Greenland halibut (*Reinhardtius hippoglossoides* (Walb.))
- (c) In Subarea 3
(**)
- cod (*Gadus morhua* (L.))
 - haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus* (L.))
 - redfish (*Sebastes*), except in the statistical Div. 3N, 3O and 3P
 - halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus* (L.))
 - witch (*Glyptocephalus cynoglossus* (L.))
 - yellowtail flounder (*Limanda ferruginea* (Storer))
 - American plaice (*Hippoglossoides platessoides* (Fab.))
 - Greenland halibut (*Reinhardtius hippoglossoides* (Walb.))
 - pollock (saithe) (*Pollachius virens* (L.))
 - white hake (*Urophycis tenuis* (Mitch.))
- (d) In Subarea 4
(***)
- cod (*Gadus morhua* (L.))
 - haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus* (L.))
 - flounders:
 - witch (*Glyptocephalus cynoglossus* (L.))
 - yellowtail flounder (*Limanda ferruginea* (Storer))
 - winter flounder (*Pseudopleuronectes americanus* (Walb.))
 - American plaice (*Hippoglossoides platessoides* (Fab.))

(* - not yet in force)

(** - not yet in force for species other than cod and haddock)

(*** - not yet in force for flounders)

- (e) In Subarea 5 cod (*Gadus morhua* (L.))
 haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus* (L.))

(3) The minimum mesh sizes for nets measured with the gauge specified in paragraph (4) are:

- (1) for trawl nets made of manila
- (1) in Subarea 1 - 130 mm (*)
- (ii) in Subareas 2, 3, 4 and 5 - 114 mm
when measured wet after use or their equivalents
when measured dry before use (**)
- (2) for seine nets and for trawl nets made of materials other than manila such mesh sizes as the Commission may, on the basis of scientific advice as to selectivity equivalents, determine to be appropriate to the mesh sizes specified in sub-paragraph (1) [Annex I].

(4) Mesh sizes are measured by a flat wedge-shaped gauge having a taper of 2 cm in 8 cm and a thickness of 2.3 mm, inserted into the meshes under a pressure or pull of 5 kg.

(5) For the purpose of paragraph (1) the mesh size of a net shall be taken to be the average of the measurements of any series of twenty consecutive meshes, at least ten meshes from the lacings, in the codend beginning at the after end and running parallel to the long axis.

(6) No means or device may be used in any net under these regulations, other than those described in paragraph (7), which would obstruct the meshes of the nets or which would otherwise, in effect, diminish the size of the meshes.

(7) (a) The Commission may approve devices to be attached to the upper side of the codend, based on scientific advice that the attached devices do not obstruct the meshes or reduce significantly the selectivity of the codend. Any approval so given may be withdrawn at any time on giving not less than twelve months' notice to the Parties [Annex II].

(b) Any canvas, netting, or other material may be attached to the underside only of the codend of a net to reduce and prevent damage.

(8) (a) In order to avoid impairment of fisheries conducted primarily for species to which these regulations do not apply and which take incidentally small amounts of species to which these regulations do apply, regulated species, as specified in sub-paragraph (c), may be taken with trawl nets having a mesh size less than that specified in paragraph (3).

(b) Regulated species may be taken in accordance with sub-paragraph (a) so long as such regulated species are not:

- (1) in possession on board a vessel fishing primarily for non-regulated species in amounts in excess of 2,268 kg for each or 10% by weight for each of all fish on board such vessel, whichever is greater; or
- (2) caught by such vessel, in any period of twelve months, in amounts in excess of 10% for each regulated species of all trawl-caught fish taken by such vessel in that period of twelve months (***).

(c) The classes of regulated species to which this paragraph applies are:

- (1) In Subarea 3, to:
- (i) cod
(ii) haddock
(iii) other species mentioned in paragraph (2)(c) taken together
(****)

(* - not yet in force)

(** - not yet in force for Subarea 2; currently 102 mm for Subarea 3 pending entry into force of change to 114 mm)

(*** - not yet in force for Subarea 3)

(**** - not yet in force)

(2) In Subarea 4, to:

- (i) cod
- (ii) haddock
- (iii) flounders, as mentioned in paragraph (2)(d) (*)

(3) In Subarea 5, to:

- (i) cod
- (ii) haddock.

(* - not yet in force)



Serial No.1943
(B.g.11.67)

Proceedings No.17
Appendix I
Annex I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Mesh size equivalents for twine-netting materials
in relation to manila as an ICNAF standard, 1967/68

Part of Convention Area	Type of Net	ICNAF gauge
Subarea 1	Seine Net	110 mm (4 3/8 in)
	Such part of any trawl net as is made of cotton, hemp, polyamide fibres or poly- ester fibres	120 mm (4 3/4 in)
	Such part of any trawl net as is made of manila or any other material not mentioned above	130 mm (5 1/8 in)
Subareas 2-5	Seine Net	100 mm (4 in)
	Such part of any trawl net as is made of cotton, hemp, polyamide fibres or poly- ester fibres	105 mm (4 1/8 in)
	Such part of any trawl net as is made of manila or any other material not mentioned above	114 mm (4 1/2 in)



Serial No. 1943
(S.g. 11.67)

Proceedings No. 17
Appendix I
Annex II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Approved topside chafing gear, 1967/68

1. ICNAF-type topside chafer

This chafer is a rectangular piece of netting attached to the upper side of the codend and must conform to the following conditions:

- (a) This netting shall not have a mesh size less than that specified [for the codends]. For the purposes of this sub-paragraph, the [specified] mesh size when measured wet after use shall be taken to be the average of the measurements of 20 consecutive meshes in a series across the netting, such measurements to be made with a like gauge inserted into the meshes as specified [for the codend mesh size measurements].
- (b) This netting may be fastened to the codend only along the forward and lateral edges of the netting and at no other place in it, and shall be fastened in such a manner that it extends forward of the splitting strap no more than four meshes and ends not less than four meshes in front of the cod line mesh.
- (c) The width of this netting shall be at least one and a half times the width of the area of the codend which is covered, such widths to be measured at right angles to the long axis of the codend.

2. Modified ICNAF-type topside chafer

This chafer differs from the ICNAF-type topside chafer only in that it prescribes the extent of the topside chafer netting when a splitting strap is not used. Thus, the following is added to condition (b) in the above description of the ICNAF-type topside chafer:

"; where a splitting strap is not used the netting shall not extend to more than one-third of the codend measured from not less than four meshes in front of the codline mesh."

3. Multiple flap-type topside chafer

This chafer consists of pieces of netting which have in all their parts, meshes the dimensions of which, whether the pieces of netting are wet or dry, are not less than those of the meshes of the net to which they are attached, provided that:

- (i) each piece of netting
 - (a) is fastened by its forward edge only across the codend at right angles to its long axis;
 - (b) is of a width of at least the width of the codend (such width being measured at right angles to the long axis of the codend at the point of attachment), and
 - (c) is not more than ten meshes long; and
- (ii) the aggregate length of all the pieces of netting so attached does not exceed two-thirds of the length of the codend.

4. Polish-type topside chafer (Large mesh chafer)

This chafer consists of a rectangular piece of netting attached to the rear portion of the upper side of the codend and extends over all or any part of the codend and has in all its parts a mesh size twice as large as the mesh size of the codend and a width the same as the codend. The netting must be fastened to the codend only along the forward, lateral and rear edges of the netting in such a way as to secure that the meshes of the netting exactly overlap the meshes of the codend. The netting must be the same twine material and size as that of the codend.



Serial No.1944
(B.b.67)

Proceedings No.18

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of the Third Plenary Session

Thursday, 8 June, 1100 hrs

1. The Chairman, Mr Fulham (USA), opened the meeting. The Executive Secretary was asked to present the Report of the Second Plenary Session (Proc.2), the Report of the Joint Meeting of Panels 1-5 (Proc.14), the Report of the Meeting of Panel 2 (Proc.3), the Report of the Meeting of Panel 3 (Proc.4) and the Report of the Meeting of Panel 4 (Proc.5). These Reports were adopted.

2. Under Plenary Item 13, Fishing Practices, Mr Tame (UK) reported on the meeting of the Fisheries Policing Conference in London. He said that a draft Convention had been approved by representatives of the 18 countries present, which included all members of ICNAF except the new member, Romania. The Convention was now open for signature and would afterwards be subject to ratification or approval by governments. Additional governments could adhere with the consent of three-quarters of the participants.

The Convention applies to the whole of the North Atlantic and Arctic. It establishes general rules of good conduct for fishing vessels; deals with methods of registration and marking of vessels; and makes detailed provisions for such matters as the light and sound signals to be given while fishing and the marking of gear. The Convention makes it clear that implementation is primarily for the flag state but there is also provision for investigations and reports to be made by the inspectors of one country regarding alleged contraventions by vessels belonging to another contracting party. Reservations may, however, be made against this provision.

Mr Tame (UK) said that it had been a long and arduous process to reach agreement but he had been impressed by the determination of all concerned to arrive at an agreement and at the good will and willingness to compromise shown by all concerned. If the Convention were now ratified, it would mark an important step forward in international cooperation in the field of fisheries.

The meeting agreed that the item had been dealt with adequately.

3. Under Plenary Item 14(a), International Cooperation, Dr Needler (Canada) said that he could speak to this Item as Chairman of the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) which was the parent body of the Subcommittee on Development of Cooperation with International Organizations concerned with Fisheries. He pointed out that the title of the Subcommittee was somewhat of a misnomer in that the terms of reference for the body were to review the status, scope and adequacy of regional and international fisheries bodies in respect of needs for and development of conservation measures based on scientific evidence. FAO believed that some regions were moving rapidly toward intensive exploitation and therefore needed international regulation. The Subcommittee had reported to COFI in April and recommended new regional bodies or changes in existing bodies. There were no recommendations directly affecting ICNAF in any way. The Subcommittee was developing a compendium of the scope, organization and functions of the various regional and international fisheries bodies in existence throughout the world.

4. Under Plenary Item 14(b), UN Resolution on Marine Resources, Dr Cain (USA) referred to Comm.Doc.67/3, Text of UN Resolution on Development of Natural Resources of the Sea, and said that the US delegation emphasized the importance of that proposal for the interests of the ICNAF nations, especially as to effective arrangements for international cooperation in scientific and technological data gathering. Many physical parameters of the oceans are difficult, slow and expensive to gather by traditional methods from shipboard. New techniques of remote multi-spectral sensing from airplanes and satellites can provide traditional data as well as other information not otherwise obtainable. Then, too, there are the possibilities of instrumented buoys that can telemeter data about the sea to central data stations. The US, therefore, urges that ICNAF express its interest in the program being explored by the United Nations because each nation by itself cannot obtain the useful information that is possible by cooperative efforts. There is no concern at this time about the practical questions of national sovereignty or freedom of the seas because proposals concerning research need to be explored if the nations are to have adequate data for subsequent considerations.

(over)

Mr Popper (FAO) described the origin of the UN Resolution which had arisen from a consideration by the UN of international aspects of non-agricultural resources. There had been a desire in some quarters to see all activities relating to the oceans more closely coordinated internationally, and the Resolution in its operative paragraphs accordingly called for: (1) a comprehensive survey of activities in marine science and technology, and (2) the formulation of proposals for ensuring the most effective arrangements for an expanded program of international cooperation and a better understanding of the marine environment through science and in the exploitation and development of marine resources with due regard to the conservation of fish stocks.

A number of international agencies were being requested by the Resolution to cooperate in the survey, and a smaller number in the formulation of the proposals. There had not been previous consultation with these organizations, and some difficulties were being encountered in making effective arrangements. However, the implementation of the Resolution had been considered by a number of agencies, and one result was that a joint working group with members nominated by the Chairmen of ACMRR, SCOR, and the Advisory Committee of WMO had been established to consider various scientific aspects, and this group was scheduled to meet in mid-July.

The Subcommittee on Marine Science and its Applications of the Administrative Committee on Coordination of the United Nations System had thoroughly discussed the composition and *modus operandi* of the group of experts which was to assist the Secretary General in his task and had drawn up a timetable. The Subcommittee had envisaged a small group of about ten, mainly representatives of the various organizations mentioned in the Resolution, including nominees from FAO and its Committee on Fisheries and from UNESCO and its Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission. It now appeared, however, that the United Nations were convening a much larger group, to hold its first meeting in Geneva next week, which would include a number of individual experts nominated by governments but attending in a personal capacity, as well as observers from several groups including ACMRR and ICES. The Director General of FAO had suggested that a small executive group should be selected from this larger body in order to carry out effectively the functions of the group of experts.

Mr Popper mentioned that three persons attending the present meeting were members of the group of experts, namely, Dr Needler, as nominee of COFI, Mr Jónsson, in a personal capacity, and Mr Popper, himself, as nominee of FAO.

Mr Tame (UK) said that the UN Resolution could have important implications for the future of ICNAF. As mentioned by Mr Popper, the effective part of the resolution called for two things: a survey; and proposals for better coordination and exploitation of marine resources, including conservation. The latter was a field of direct concern to ICNAF and he understood from an address given by Dr Chapman of USA to the 1967 meeting of COFI that the motivation behind the UN Resolution was to some extent dissatisfaction with the existing arrangements in this field. Far-reaching solutions were apparently being canvassed which, if adopted, could well supercede the work of commissions such as ICNAF. Mr Tame said that while a great deal remained to be done in other parts of the world, he was unconvinced that new organizations could operate more effectively than the existing conservation commissions in the areas that they covered. ICNAF had considerable experience in dealing with the subject matter of the UN Resolution and it was important that they should have an opportunity of commenting on any proposals made to the UN by the Secretary General's Committee. He suggested that the Commission might ask Dr Needler, or one of the other persons present who would be attending the Secretary General's Committee in another capacity, to represent the interests of ICNAF and suggested that the Executive Secretary should approach the Secretary General for acceptance of such representation. At the same time, the Commission should take note of the criticisms being made of organizations such as ICNAF, which were not entirely without foundation, and consider whether they could not improve their procedures.

Following statements by Mr Lund (Norway), Mr Kamentsev (USSR) and Dr Needler (Canada) in support of Mr Tame's proposal, the meeting agreed (1) that the Executive Secretary, on behalf of ICNAF, should seek the approval of the Secretary General of the United Nations for an ICNAF observer to attend meetings of the UN Group of Experts established under A/RES/2172 Resources of the Sea, and (2) that, following approval, the Commission accept the kind offer of Dr A.W.H.Needler (Canada) to act as ICNAF observer.

5. The meeting adjourned at 1215 hrs.



Serial No.1945
(B.c.1967)

Proceedings No.19

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Third Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration

Thursday, 8 June, 1610 hrs

1. The Chairman, Mr R. Green (USA) opened the meeting and asked the Executive Secretary to present the Report of the Second Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Proc.13). The Report was read and adopted.

2. Under F&A Item 7, Estimates for 1967/68, the Executive Secretary presented revised proposed estimates of \$102,000 to meet the ordinary expenditures and \$4,000 to meet expenditures in connection with publication of the ICNAF Environmental Survey Report (NORWESTLANT 1-3) (Appendix I).

Mr Tame (UK) said regretfully that, because the revised proposed estimates for 1967/68 which included salary increases, had not been presented to his government in time to appropriate sufficient funds for its share of a \$102,000 ordinary budget, therefore the UK budgetary ceiling for ICNAF stood at £2,400 (#7,200 (Canadian)) for 1967/68.

After considerable discussion, F&A

recommends

- (i) that the appropriations for ordinary expenditures of the Commission for the fiscal year 1967/68 be \$102,000;
- (ii) that \$3,500 be appropriated from the Working Capital Fund to cover the major portion of Item 1(e) "Retroactive Salary" and that the remainder (\$98,500) be apportioned to Member Governments in the usual manner;
- (iii) that \$4,000 also be appropriated from the Working Capital Fund to cover additional cost in publishing Special Publication No.7 (NORWESTLANT 1-3 Report).

3. Under F&A Item 8, Forecast for 1968/69, the Executive Secretary reviewed the budget forecast for 1968/69 (Appendix II). F&A

recommends

that the Commission give consideration at the 1968 Annual Meeting to authorizing appropriations from member governments for ordinary expenses for the fiscal year 1968/69 of \$105,700 and to authorizing appropriation from the Working Capital Fund of \$8,000 to defray the cost of the Commission's share of presenting and publishing the Marine Food Chains Symposium, Copenhagen, July 1968.

4. Under F&A Item 17, Date and Place of 1969 Annual Meeting, Professor Chrzan (Poland) extended, on behalf of the Polish People's Republic, an invitation to the Commission to hold its 1969 Annual Meeting in Warsaw, Poland. The Chairman thanked Professor Chrzan for extending this kind invitation on behalf of his government and F&A

recommends

that the kind invitation of the Polish People's Republic to hold its 19th Annual Meeting in Warsaw, Poland, from 2-7 June 1969 be accepted with thanks.

5. Under F&A Item 15, Publications, the Executive Secretary reported:

- (a) that cards would be sent to all member countries requesting updating of national mailing lists for Commission's publications;
- (b) that the Research and Statistics Committee had not recommended publication of national research reports in the 1967 Annual Proceedings;
- (c) that an inventory of all Commission's publications was being carried out in order to propose to the 18th Annual Meeting some means of reducing present excess holdings of early issues.

(over)

(d) that approaches would be made to the appropriate Canadian Government department through the Canadian Commissioners regarding a revision and reprinting of the coloured map of the Convention Area.

6. Under F&A Item 18, Other Matters, the Executive Secretary referred to the date set for the 18th Annual Meeting in London, pointing out that Monday, 3 June, the proposed opening date for this meeting was Whitsun Holiday in UK. Following his proposal, F&A

recommends

that the starting date for the 18th Annual Meeting in London be changed from 3 June (Monday) to 4 June (Tuesday) 1968 and that the meetings continue through to and including 8 June (Saturday) 1968.

7. Under F&A Item 19, Election of Chairman, Mr R. Green (USA) was unanimously re-elected Chairman of the Committee for the year 1967/68.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 1715 hrs.



Serial No.1945
(B.c.1967)

Proceedings No.19
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

1967/68 Expenditures to be covered by Appropriations from Contracting Governments
and the Working Capital Fund

1. Personal Services	
(a) Salaries	\$55,200 ^{a)}
(b) Superannuation	1,500
(c) Additional help	1,200
(d) Group medical and insurance plans	500
(e) Retroactive salary	4,500
2. Travel	6,500
3. Transportation	500
4. Communications	3,000
5. Publications	13,600 ^{b)}
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	\$102,000

Special expenditures to be covered
from Working Capital Fund for

(i) Special Publication #7	\$4,000
(ii) Major portion of Item 1(e) "Retroactive salary"	\$3,500 ^{c)}

a)	
Executive Secretary	\$20,017
Assistant Executive Secretary	13,055
Editorial Assistant	7,514
Senior Secretary	5,808
Clerk Stenographer	4,976
Clerk Typist	3,773

b)	
Annual Proceedings Vol.17	\$1,500
Statistical Bulletin Vol.16	5,000
Research Bulletin No.4	5,000
Sampling Yearbook Vol.11	600
Redbook 1967	1,000
Handbook	500

c)
to cover major portion (\$3,500) of Retroactive Salary Item of \$4,500.



Serial No.1945
(B.c.1967)

Proceedings No.19
Appendix II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

1968/69 Expenditures to be covered by Appropriations from Contracting Governments
and the Working Capital Fund

1.	Personal Services	
	(a) Salaries	\$57,200
	(b) Superannuation	1,800
	(c) Additional help	1,200
	(d) Group medical and insurance plans	500
	(e) Contingencies	5,000
2.	Travel	6,500
3.	Transportation	500
4.	Communications	3,500
5.	Publications	14,000
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	\$105,700
	Special expenditures to be covered from the Working Capital Fund	
	(i) Marine Food Chains Symposium	\$8,000

a)	Executive Secretary	\$20,802
	Assistant Executive Secretary	13,599
	Editorial Assistant	7,841
	Senior Secretary	6,000
	Clerk Stenographer	5,059
	Clerk Typist	3,893



Serial No.1946
(B.b.67)

Proceedings No.20

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Fourth Plenary Session

Friday, 9 June, 1000 hrs

1. The Chairman, Mr T.A.Fulham (USA), opened the meeting with representatives from all Member Countries, except Italy, and Observers present.
2. Under Plenary Item 19, Reports of Panels, the Chairman asked for consideration of Report of Panel 1 (Proc.2), Report of Panel 5 (Proc.6), Report of Panel A (Proc.7). The Reports and Recommendations were adopted without change.
3. Under Plenary Item 11, Possible Conservation Actions, the Report of the Meeting of the Special ad hoc Committee on Fishery Management (Proc.16) was presented by its Chairman. A proposal by the UK delegation to delete reference to dates in paragraph 5.5 was adopted by the Plenary which then approved the Report as amended.
4. Under Plenary Item 15, Reports by Commission Observers, the Executive Secretary was asked to review the reports. The observer to INPFC, Mr McKernan (USA), reported verbally that the INPFC met in annual session during November 1966 to examine the results of studies of intermingling of Pacific salmon of North American and Asian origin. There were no results presented that altered the preceding conclusions that salmon of Asian and North American origin range widely in the North Pacific Ocean and intermingle broadly from the eastern North Pacific to the western North Pacific Ocean. Conservation measures were recommended for halibut in the eastern Bering Sea for the coming year. He pointed out that the other task of the Commission is to determine whether certain stocks of fish in the North Pacific continue to qualify for Abstention. No agreement was reached on this issue. Cooperative research continues on a broad scale in the North Pacific Ocean.

The Executive Secretary drew attention to Comm.Doc.67/18, 67/24 and 67/20 containing reports, recommendations and conclusions from the various NEAFC, ICES and FAO meetings held in 1966/67. It was pointed out that items of concern to the Commission arising out of ICES, IOC and SCOR meetings were discussed during the meetings of the Research and Statistics Committee and its Subcommittees.
5. Under Plenary Item 16, Appointment of Commission Observers, the Plenary agreed that the Chairman and the Executive Secretary should make any necessary appointments.
6. Under Plenary Item 23, Other Business, Dr Cain (USA) referred to Comm. Doc.67/22 containing the USSR proposal to IOC to create an IOC Working Group on Legal Aspects of Scientific Research on the High Seas, to draft a Convention on this subject. He pointed out that this proposal is indicative of the wide and growing interest in marine science matters, which has been demonstrated in other Agenda items. He noted, however, that most if not all ICNAF members are also members of Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission and can be expected to make their views known at the IOC Session in October, if not before that through IOC channels. He could see no particular benefit from trying to formulate a coordinated position on this matter between ICNAF members at this time. Following his suggestion which was supported by the UK delegation, the Plenary agreed that the Executive Secretary inform the Secretary of IOC that ICNAF members prefer to deal with this subject in IOC itself and therefore ICNAF has no suggestions to make at this time. It was hoped that ICNAF would continue to be informed of IOC action on this subject through the excellent collaboration between the two Secretariats.
7. The Plenary agreed to Mr Tame's request for reopening of Plenary Item 4(b), Status of Proposals for International Regulation of Fisheries. Mr Tame (UK) referred to the status of the codification of regulations adopted at the 1965 Annual Meeting of the Commission (Comm.Doc.67/10 - columns V, VV, W, WW, X, XX). He pointed out that with the acceptance by Poland of the 1965 codification for Subareas 1-3 and withdrawal by USSR of its conditional acceptance of the 1965 codification for Subareas 1-4, it was possible that all regulations up to and including those for 1965 for Subareas 1-5 might come into effect in the Convention Area. He understood that the USSR had agreed at the 1966 Annual Meeting to withdraw its reservations regarding the use of chafer on stern trawlers when the Commission approved the use of the Polish-type chafer.

He pointed out that the UK was ready to withdraw early reservations, if they were relevant, and asked if acceptance of the codification, alone, would not bring into force trawl regulations for Subareas 1-4. Mr Sullivan (USA) in replying on behalf of the Depositary Government said this was true.

Mr Kamentsev (USSR) said the USSR was ready to withdraw its reservations if the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations to the Commission for approval of the modified Polish-type topside chafer (to cover the length of the codend) was adopted. Furthermore, Soviet vessels will be using the modified Polish-type chafer from the second half of the current year.

Dr Chrzan (Poland) said that with approval of the Polish-type chafer, Poland can withdraw her reservations next year.

Captain Almeida (Portugal) said that his country had accepted the 1966 proposal for 130 mm in Subarea 1. Dr Rodriguez Martin (Spain) said his country's acceptance of the 1966 proposal was en route to the Depositary Government.

Mr Løkkegaard (Denmark) promised early action on the 1966 Subarea 1 proposal. Mr Kamentsev (USSR) pointed out that USSR accepted the 1966 Subarea 1 proposal in May 1967. Mr Möcklinghoff (Fed.Rep.Germany) stated acceptance by his country was in the diplomatic channels. M. Lagarde (France) reported that acceptance by his country was also proceeding.

8. The Plenary agreed that the Executive Secretary be authorized to inform the Depositary Government that the Commission has considered the content of the diplomatic note received by Depositary Government on 1 December 1966 relating to the Portuguese approval of Polish Conditional Acceptance of 1961 proposals for Trawl Regulations in Subareas 1, 2 and 3 and that the Commission has approved the modified Polish-type topside chafer for use in the Convention Area.

9. The meeting adjourned at 1110 hrs.



Serial No.1951
(B.c.67)

Proceedings No.21

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Fourth Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration

Friday, 9 June, 1400 hrs

1. The Chairman, Mr Green (USA), called the meeting to order and asked the Executive Secretary to present the Report of the Third Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Proc.19). The Report was read and adopted with minor amendments.
2. There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 1425 hrs.



Serial No.1950
(B.e.67)

Proceedings No.22

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Second Joint Meeting of Panels 1-5

Friday, 9 June, 1445 hrs

1. The Chairman of the Commission opened the meeting and asked for consideration of the recommendations pertaining to mesh measuring and topside chafer contained in the Report of the Second Meeting of the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations (Proc.15).
2. The Panels, in joint session, agreed to recommend that the Commission adopt and, in accordance with Convention Article VIII, transmit through Depository Government to Contracting Governments the two proposals of the *ad hoc* Committee which would establish (1) that the pressure or pull specified for ICNAF mesh measuring regulations should be at 5 kg and (2) that the ICNAF standard used in measuring a codend should be set at 20 consecutive meshes instead of 50 consecutive meshes.
3. The Panels, in joint session, also agreed to recommend that the Commission adopt and advise Contracting Governments through the Commission's Notification Series of the following items: (1) that, with the expiry of the 1967 ICNAF meeting, approval, for one year, of the ICES and NEAFC mesh measuring gauges as alternatives to the ICNAF gauge (ICNAF Notification Series No.2) the only mesh measuring gauge approved for use in the Convention Area is the ICNAF mesh measuring gauge as described in the ICNAF trawl regulations for Subareas 1-5; (2) that mesh differentials for nets of different materials for Subarea 1 shall be the same as for those in Region 1 of NEAFC in order to meet the proposed 130 mm mesh size regulation in Subarea 1; (3) that specifications of the Polish-type chafer (ICNAF Notification Series No.1) shall be modified to allow it to extend the whole length of the codend if this is needed for additional strength to the codend.
4. The meeting adjourned at 1448 hrs.



Serial No.1949
(B.b.67)

Proceedings No.23

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Report of Fifth Plenary Session

Friday, 9 June, 1430 hrs

1. The Chairman, Mr T.A.Fulham (USA) opened the meeting with representatives from all member countries present.

2. Under Plenary Item 9, Exchange of National Inspection Officers, Dr Needler (Canada) reported that an exchange of inspection officers had been carried out between 7-30 June 1966. He noted further that US and Canadian inspection officers have carried out informal exchanges since 1956 and that very few years have passed without one or the other making a visitation. Early exchanges involved only procedures followed ashore because during the earlier years Canada did not have the facilities to carry out enforcement at sea. In 1965, the USA and Canada agreed to incorporate boarding of trawlers at sea during their informal exchanges in order to promote "international inspection" through ICNAF. In 1966 the exchanges were continued so that the broad understanding of methods and problems could make further gains. Exchanges of officers are now planned to take place in 1967 in Sub-areas 4 and 5. It is expected that enforcement time at sea will exceed that of former years.

Dr Chrzan (Poland) reported that Poland was now forming an inspection team and was preparing to ask Canada to exchange inspection officers.

Dr Rodriguez-Martin (Spain) drew attention to Comm.Doc.67/27 which reported on the Spanish-Portuguese joint inspection.

3. The Chairman proposed that the Plenary recess in order that a Joint Meeting of Panels 1-5 could be convened to consider the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations. The proposal was accepted and the Plenary recessed at 1445 hrs.

4. The Fifth Plenary Session was reconvened at 1450 hrs. The Chairman requested consideration of Reports of the First (Proc.10), Second (Proc.15) and Third (Proc.17) Meetings of the ad hoc Committee on Trawl Regulations and the Report of the Second Joint Meetings of Panels 1-5 (Proc.22). These Reports which recommended proposals for adoption by the Commission under Plenary Items 5, 6, 7 and 8 were received and approved by the Plenary.

5. Under Plenary Item 10, Form of International Inspection Scheme, Dr Cain (USA) said that the USA would like ICNAF to take expeditious action to institute an international inspection scheme for the ICNAF Area as soon as possible. His country believed that this is one of the most critical programs in which the Commission must make rapid progress. From participation in the NEAFC discussions and at the 1965 ICNAF meeting, it is known that the USA desires a strong and effective scheme of enforcement. He said that USA did not consider the NEAFC scheme (Annex D of Comm.Doc.67/18) entirely adequate; it is considered a minimal scheme. Nevertheless, the most essential step to take is to initiate some scheme and to build it up and improve it over the years as knowledge through experience grows, rather than to try to achieve a perfect scheme through continued long discussions at this time.

Dr Cain said that USA was prepared to accept the NEAFC scheme for use in the ICNAF Area, with appropriate modifications where there is difference between NEAFC and ICNAF regulations, when the Protocol enters into force. The two differences as seen by the USA are: one on mesh measuring in paragraph (10) of the NEAFC proposal and the second on measurement of fish in paragraph (13). There may be other differences and these must be considered. Dr Cain then proposed creation of a Special Committee on International Measures of Control to consider any point in the NEAFC scheme which is incompatible with basic ICNAF regulations and proposal, and to lay before the Commission during the 1968 Annual Meeting a modified NEAFC scheme which then might be adopted by ICNAF under the Protocol, which it is hoped will have entered into force by that time. He suggested that the Special Committee hold a brief organizational meeting during the present session. Any meeting during the coming year might coincide with the meeting of the new Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures to reduce travel costs to member countries.

The delegates from UK, Poland, Norway, Canada and USSR agreed that the NEAFC scheme would provide a useful basis for an ICNAF scheme and that a Special Committee should be set up. However, the USSR delegate pointed out that it is impossible for the Commission to establish a committee on a subject outside the authority of the Convention. Following considerable discussion, Mr Kamentsev (USSR) said there could be no objection to unofficial discussion of a possible international inspection scheme for ICNAF based on the NEAFC scheme and suggested that a suitable place for discussion would be in the present *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations. At Dr Needler's (Canada) suggestion, the Plenary agreed (1) that the views of member countries in regard to an international inspection scheme based on the NEAFC scheme should be assembled by correspondence by the Executive Secretary, (2) that these views should be considered by the *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations at a meeting prior to the 1968 Annual Meeting, and (3) that the Chairman for such a meeting of the *ad hoc* Committee should be provided by Canada.

6. At the request of Mr Tame (UK), the Plenary agreed to give further consideration to Plenary Item 4a, Status of Proposals for Convention Changes. Mr Tame noted that Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Poland, Portugal and USSR had not yet accepted the Protocol relating to Measures of Control. USSR reported that it was considering ratification of the Protocol; Fed. Rep. Germany reported that a law was being passed to give effect to the Protocol, hopefully by next year; Portugal and Denmark reported action would be taken to press ratification; Poland reported that steps were being taken to ratify. Since Italy was not represented at the meeting, the Plenary agreed that the proper Italian authorities be approached by the Executive Secretary and by Depository Government to urge early ratification.

7. Under Plenary Item 17, Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (Proc.1, being *Redbook* 1967, Part I), Dr Templeman (Canada), Chairman of the Standing Committee, presented the Report which was adopted with its recommendations and conclusions by the Plenary.

8. Under Plenary Item 11, Possible Conservation Actions, the Chairman called for consideration of the Report of the Meeting of the Special *ad hoc* Committee on Fishery Management (Proc.16). Following agreement by the Plenary that the Executive Secretary should convene an early mid-term meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures which would elect its own Chairman, the Plenary adopted the Report.

9. Under Plenary Item 18, Report of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, Mr Green (USA), Chairman of the Standing Committee, presented the Reports of the First (Proc.11), Second (Proc.13), Third (Proc.19) and Fourth (Proc. 21) Meetings of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration. The Reports with recommendations and conclusions were adopted unanimously by the Plenary.

10. The Chairman referred to the Reports of the Third (Proc.18) and Fourth (Proc.20) Plenary Sessions. The Reports were adopted by the Plenary.

11. Under Plenary Item 23, Other Business, Mr Ostvedt, Observer for IOC, Mr Popper, Observer for FAO, Mr Isogai, Observer for Japan, Mr MacKernan, Observer for Ireland, Mr Tienstra, Observer for The Netherlands and Mr Möcklinghoff, Observer for NEAFC expressed the appreciation of his country or organization for the invitation to attend the meeting. Both Mr Möcklinghoff and Mr Tienstra suggested that joint sessions of NEAFC and ICNAF might be useful. Mr Tienstra suggested that the Panels' activities might be strengthened.

12. The Chairman thanked the Chairmen of the various Committees and Panels, in particular Dr Templeman (Canada) for his excellent work as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, and Mr Green (USA) for his equally fine work as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration. He expressed the Commission's appreciation to the Executive Secretary and staff, to Mr Wm. Sabbagh (USA), Conference Administration Officer, and to the Commissioners, their Advisers and to the Observers for their contributions to the meeting.

13. Under Plenary Item 20, Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman, Mr V. Kamentsev (USSR) was unanimously elected Chairman of the Commission for the two ensuing years. Mr Fulham welcomed the new Chairman, Mr Kamentsev, who expressed his gratitude at the high honour accorded him and his country, and thanked Mr Fulham, on behalf of the Commission, for his excellent service as Chairman over the past two years. Dr A.W.H.Needler (Canada) was then unanimously elected Vice-Chairman of the Commission for the two ensuing years.

13. There being no other business, the Chairman thanked the Government of the United States of America for its hospitality and for its excellent meeting facilities. He thanked particularly the delegation of the US, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the City of Boston, as well as the US Industry Advisers and the State of Maine, for their generous contributions to the welfare of the meeting participants.

14. The Chairman declared the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Commission adjourned at 1655 hrs.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1967

Officers

Chairman of Commission - Mr T.A.Fulham (USA)
Vice-Chairman of Commission - Mr V.M.Kamantsev (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 W.C.Tame (UK) (for Mr A.J.Aglen (UK))
" Scientific Advisers - Dr A.S.Bogdanov (USSR)
Chairman, Panel 3 - Dr O. Rodriguez Martin (Spain)
" Scientific Advisers - Dr H.W.Graham (USA)
Chairman, Panel 4 - Mr J. Rougé (France)
" Scientific Advisers - Dr J.L.Hart (Canada)
Chairman, Panel 5 - Dr A.S.Bogdanov (USSR)
" Scientific Advisers - Dr S.A.Studenatsky (USSR)
Chairman, Panel A (Seals) - Dr A.W.H.Needler (Canada)
" Scientific Advisers - Dr B. Rasmussen (Norway)

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)

