RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

18TH ANNUAL MEETING

1968

CONTENTS

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Index to Major Items

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.2073
(B.e.68)

Proceedings No.2

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Panel A (Seals)

Wednesday, 5 June, 1200 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr A.W.H.Needler (Canada). All member countries were represented and observers from the UK and ICES were present.

2. Rapporteur. The Chairman proposed and the Panel agreed that Mr E.B. Young (Canada) should act as Rapporteur.

3. Agenda. The agenda as circulated was adopted.

4. Panel Rules of Procedure. The Panel adopted the Panel Rules of Procedure.

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

6. Reports of Mid-Year Meeting of Panel A and Scientific Advisers, Hamburg, 12 October 1967. These Reports (circulated as Comm.Doc.68/2) were adopted and are attached as Appendix III and Annex I.

7. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr Rasmussen (Norway), Chairman of the Scientific Advisers to Panel A, presented the Report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel A (Appendix I). The Panel took note of the uncertainties in the assessment of the state of the stocks and the recommendation of the Scientific Advisers and

recommends

that R&S be requested to arrange for a special meeting between those working on sealing and on stock assessments at the time of the 1969 meeting, and to ensure that the relevant material is made available to the stock assessment workers at least one month in advance of this meeting.

At this point in the meeting, the Chairman drew attention to the presence of Dr Elizabeth Simpson, representing the World Federation for the Protection of Animals, and Dr E.A.Smith, Co-ordinator for the International Biological Programme, Marine Productivity Section, and it was decided to request any presentations they might have to make.

Mr O. Lund (Norway) asked first to make a statement concerning Norwegian sealing operations in the spring of 1968. He noted that at the Meeting of Panel A in Boston in 1967 Norway had stated that she was prepared to introduce not only the opening and closing dates for the hunting of seals, but also provisions similar to those in Canada to ensure humane killing, to provide inspection, and to cooperate with Canada in this respect. Norway also advised that facilities would be provided for a representative of societies for the protection of animals to observe their methods, and that the seal hunters would be well informed concerning the regulations.

Mr Lund advised that the promises were fulfilled and referred to the outline of Norwegian regulations from the Hamburg meeting, Appendix III.

Mr Lund also made reference to the agreement with Canada on a scheme of joint enforcement of sealing regulations.

The observer with the Norwegian sealing ships, Mr Erling Sognen, was appointed by the International Society for the Protection of Animals. His report

(over)

has not yet been received but he has expressed satisfaction with the conduct of the hunt on Norwegian television and in the press. The Norwegian inspector has yet to file his report but was also satisfied with the conduct of the operation.

Dr Elizabeth Simpson thanked the Commission and the Panel members for the opportunity to present the point of view of the World Federation for the Protection of Animals and read the following brief:

1. "Submission to the ICNAF Seal Panel from the World Federation for the Protection of Animals, Zurich.

2. "I would like to thank you for the very great efforts that have been made to improve the standard of seal hunting in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. I understand from reports in the press, and from veterinary pathologists present in the Gulf in March 1968 that large numbers of fisheries officers were present on the ice floes. It would therefore be pleasant if I could also say that cruelty had been reduced to an acceptable minimum, but this, unfortunately, is not the case, since the pathologists indicate that of 695 carcasses examined, 117, or 17%, did not have fractured skulls. A pre-mortem fractured skull is the only satisfactory criterion which can be accepted as proof that the seal was not skinned whilst still conscious. If the animal is merely stunned, or 'playing dead' (and this reflex has now been described by a number of people), no one can be certain that it is unconscious at the time of skinning. An advantage of this criterion is that a layman can recognize it readily if trained to do so. The World Federation for the Protection of Animals would therefore be glad to see this criterion of a fractured skull as an indication of death written into the existing Canadian and Norwegian legislation, since the present requirement that the animal be 'dead' before it is skinned is apparently leading to some difficulty of interpretation.

3. "I might add at this point that when this criterion of a fractured skull was applied in the summer of 1967 to another large sealing operation, that of the fur seal on the Pribilof Islands, Alaska, USA, less than 2% of a sample of over 1,000 carcasses examined by me had unfractured skulls. I would refer you to my paper in Nature 216, pp. 1237-1238 on this subject. This figure of under 2% was considered to be an indication of the acceptably humane level at which this operation is run.

4. "Whilst considering other seal hunts, it is essential to point out that there are other areas of seal hunting under the jurisdiction of the International Commission for North Atlantic Fisheries, namely the 'Front' and the hunt off Jan Mayen Islands. Today was the first that I had heard of any investigation by veterinary pathologists of the Front, and I shall look forward to reading that report, the manner in which the investigation was conducted and the criteria used. There remains the Jan Mayen hunt to investigate, and the World Federation for the Protection of Animals is very anxious that this be done, and that a continuous check be kept on all seal hunts, so that the public is not lulled into a false sense of security as to whether proper control is being carried out. The World Federation for the Protection of Animals would ask that co-operation of all members of this Panel to facilitate such investigations as it is obvious that they can be better done from on board a sealing vessel, than from a land base."

The Chairman then recognized Dr Smith, who referred to the document "Theme on Marine Mammals", attached as Appendix II. Dr Smith advised the Panel members that there had been an encouraging measure of support following circulation of this document which has helped in the definition of the role of IBP in this field. A Working Group is to assemble in Cambridge, England, in July 1968 at the first meeting of the International Biological Programme.

8. Conservation Measures and Requirements. It was not possible to take regulatory action at this meeting because of the 60-day notice requirement,

although the Chairman pointed out that it was clear from the Report of the Scientific Advisers that further restrictions would be necessary if stocks on the "Front" were to be maintained or restored to higher levels.

The Chairman pointed out that measures agreed to between Norway and Canada were for one year only and subject to review. Further action, if desirable for 1969, would have to be accomplished outside ICNAF. He suggested a meeting of interested Government representatives, possibly at the time of the ICES meeting in October, to consider measures for 1969 and to consider what should be recommended to ICNAF as a long-term plan at the 1969 meeting. The decision was that Canada should propose by letter to the other two Governments the matters which should be considered and also a time and place for a meeting.

9. Future Research. This is included in the Report of Scientific Advisers to Panel A (Appendix I). The Panel took particular note of the requirement for more tagging to assess the degree of intermingling between herds in the "Gulf" and the "Front" areas.

10. 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.

11. Other Business. The Chairman, on behalf of Canada, advised that reports received from observers who attended the seal hunt in the Gulf of St. Lawrence at the request of the Canadian Government, will be circulated to Panel members.

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

13. Election of Chairman. It was proposed by Mr Lund (Norway) and unanimously agreed that Mr H.J.Lassen (Denmark) be elected Chairman of the Panel for the following two years.

14. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 1250 hrs.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.2073
(B.f.68)

Proceedings No.2
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel A

Friday, 31 May, and Saturday, 1 June

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Dr B. Rasmussen (Norway).

2. The meeting was attended by representatives of the Panel member countries (Canada, Denmark, Norway), by representatives from the Assessments Subcommittee (Mr Parrish and Mr Gulland) and by observers from non-Panel member countries.

3. Dr G.F.M.Smith was elected Rapporteur.

4. Documents relating to this meeting are

(a) Report of Meeting of Panel A, Hamburg, 12 October 1967 with appendices (Comm. Doc. 68/2 and Appendix III to this Proceedings)

(b) Research Documents 68/70, 68/84;

(c) Additional manuscript information was introduced during the meeting.

5. The Chairman stated that the prime object of this meeting was to prepare, with the Assessment Subcommittee, a joint recommendation to Panel A concerning the exploitation of harp seals on the Front.

6. Status of the Fishery. The ICNAF Secretariat has assembled the statistics of seal catch in the Gulf, Front and at West Greenland for the years 1949 to 1967 inclusive. New statistics for the 1968 catch on the Gulf and Front were introduced to the meeting. These and the 1967 figures for comparison are as follows:

		Harp Seals			Hood Seals		
		Juvenile	Older	Total	Juvenile	Older	Total
1967	Gulf	92,078	9,879	101,957	-	-	-
	Front	184,507	44,751	229,258	8,345	6,354	14,699
1968	Gulf	56,676	4,464	61,140	-	-	-
	Front	98,077	30,176	128,253	1,302	463	1,765

The reduction in the 1968 catch was the direct result of decreased catching effort brought about by a bilateral agreement between Norway and Canada to permit only a shorter catching season and opening at a later date. The Gulf catch of harp seals is taken only by Canada and is limited by quota to 50,000 pups by vessels and planes plus a landsmen's catch. The Norwegian fleet on the Front employed about one-third less vessels than the previous year.

7. Research. Additional new information (Res.Doc.68/70) showed that about two-thirds of the recoveries of harp seals tagged in the Gulf were made on the Front. Due to the greater intensity of catching on the Front, this is interpreted as indicating that about one-sixth of the Gulf-produced pups later turn up at the Front. Serological studies (Res.Doc.68/84) have not revealed any differences between Gulf and Front harp seal herds.

Manuscript data from Norway indicated that harp seal maturity begins at age 4 and is complete for all individuals by age 12. Breeding begins at age 5. The maximum fertility rate is about 92% but less for young females.

(over)

8. Assessment of the State of Stocks. The Advisers considered that the additional available data were not sufficient to enable any substantial revision to be made to the assessments presented at the 1967 ICNAF Annual Meeting, especially taking into account the limited time available for detailed analysis. The Advisers therefore have no reason to alter their earlier conclusions that, for the Front herd, may be summarized as follows:

(a) the stock has been reduced to a level which is certainly not much above, and is probably below, the level giving the maximum sustainable yield;

(b) the sustainable yield, taken solely as pups, is of the order of 100,000 pups;

(c) the sustainable yield, in numbers of animals, depends on the age and sex of the animals killed;

(d) recent catches have been greater than the sustainable yield.

Much further research is needed to establish the sustainable yield with accuracy; the factors that need to be examined include:

(i) the degree of interchange between the Gulf and Front herds;

(ii) the present pup production of both herds;

(iii) the mortality rate of immature and mature animals;

(iv) the growth and the age at sexual maturity;

(v) the influence of stock abundance on the above factors.

If, as is very desirable, the present regulations concerning the animals older than one year are maintained so that the kill of these older animals is no more than about 40,000, including only a low proportion of mature females, then the sustainable kill of pups is between 80,000 and 120,000 animals. That is, any kill greater than 120,000 pups will certainly continue the reduction of the Front stock, and of the sustainable yield from it. However, it is not certain that catches of this magnitude would be sufficiently low to maintain the stock; further research is necessary to establish the figure with greater accuracy, and it may be that the catches would have to be as low as 80,000 pups to maintain the stock at its present level. Even lower catches would be necessary for a period, if the stock has to be increased to bring it to the level giving the maximum sustained yield.

In view of the uncertainties in the above estimates, and their importance in relation to the management of the seal stocks, the Advisers

recommend

that R&S be requested to arrange for a special meeting between those working on sealing and on stock assessments at the time of the 1969 meeting, and to ensure that the relevant material is made available to the stock assessment workers at least one month in advance of this meeting.

9. Dr G.F.M.Smith was elected Chairman of the Scientific Advisers to Panel A.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.2073
(B.f.68)

Proceedings No.2
Appendix II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

IBP/PM

THEME ON MARINE MAMMALS

During recent years there has been an increase in research on many marine mammals species. Investigations include work on their physiology, under-water acoustics and behaviour, but are mainly concerned with population studies, resource management and with the trophic status of these animals. Many species are important, yielding skins, oil or meat meal of commercial value; others compete with fisheries. Some have been massively over-exploited, some represent an untapped resource, others have been profitably managed for many years. Most species have an aesthetic appeal, and some provide an amenity which may have economic importance.

Much of the research effort is already the concern of international organizations which are also responsible for political and commercial aspects. These are:

International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries
International Council for the Exploration of the Sea
Scientific Committee for Antarctic Research
North Pacific Fur Seal Commission
Sealing Commission for the Northeast Atlantic
International Whaling Commission

Features common to all studies on marine mammals are the difficulties in estimating biomass and the limitation of access to animals during the breeding season due to a dispersed pelagic non-breeding regime. Thus, despite the large number of scientists involved, the size of samples and the volume of information does not yet demand complex data processing. However, the IBP could perform a valuable coordinating service by preparing literature lists, by disseminating notes on techniques, organizing meetings and by promoting other means of enhancing communications between specialists.

The comments received in answer to the preliminary working paper suggest the following conclusions:

a) Seals. The international organizations cited above achieve between them reasonably complete global coverage, with certain exceptions, and the research workers concerned maintain contact by correspondence, etc. It is most useful to maintain and enhance such contact with the sharing of experience on scientific issues. The IBP could play an important role of co-ordination on a global scale. It would act at a different level from those international bodies which, each concerned with a different area, are essentially operating in parallel. Gaps in knowledge could be recognized, advice given and priorities determined.

b) Cetacea. Large whales have received much attention and because of the acute reduction of stocks present major problems in conservation. Current research is now largely directed towards smaller Cetacea. There is a real need for scientific coordination here and agreement among correspondents that the smaller species should be included in the IBP. Large whales, which continue to be important in the food chains of some oceans, should not be excluded but the focus of interest by IBP should be on those Cetacea with an adult mean length less than say 30 feet.

c) Sirenia. Many problems present themselves here, including the discontinuous distribution of these animals, the paucity of knowledge about them and the threat to their stocks in many places so there is an urgent need for research. For these reasons it would be appropriate to include them in the IBP. Although some occur in fresh or brackish water, they are probably best dealt with under PM. The few species of freshwater phocids and Cetacea should also be included.

(over)

d) Polar bear. Studies on these animals are being considered and coordinated at special meetings of IUCN, and so may be omitted from IBP.

e) Sea and freshwater otters. Although these animals are not pelagic nor truly international in distribution, the correspondence following the circulation of the preliminary working paper indicated that their inclusion is warranted.

Organization

It is desirable to begin by summarizing the present state of knowledge and, more particularly, the current research effort. That is, a list of species with recent estimates of populations should be prepared - largely by correspondence to include authors' recent unpublished estimates where possible. No review of published information can be sufficiently up to date. Documents could be maintained by the IBP to be constantly revised and recirculated. Such a task would need the assistance of a small working group in PM. This could operate largely by correspondence and should include a key scientist from each country or group of countries to which marine mammal research is important.

Programme

A programme of operations for the period of IBP, ending in 1972, would need to be considered and proposed by the working group, and subsequently approved by the PM Section Committee and SCIBP. It is certain, however, that such a programme must include one or more meetings at which research workers on marine mammals would exchange views on problems, methods and results. It is suggested that the first such meeting should be at the SCAR/IBP symposium on Antarctic ecology (at which certain bipolar themes will be discussed), in July 1968 at Cambridge, England. Later it may be desirable to convene a meeting at which research on tropical and temperate marine mammals would be included. ICES has already welcomed the suggestion that IBP/PM might arrange such a meeting, probably to be held in 1969. A suitable geographical centre should be chosen for as wide a representation as possible.

The Proceedings of these meetings should be published to form the basis of future work rather than as a summary of past results. They might also provide material for a possible IBP handbook.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No. 1961
(B.e.67)

Proceedings No. 2
Appendix III

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of the Meeting of Panel A (Seal)[1]

Hamburg, 12 October 1967

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr. A.W.H. Needler (Canada), and representatives of all Panel A members (Canada, Denmark, Norway) were present.

The Chairman referred to the purpose of the meeting as outlined in the recommendations contained in ICNAF Proceedings No. 7 of the Annual Meeting, June 1967..."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" and "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."

2. Rapporteur

Mr Lund (Norway) proposed and the Panel agreed that Dr Sprules (Canada) should act as Rapporteur.

3. Agenda

The agenda as circulated was adopted with the understanding that Item 7 should read "Present and future conservation measures."

4. Reception of Briefs

The Chairman informed the Panel that requests had been received from three international organizations to present briefs to the meeting. He introduced Dr Elizabeth Simpson who was present to speak on behalf of the World Federation for the Protection of Animals and the New Brunswick Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and Mr A. G. Bourne who would address the meeting on behalf of the Survival Service Commission of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. Although a request had been received no representative was present to speak on behalf of the International Society for the Protection of Animals.

Dr Simpson referred to the joint brief of the WFPA and NBSPCA which had not been received in time to be considered by the Panel at its last meeting held in Boston in June (Comm.Doc.68/2). She stated that the WFPA represented 100 societies located on five continents and requested that the Panel give serious consideration to the proposals contained in the brief which she understood had been circulated to all Panel members after the Boston meeting. Dr Simpson stated that she was now a staff member of the Department of Animal Pathology at the University of Cambridge and that she had conducted post-mortem examinations on the carcasses of a random sample of 154 newly-born harp seals in the Gulf of St. Lawrence from 7 to 9 March 1967. She reviewed the results of her investigation and distributed copies of a published report reprinted from Nature, Vol.214, No.5094, p.1274 only, 17 June 1967.

Mr Lund (Norway) expressed appreciation of the efforts of the many associations concerned with the humane aspects of sealing operations and stated that the Norwegian industry and government were prepared to cooperate in all possible ways. He said that new Norwegian sealing regulations were being drafted to give effect to the assurances he had given at the Boston meeting of the Panel and that measures similar to those contained in the Canadian sealing regulations would be in effect for Norwegian sealers operating in 1968.

Mr Bourne presented the following brief on behalf of the Survival Service Commission of the IUCN:

---

[1] circulated earlier as Comm. Doc. 68/2

(over)

"The Survival Service Commission is concerned with the exploitation of the seal stocks in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and in the Front Areas. We are aware of the intense research effort by the scientists in the employ of the sealing nations and hope that this will continue. But, most important in our opinion is that the recommendations regarding the size of the cull made by the scientists should be accepted by this Panel of ICNAF, which represents those interested in the resource. The rational exploitation of any stock of wild animals can only be successful if based on a scientific evaluation of the resource. Unless the sealing industry acknowledges this by accepting and acting on the advice of their scientists they will find themselves in the same situation the whaling industry finds itself today and this panel and ICNAF will face a similar failure to conserve the raw material upon which their industry depends."

Dr Needler (Canada) thanked Mr Bourne and pointed out that Canada has established an annual quota on harp seals of less than a year in age for licensed vessels and aircraft operating in one district of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The average annual catch by landsmen was taken into account when the quota was established and the total annual production of young harp seals in the Gulf of St. Lawrence is maintained at a figure below the estimated annual sustainable yield as determined from the most recent scientific data.

5. Proposed IBP Project on Marine Mammals

Mr Day reviewed the proposal which had been circulated to specialists and international organizations by the Section Productivity Marine (PM) of the International Biological Programme (IBP) of the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU) on 27 July 1967, for a programme aiming at the coordination of research and the improvement of communication on 23 marine mammals including harp and hood seals. The Panel took note of the proposal and agreed that no specific comments could be made at this time. It was understood that cooperation would be provided by the national agencies directly involved in marine mammal investigations.

6. Report on Status of Seal Fishery and Research

Dr Rasmussen (Norway) presented the report of the Scientific Advisers to Panel A who had met under his chairmanship on Wednesday, 11 October (Annex I). The Panel expressed its appreciation to the scientific advisers and accepted the report with the understanding that paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of section 5 would be combined to form one paragraph when the report is reproduced in final form.

During the discussion of the report the Panel took special note of the recommendation of the scientific advisers that the data for determination of the sustainable yield of harp seals in the Front Area be reviewed with the ICNAF Assessment Subcommittee at the time of the next Annual Meeting of ICNAF and a joint recommendation be prepared for consideration by the Panel at that time.

7. Present and Future Conservation Measures

The Chairman reviewed the current situation with regard to the recommendation for conservation measures for the 1968 sealing season which had been made by the Panel and adopted by the Commission at the last Annual Meeting in Boston. He said the recommendation had been circulated by the Depositary Government and that it was assumed that ratification by the Member Governments concerned would bring the new regulations into force before the 1968 sealing season.

The Panel members had no proposals for additional conservation measures to be submitted to the Commission at this time and on the suggestion of Mr Lund (Norway) it was agreed that if a Panel member wishes to have such a proposal considered at the next Annual Meeting it should be circulated to the other Panel members by 31 January 1968.

8. Possible International Inspection Scheme and Joint Enforcement Procedures

Mr Lund (Norway) advised the meeting that Norway was prepared to accept international inspection of its sealing operations provided that a satisfactory arrangement could be made with other sealing nations. He said he had prepared a draft proposal based on the international inspection scheme adopted recently by the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission and had given a copy to Dr Needler (Canada) for review and comment. Mr Lund stated that it would not be possible for Norway to place an inspector on board each Norwegian sealing vessel and thus some joint enforcement scheme with Canada would be desirable.

Dr Needler stated that Canada was in favour of some international inspection scheme provided new implementing legislation would not be required. He said the Norwegian proposal would be reviewed and comments would be submitted by correspondence in an attempt to arrive at an acceptable arrangement for the 1968 sealing season. It was understood that Denmark would not be directly involved in such a scheme because sealing operations in Greenland were confined to inshore waters for the most part.

9. Future research

The Panel members accepted the research plans submitted by the scientific advisers in their report and commended the scientists of the three member nations for the development of an effective coordinated research program including exchange of data and biological specimens.

10. Next Meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Panel would be held at the same time and place as the next Annual Meeting of ICNAF.

11. Other Business

There was no other business.

12. Approval of Report

It was agreed that the rapporteur would prepare a draft report of the meeting which would be sent to Dr Needler (Canada), Mr Lassen (Denmark) and Mr Lund (Norway) for review and comment and subsequently approved by correspondence.

13. Press Release

It was decided that a press release would not be prepared.

14. Adjournment

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 1610 hours.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Proceedings No.2
Appendix III
Annex I

Serial No.1961
(B.f.1967)

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel A
Hamburg, 11 October 1967

1. The meeting was called to order at 1500 hrs by the Chairman, Dr B. Rasmussen (Norway), who welcomed the Delegates and Observers.

2. The agenda was adopted.

3. Dr G.F.M.Smith (Canada) acted as Rapporteur.

4. The Chairman briefly reviewed the reports of meetings of the Scientific Advisers to Panel A, the Seal Assessment Working Group and Panel A held at Boston in June 1967 (ICNAF 1967 Meeting Proceedings No.7, with Appendix and Annex).

5. The Chairman called for reports on the status of the seal fishery and research. Dr Sergeant (Canada) and Mr Øritsland (Norway) reported that revised 1967 statistics were now available for ICNAF (ICNAF Serial No.1882 - Canada; ICNAF Serial No.1959 - Norway). Mr Øritsland stated that the subdivision of harp seal pelt types, exactly as requested by the Assessment Working Group, was not practical for the Norwegian fishery on the Front but as much detail as could be had would be supplied.

Dr Sprules (Canada) and Dr Rasmussen (Norway) agreed that the historical records from Canada and Norway would be supplied in as much detail as possible for publication in the ICNAF Statistical Bulletin and for the use of the ICNAF Assessment Group.

Mr Øritsland (Norway) reviewed briefly some data and analysis of pelt types taken on the Front. Graphs of these were deposited with the ICNAF Secretariat (Serial No.1960).

Dr Sergeant (Canada) presented his paper on Canadian research (ICNAF Serial No.1952). It appears that the annual Gulf catch should not exceed about 85,000 harp seals which is about the catch in the last few years. The sustainable catch on the Front at the present annual reproductive rate is about 90,000 harp seals which is less than recent captures. The current reproduction of young harp seals at the Front is about 200,000 per year.

Dr Rasmussen (Norway) offered to supply jaws to Dr Sergeant (Canada) for age determination from large Norwegian samples taken at the Front. Jaw bones can also be supplied by the industry and from Greenland by Denmark.

Dr Rasmussen stressed the value of a large scale tagging program in the Gulf to understand better the discreteness of Gulf and Front stocks.

Mr Øritsland (Norway) suggested that serological studies might be of value in separating stocks. Two Norwegian samples have already been obtained from the Front but none yet from the Gulf. It is suggested that samples from the Gulf could be obtained in 1968 for Norwegian analysis with Canadian cooperation.

The importance of catch and effort statistics for use in population estimation was stressed.

6. Under the item Conservation Measures, the Scientific Advisers agreed that they were convinced by the evidence that the harp seal herd on the Front was being overexploited at the current capture rate and that the catch should be limited to the sustainable yield. Dr Sergeant's (Canada) paper (ICNAF Serial No. 1952) indicates that this is between 75,000 and 90,000 harp seals. The Scientific Advisers

recommend

that the data for this sustainable yield be reviewed with the ICNAF Assessment Subcommittee and a joint recommendation be prepared for Panel A at its 1968 meeting.

(over)

It is noted that the Scientific Advisers and the ad hoc Seal Assessment Group have already expressed concern on this matter.

7. The Scientific Advisers noted the IBP proposed project on Marine Mammals forwarded under cover of letter of 27 July 1967, but has no suggestions to offer.

8. The Scientific Advisers agreed to meet at the time of the next ICNAF Meeting.

9. The Scientific Advisers confirmed Dr Rasmussen (Norway) as its Chairman for 1967/68.

10. The meeting adjourned at 1745 hrs.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.2106
(B.e.68)

Proceedings No.3

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Panel 3

Wednesday, 5 June, 0900 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr F. Chrzan (Poland). Representatives of Canada, Poland, Portugal, Spain, USSR, UK and USA were present. The Federal Republic of Germany and Norway were represented by observers.

2. Rapporteur. Dr H.A.Cole (UK) was appointed Rapporteur.

3. Agenda. The Agenda as prepared was adopted.

4. Panel Membership. The Federal Republic of Germany and Norway applied for membership in Panel 3 and were accepted unanimously.

5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr Cole (UK) presented his summary of the status of fisheries and research carried out during 1967 (Res.Doc.68/103 Revised) and the Report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers (Appendix I). One amendment was made in Res.Doc.68/103 Revised, the footnote to Table 2 to be replaced with the words "Probably includes a large proportion of Greenland halibut".

During the discussion which followed, the USA referred to the state of the cod stocks and asked whether the Advisers were not a little complacent in view of the estimates of potential yield contained in Res.Doc.68/75 compiled by FAO. This showed a potential yield of cod for Subarea 3 of 450,000 to 600,000 tons which had already been exceeded in 1967. Dr Cole, in reply, referred to the influence of the good year-class of 1963 and the very strong incoming year-class of 1964. He mentioned that the report of the Research and Statistics Committee contained no clear recommendations regarding the stocks in Subarea 3. Dr May, who had chaired the small assessment group dealing with the stocks in Subarea 3, confirmed the importance of fluctuations arising from strong year-classes especially in the southern divisions of the subarea. In this southern part of the subarea, the assessment of the state of the stocks was feasible but in the northern divisions the position was uncertain due to overlap with Subarea 2. During the present meeting, it has been estimated that in the northern divisions the recent landings represent at least 80% of the maximum sustainable yield but the effort has increased. Because of this increase new assessments were needed.

Dr Cole referred to the fact that new mesh regulations for the subarea would come into force in September 1968.

6. Conservation Requirements. Norway asked whether an increase in mesh size had been considered and referred to the desirability of uniformity among Subareas 1 to 3.

In the discussion which followed, the USA drew attention to the statement in the Report of the Meeting of Panel Advisers that "the 3N and 0 cod stock might well benefit from even larger mesh sizes than 4 1/2 inches". In reply, Dr May said that this opinion was based on assessments made some time ago and more up-to-date assessments were desirable. For Div.3N and 0, the data were satisfactory but for the northern divisions the conditions were not so clear.

In further discussion, it was agreed that the effect of the pending mesh size regulations would need to be observed but the Research and Statistics Committee should be asked to provide new assessments as soon as practicable.

7. Future Research. The programs circulated showed that member countries were active in research. Norway indicated that research in Subarea 3 would be undertaken when possible and the Federal Republic of Germany mentioned that their research work in the subarea would continue.

8. Next Meeting. It was agreed that this would be held in conjunction with the 1969 meeting of the Commission in Warsaw.

9. Approval of Report. It was agreed that a draft Report would be circulated for comments and approved as amended without a further meeting.

10. Adjournment. There being no further business, the Panel meeting was adjourned at 0950 hrs.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.2106
(B.f.68)

Proceedings No.3
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 3

Saturday, 1 June, 1400 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr H.A.Cole (UK). Representatives from the following Member Countries of the Panel were present: Canada, Poland, Portugal, Spain, USSR, UK, USA.

2. Dr A.W.May (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.

3. It was agreed that the Panel agenda, as applicable, would be followed.

4. The Chairman presented his Summary of Research and Status of the Fisheries (Res.Doc.68/103), drawing attention to recent trends in catches by species and country, and reviewing various research accomplished. The Summary was adopted with some minor revisions.

5. The Advisers were informed that the Assessments Subcommittee had reached no firm conclusions concerning the state of various stocks in Subarea 3 relative to present levels of effort, but that it seemed likely that several of the cod stocks were now being fished at, or near, the level of maximum sustained yield. Particular attention was drawn to the cod stock of Div. 3N and 3O. Reports of past years indicated that this stock was being fished near the level of maximum sustained yield, but catches increased threefold in 1967. Part of this increase could be attributed to better recruitment, but part also to increased effort. It was further noted that for those cod stocks which spend part of the year in Canadian coastal waters, annual catch per man has continued to decline, though amount of gear used has increased.

The Chairman drew the Advisers' attention to information contained in Comm.Doc.68/10, indicating that pending mesh regulations will come into force in September 1968. In this connection, it was noted that the 3N and 3O cod stock might well benefit from even larger mesh sizes than 4 1/2 inches.

6. The present state of the haddock stocks in Div.3N, 3O and 3Ps was discussed briefly. It was concluded that these were separate from stocks in Subareas 4 and 5 and that recruitment from other areas was unlikely. The Grand Bank stock may now be at such a low level that it is incapable of producing a very large year-class.

The Advisers wish to draw the Panel's attention to the report of the Assessments Subcommittee for information on other stocks and other species.

7. Future research programs of the various Member Countries were reviewed. It was evident that countries will continue collection of basic data on age and size composition, either from research vessels, through observers on fishing vessels or by market sampling. Work on plankton and hydrography will also be continued. Some greater emphasis will be given to surveys of pre-recruit sizes, especially for cod. Expansion of present programs for salmon and herring research is contemplated.

8. It was agreed that the next meeting of Advisers should be held a few days before the 1969 meeting of the Panel.

9. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.2107
(B.e.68)

Proceedings No.4

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Panel 4

Wednesday, 5 June, 1120 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Captain T. de Almeida (Portugal).

2. Rapporteur. Dr W. Templeman (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.

3. Agenda. The agenda as circulated was adopted.

4. Panel Membership. Representatives of all members of the Panel, with the exception of Italy, were present. Dr Chrzan (Poland) notified the Panel that Poland had applied to become a member of the Panel. This application was approved by the Panel.

5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr R. Monteiro (Portugal), Chairman of Scientific Advisers to the Panel, presented his summary report of research and status of fisheries in the subarea during 1967 (Res.Doc.68/104), and also the Report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers (Appendix I). The Panel approved these reports without change.

6. Review of Conservation Measures and Requirements. No proposals were made for further conservation actions.

7. Future Research. The report of Scientific Advisers and the programs submitted by Member Countries contain summaries of plans for future research. No additional research plans were presented with the exception that Spain expects to carry out new sampling on board pair trawlers.

The Chairman of the Panel said that although the Research and Statistics Committee came to no firm conclusions on the state of the stocks in this subarea, this does not mean that the stocks are underexploited. He hoped that in future more data will be available so that it may be possible to arrive at firmer conclusions on the state of the stocks of cod and of other species of the subarea.

8. Next Meeting. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Panel would be held at the time and place of the next ICNAF meeting. The Advisers will meet during the previous week.

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

10. Approval of Panel Report. It was agreed to circulate the Panel Report among the Panel members for approval.

11. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 1145 hrs.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No. 2107
(B.f.68)

Proceedings No. 4
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 4

Saturday, 1 June, 1500 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr R. Monteiro (Portugal). Participants from Canada, Portugal, Spain, USSR and USA were present. Observers from ICES, Poland and UK were also present.

2. Dr F. D. McCracken (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.

3. The Chairman proposed to follow the agenda of Panel 4 insofar as it was appropriate and it was agreed to do so.

4. The Chairman read a Summary of Status of Fisheries and Research carried out in Subarea 4 in 1967 (Res. Doc. 68/104).

The Advisers discussed the Summary and agreed to accept it with minor revisions and several additions.

5. Assessment of Stocks. At the request of the Chairman, Mr Parish, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Assessments, reviewed briefly the work being done at this meeting in relation to questions posed by the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures with particular reference to Subarea 4. He drew attention to Annex 3 of the Report of the Subcommittee on Assessments which dealt particularly with Subarea 4 stocks. The problems being considered related to fishing intensity and not specifically to mesh regulation. He pointed out that Subarea 4 stocks and fisheries were among the more complex. He noted that in Table 8 of the Report of the Subcommittee on Assessments that no firm recommendations about status of the stocks could be made for this subarea. This was not because the stocks are believed to be underexploited, but rather that firm conclusions cannot be drawn from data and analyses available. He pointed out the need for intensive studies in Subarea 4 and these must be backed up by adequate sampling of commercial landings.

The assessment on Div. 4T cod stocks carried out and reported to R&S in 1967 was briefly reviewed and the results noted.

6. Research Plans. The research plans for 1968 by countries have already been circulated. A few additions were recorded. Canada reported proposed participation in a cooperative plankton survey (with USSR and USA) and on use of a submersible for observations in Subarea 4. Portugal expects to continue sampling for cod for length age composition. Spain expects to carry out sampling aboard commercial vessels including pair trawlers if possible. The USSR expects to continue hydrographic studies and studies on juveniles of silver hake and other species. The USA will continue sampling for length and age composition of landings and carry out groundfish surveys in the southern part of Subarea 4.

The Polish observer reported that Poland plans to seek membership in Panel 4 and noted that research had been carried out in the subarea. Research on argentines and other species will be continued.

The UK expects to continue its efforts with the Continuous Plankton Recorder survey.

7. Date and Place of Next Meeting. The next meeting will be held in conjunction with the 1969 ICNAF meeting as arranged by the Secretariat.

8. Other Business. No other items of business were raised.

9. Chairman. It was noted that Dr Monteiro will be expected to serve as Chairman for the second year.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 1545 hrs.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Proceedings No.5

Serial No.2108
(B.e.68)

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Panel 5

Wednesday, 5 June, 1000 hrs

1. In the absence of Panel Chairman, Mr T.A.Fulham (USA), the meeting was opened by the Commission Chairman, Mr V.M.Kamentsev (USSR).

2. Chairman of Meeting. Mr R.W.Green (USA) was elected Chairman.

3. Rapporteur. Dr G.F.M.Smith (Canada) was elected Rapporteur.

4. Agenda. The agenda, as circulated, was adopted.

5. Panel Membership. All Panel Member Countries, Canada, Romania, USA, USSR, were represented. Poland advised the Panel that it wished to join Panel 5. This was approved unanimously.

6. Report of Scientific Advisers. The Report of the Scientific Advisers to Panel 5 was read and adopted (Appendix I).

7. Review of Conservation Measures and Requirements. The US Delegate drew especial attention to the present low level of haddock stocks in Subarea 5 and that question had arisen concerning the possibility that this low level might interfere with recruitment. This raised the question as to whether new conservation measures were therefore now required. He requested that this be brought to the attention of the Commission.

The US Delegate discussed briefly the possibility that the small size of the last four haddock year-classes might be due to environmental conditions. From 1952 to 1968 there have been generally decreasing temperatures in the subarea but the largest year-class on record was that of 1963. At present it is not possible to state whether the recent small year-classes are the result of heavy fishing or environmental conditions. There has been no full analysis of the possible relation between year-class strength and environmental conditions but data are currently being assembled.

The USSR Delegate noted that in the Barents Sea, small adult populations may provide very good recruitment and this is interpreted as the result of favourable environmental conditions.

The US Delegate presented a brief (Appendix II) requesting special management action on Subarea 5 haddock and asked for an informal conservation understanding among the nations fishing haddock in Subarea 5. It further requested a "favoured nation status" in this regard for the USA on an historical basis and also because the US haddock fleet was not mobile.

The Romanian Delegate indicated that his country would cooperate in applying any necessary restrictive measures to protect the haddock stock.

The Polish Delegate stated that the main interest of the Polish fishing fleet in Subarea 5 was herring and the preservation of these stocks.

The USSR Delegate indicated that USSR was prepared to take an active part in research concerning stock size and the causes of year-class size fluctuation. The size of the total catch should be based on deliberations on the conclusions of the Assessment Subcommittee. The USSR will have proposals for the preservation of all commercial fish stocks in the ICNAF Area.

The USSR Delegate noted that special status for the USA with regard to Subarea 5 haddock was beyond the competence of ICNAF.

The US Delegate asked for inclusion of the brief in this report. This was agreed (Appendix II). He stated that USA will present a more complete proposal with suggestions for implementation at the next ICNAF Annual Meeting. There were no further suggestions for conservation measures on other than haddock.

8. Review of the 10% Annual Exemption. US returns on this item in Res. Doc. 68/98 were reviewed. There were no additional comments.

9. Future Research Requirements. Discussion on this item stressed the need for:

(a) More assessment research
(b) An examination and research on the stock recruitment-environmental relationships by a special working party
(c) Special effort to obtain quantitative information
(d) The need for catch sampling data from commercial vessels from all countries fishing in the subarea.

It was noted that the R&S report recommends continuing mid-term meetings of assessment working groups. The Canadian Delegate suggested that such a working group give top priority to consideration of Subarea 5 haddock.

The Panel

recommended

that the mid-year meeting of the assessment working group approved by R&S give high priority to:

1) the kinds of information and the methods of sampling required to elucidate the environmental factors affecting recruitment,

2) specification and modelling of the population processes with regard to stock-recruitment relations,

3) examination of available data on stock recruitment with special reference to Subarea 5 haddock.

It was further suggested by Canada that special attention to haddock in Subarea 5 apply to the three recommendations and not merely number 3.

10. Date and Place of Next Meeting. USA informed the Panel that an informal meeting among the interested scientists would be organized to discuss joint and cooperative studies in Subarea 5.

It was agreed that the next Panel meeting would be held at the time of the 1969 Annual Meeting.

11. Approval of Report. It was agreed that the Panel Report should be approved by circulation of a draft without re-convening the Panel for this purpose.

12. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 1500 hrs.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.2108
(B.f.68)

Proceedings No.5
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 5

Friday, 31 May, 1405 hrs

1. The Chairman, Dr G.F.M.Smith (Canada), opened the meeting with representatives from Member Countries, Canada, Romania, USSR and USA in attendance. Observers from Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Poland and UK were present.

2. Mr J.B.Skerry (USA) was appointed Rapporteur.

3. The Agenda for Panel 5 with minor modification was adopted.

4. Report by the Chairman on the Status of Fisheries and Research carried out in 1967. The Chairman referred to, and presented, Res.Doc.68/105. The report was discussed and several corrections made, following which it was adopted for presentation to the Panel.

5. Review of Conservation Measures and Requirements including Minimum Mesh Sizes for Species other than Cod and Haddock. The USA drew attention of the Panel to the present status of Georges Bank haddock stocks and the need for conservation measures beyond the present mesh size regulation. It noted in the Report of the Subcommittee on Assessments that the stocks of haddock are now at a relatively low level because the heavy removal has exceeded the maximum sustainable yield. In addition there has been poor recruitment since 1963. The Report states:

> "The immediate course of action with regard to regulation depends on assumptions about stock recruitment relation. If recruitment is independent of stock density, restricting the catch would not in itself promote a recovery in recruitment in the next few years. If, on the other hand, good recruitment is dependent on maintenance of moderate stock size, removals should be severely restricted immediately to allow this rebuilding of the stock to take place."

Mr R.C.Hennemuth (USA) discussed Res.Doc.68/92, Status of the Georges Bank Stock and Effects of Recent High Levels of Fishing Effort.

In discussion concerning recruitment, it was noted that this is the first recorded failure of four successive years. There have been several occasions of three year failures.

It was noted that no recent assessments have been made of the effects of increasing mesh size in relation to the recent increased fishing rate.

Concerning minimum mesh size, Res.Doc.68/91, Codend Mesh Selection Studies of Yellowtail Flounder (Limanda ferruginea (Storer)), was also presented by Mr Hennemuth. These experiments indicated that the selection curves derived from the data are not sharp and that quantities of small fish are retained by mesh sizes up to 145 mm.

6. Future Research Required, including further plans for the Joint Environmental Survey of Georges Bank-Gulf of Maine Area. USA will continue research as carried out in the past toward assessment and management of the stocks of fish of the subarea. It was suggested that a report of joint research carried out by US-USSR be presented to the Panel.

USSR will continue research as in the past including joint research with USA.

Poland advised of intent to become a member of the Panel. Plans are to continue research, but only on herring.

(over)

Romania will carry out research on herring and mackerel.

The USA mentioned tagging studies being carried out on offshore lobster stocks. Countries were asked to be on the watch for these tags which may be taken in trawl nets.

The USA stressed the importance of getting better sampling of commercial catches in the subarea. This is essential if assessments are to be continued.

The USSR advised that they had data on the lengths and ages of the commercial haddock catch in 1967. This information was turned over to the USA for study.

7. Other Matters. Canada drew attention to Res.Doc.68/59, Recent Developments in the Georges Bank Scallop Fishery.

8. Date and Place of Next Meeting. It was agreed that the next meeting would be held prior to the Panel Meeting at the time of the next Annual Meeting.

It was suggested by Dr Graham (USA) that a meeting to discuss the plankton survey be held early in 1969 either in Canada or USA. Dr Graham was requested to contact Panel Advisers to arrange for such a meeting on an ad hoc basis.

9. Approval of Report. It was agreed that a report would be prepared by the Chairman and the Rapporteur and circulated for approval.

10. The meeting adjourned at 1515 hrs.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.2108
(B.e.68)

Proceedings No.5
Appendix II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

US Brief on

Management of the Georges Bank Haddock Fishery

International management of the Georges Bank haddock fishery has failed to achieve its objective. The Georges Bank haddock stock is at its lowest level in history due to overexploitation and reduced recruitment.

This stock of fish was the first in the Convention Area to be brought under ICNAF management when the 4 1/2 inch mesh regulation went into effect in 1953. This regulation reduced the discard of small fish and served to maintain a higher density of fish on the bank.

At the time the regulation went into effect, Georges Bank haddock were fished only by the US that took regularly each year somewhat less than 50,000 metric tons. This amount was a sustainable yield in the face of strongly fluctuating year-classes. One or two strong year-classes in four was sufficient to maintain stock density at a high level; high enough to provide a catch per day that was profitable to the fisherman and to support a stable annual yield.

Other countries began to fish this stock in 1962 and landings took a tremendous spurt in 1965 reaching a total of 150,000 metric tons. Today at least seven countries are taking haddock from Georges Bank. The effect on the US fishery has been profound. Catch per day has dropped to about half the previous level even though the more inefficient vessels are no longer fishing. Landings have dropped accordingly. There has not been a good year-class since that of 1963, a period of 4 years; the first time in history that four poor year-classes have occurred consecutively. Prospects for the next few years are very poor, decreasing stock size and landings are inevitable for at least four years (Res.Docs.68/92 and 68/17).

The failure of recruitment for four years is particularly disturbing. Although a firm relationship between stock size and recruitment has not been demonstrated for haddock (or for that matter in any marine fishery), certainly there must be some optimum stock size which produces the maximum of recruits to the fishery; of course environmental factors and co-existing species effect the process.

In terms of management, some form of control of the application of fishing effort (or equivalently the control of catch) is required if a stabilized fishery is to be maintained. Thus, even if it should prove most efficient in terms of a single year-class to harvest the surplus in a relatively short time, some heed should be paid to the necessity of spreading the yield over a period of years to sustain a species-dependent existing fishery. An increase in yield-per-recruit, even up to 20%, is not good economics if it is accompanied by severe disruptions and displacements of relatively immobile fleets fishing for a species for which there is no suitable substitute in the region.

For the Georges Bank haddock fishery, fluctuations in year-class abundance is the normal situation. By fishing at an effort level near the maximum sustainable yield point, the more abundant year-classes have provided the US fishery with reasonable catch rates up to age five, and have formed a hedge against the years of poor recruitment.

Today we are faced with a stock that has no backlog to carry the fishery over a period of poor recruitment. In view of the current status of this stock it is obvious that the annual catch should be limited immediately and to prevent further loss to the US industry should be favoured in the catch. We recognize that under the existing terms of reference of the Commission no recommendation can be made for reservation to the United States of whatever catch may be appropriate.

(over)

However, since formal action by the Commission in respect of a reservation of the quota is precluded at the present time we can only look to the possiblity of an informal understanding - outside the Convention - among the Governments whose fishermen operate in the Subarea. Under such an arrangement, if a catch quota were adopted by ICNAF for Subarea 5 haddock the Governments could regulate the activities of their fishermen so as to reserve in effect a substantial part of the catch for US fishermen.

Because of our deep concern with this problem, we would hope that this matter could be discussed at this meeting.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 2110
(B.e.68)

Proceedings No. 6

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Panel 1

Wednesday, 5 June, 1000 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Mr O. Lund (Norway). Representatives of all Member Countries of the Panel were present, and representatives from Canada, USA and ICES attended as observers.

2. Rapporteur. Dr B. Rasmussen (Norway) was appointed Rapporteur.

3. Agenda. The agenda , as circulated, was adopted.

4. Panel Membership. No change in Panel 1 membership was proposed.

5. Report of Scientific Advisers. A summary of the status of fisheries and researches carried out in Subarea 1 (Res. Doc. 68/101) was presented by Dr J. Messtorf (Federal Republic of Germany) who acted on behalf of the Chairman, Dr A. Meyer, who was unable to attend the meeting. Dr Messtorf also presented the report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 1 (Appendix I). The Panel expressed its satisfaction with the work carried out, and strongly supported the view expressed in the report of Scientific Advisers that the collection of data needed for assessment purposes should be intensified.

6. Review of Conservation Measures and Requirements. The Panel noted with satisfaction that the 130 mm mesh size recommended by the Commission would come into force on 21 September 1968. Some countries were already using this mesh size in Subarea 1. The Danish Delegate informed the Panel that the mesh regulation would be applied also in the West Greenland inshore fishery. The Chairman appealed to the Member Countries which had not yet accepted the 1967 recommendation concerning mesh measurement to accept the recommendation as soon as possible.

7. Future Research. The Panel noted the items of future research in the Subarea referred to in the report of Scientific Advisers. The Panel noted with satisfaction that a new Danish research vessel is now permanently placed in West Greenland, and that a new Icelandic research vessel would be commissioned in the near future which would enable Iceland to expand its research in Subarea 1.

8. Date and Place of Next Meeting. It was agreed that the Panel should meet during the 19th 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. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 1030 hours.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 2110
(B.f.68)

Proceedings No. 6
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 1

Saturday, 1 June 1968, 0930 hours

1. The Chairman, Dr A. Meyer (Federal Republic of Germany) was unable to attend the meeting due to illness. The Scientific Advisers agreed that he should be replaced for this year's meeting by Dr J. Messtorff (Federal Republic of Germany).

2. The Chairman opened the meeting, and Dr H. Bohl (Federal Republic of Germany) was appointed Rapporteur. Advisers from all Member Countries of the Panel, except France and Norway, were present. An observer from Canada and the General Secretary of ICES also attended the meeting.

3. It was agreed that the meeting should follow the agenda of Panel 1 as far as appropriate.

4. The Chairman presented the Summary of Research and Status of Fisheries in Subarea 1, 1967 (Res. Doc. 68/101) compiled from national research reports of all Panel 1 Member Countries plus Canada and USA. After small amendments were noted, the Summary was adopted.

5. In the discussions following the Chairman's presentation of the Summary, Dr Cole (UK) mentioned that the codified mesh regulation for Subarea 1 will become effective on 21 September 1968. Mr Parrish (UK) and Mr Horsted (Denmark) drew attention to the sections of the 1968 Assessment Subcommittee's report relevant to Subarea 1. With reference to the cod stocks, which yield about 90% of the total nominal catch, it is specially noted in this report

a) that the present fishing mortality is close to or above that giving the maximum sustainable yield, and that in no case the stocks of cod are underexploited,

b) that, if the effective mesh size would be 130 mm and assuming fluctuations of year-class strength remain at the level of recent years, the mean maximum sustainable yield would be expected to be between 400,000 and 450,000 metric tons,

c) that, at the present level of fishing intensity, an increase in sustainable yield would be obtained by a substantial increase in mesh size above that currently in force or pending, and

d) that, in case the effective mesh size of 130 mm remains unchanged, the present yield could be obtained with an effort reduction by about 25%.

The decline of total catch and catch-per-unit effort of redfish, observed for several years, continued in 1967. Although not much is known about parameters, fluctuations in recruitment and migrations, this development in the fishery clearly indicates an overexploitation of this slow-growing species in Subarea 1. From the history of the fishery, redfish may not be able to give a higher annual yield than about 25,000 metric tons. Concerning the independence of the redfish fishery, it was stated that in Div. 1A-1D redfish is only taken in small quantities as a by-catch of the cod fishery. Only a specialized German redfish fishery in Div. 1E-1F is independent of those for other species. Important stocks of sandeel (offshore) and capelin (inshore) exist and may be exploited with small-meshed gear independently of any other species.

Salmon is also caught independently. Stocks of Greenland halibut exist and may be exploited independently of other species which are important at present.

(over)

6. In view of the present state of the fisheries in Subarea 1 and possible further regulatory measures, it was strongly emphasized that the collection of data urgently needed for assessment purposes should be intensified. This applies especially to an improvement of sampling for length and age composition of cod catches from commercial vessels including information on discards as well as to studies on absolute year-class strength and year-class fluctuations of the pre-recruit cod stocks by means of experimental trawling with small-meshed codend liners in the whole Subarea. In this connection Dr Messtorff suggested that cooperation among research vessels might be useful.

Moreover, the trends of environmental conditions, e.g. water temperatures, which influence the survival rate of eggs and larvae and hence the year-class strength, should be regularly reviewed.

7. The Chairman of the ICES/ICNAF Joint Working Group on North Atlantic Salmon, Mr Parrish, drew attention to the second report prepared by this Group at the present Annual Meeting, and especially to those sections which refer to salmon research required in Subarea 1. Due to the lack of information on the growing salmon offshore fishery the necessity to collect statistical and biological data from this fishery and also to develop suitable catching methods for tagging purposes was pointed out. As a first step, investigations of the offshore fishery will be carried out by observers on the commercial vessels taking part in this fishery.

8. Future Research. The national programs of research in Subarea 1 for 1968, as submitted to the ICNAF Secretariat, were reviewed and confirmed. Mr Horsted mentioned that the new Danish research vessel *Adolf Jensen* is now permanently available in Greenland waters, thus making possible intensified investigations in offshore areas. Mr Jon Jonsson (Iceland) informed the Panel Advisers that a new Icelandic research vessel will be commissioned in the near future. This will enable the Icelandic research programs to be expanded into Greenland waters. Mr Jon Jonsson pointed out that cod tagging should be increased in order to get more information about the exchange between the cod populations of Greenland and Iceland.

9. Mr Horsted asked the German Delegates to convey the Scientific Advisers' best wishes to Dr A. Meyer and expressed their hope that he will be able to take the chair at the next Annual Meeting. On behalf of the Scientific Advisers, Dr Cole thanked Dr J. Messtorff for his service as Interim Chairman.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 1050 hours.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 2111
(B.e.68)

Proceedings No. 7

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Panel 2

Wednesday, 4 June, 0920 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman of the Commission, Mr V. M. Kamentsev. Of the 8 members of the Panel, Canada, Germany, Portugal, USSR and UK were represented. In the absence of Mr W. C. Tame (UK), Mr G. Möcklinghoff (Federal Republic of Germany) was elected Chairman of the Panel.

2. Rapporteur. Dr H. Bohl (Federal Republic of Germany) was appointed Rapporteur.

3. Agenda. The agenda, as circulated, was adopted.

4. Panel Membership. There were no proposals for additional membership. The Panel took note of the Norwegian statement in the first Plenary Session that Norway was considering possible application for membership in the future.

5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr Bogdanov presented his summary report on the status of fisheries and research in Subarea 2 during 1967 (Res. Doc. 68/102) and the Report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers to the Panel (Appendix I).

6. Conservation Measures and Future Research. No specific proposals regarding conservation measures were made. The Panel was satisfied with the plans of Member Countries for participation in future research. The Panel did not discuss the problems of the Atlantic salmon fisheries, which might affect also Panel 2, because a Joint Meeting of Panels will deal with this subject.

7. Date and Place of Next Meeting. It was agreed that the next Panel meeting would be held during the 1969 Annual Meeting of the Commission.

8. Approval of Panel Report. It was agreed that the Panel Report should be prepared by the Chairman and Rapporteur, in consultation with Panel members as necessary.

9. Adjournment. There was no other business. The meeting adjourned at 0945 hours.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 2111
(B.f.68)

Proceedings No. 7
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 2

Saturday 1 June

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, USSR, UK.

2. Mr E. J. Sandeman (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.

3. The agenda of Panel 2 was adopted as being appropriate for the meeting.

4. The Chairman presented his summary report on the status of the fishery and research carried out in Subarea 2 during 1967 (Res. Doc. 68/102(Revised)). After discussion and minor amendments, the summary was approved for presentation to the Panel.

5. The Scientific Advisers took note of the report of the R & S Subcommittee on Assessments which, in considering the whole area, did not note any specific cases of definite over-exploitation of any species in Subarea 2. It was noted, however, for the cod stock of Subarea 2 (which extends into Div. 3K and 3L), that recent work has shown that large increases in fishing and changes in the distribution of fishing both in area and season have occurred in recent years. This has complicated the assessment of the cod stock. However, different approaches to the problem have confirmed that fishing is now at a level producing at least 80%, and may even be beyond, the level of possible maximum sustainable yield.

It was also noted that the introduction of 130 mm mesh regulation in Subarea 1 will likely result in actual increases in the mesh size used in Subarea 2.

6. The Advisers reviewed the research plans of the various countries with respect to Subarea 2. Most countries intend to continue research in the area at or about the same level as during 1967, although with a new research vessel operating in the ICNAF area, the USSR hopes to expand its work in the Subarea. The importance of surveys of the pre-recruit phases of the population was noted.

7. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Scientific Advisers should be held on the Saturday preceding the 1969 meeting.

8. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No. 2112
(B. b. 68)

Proceedings No.8

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of the First Plenary Session

Tuesday, 4 June, 1130 hrs

Item 1. Opening. The Chairman of the Commission, Mr V. Kamentsev (USSR), called the First Plenary Session to order and welcomed the Delegates from the Member Countries of the Commission. He welcomed observers from FAO, ICES, NEAFC, IOC, Japan and particularly the representative from the Government of Cuba which, for the first time, had been invited to send an observer to the Commission's Annual Meeting. The Chairman presented his opening remarks (Appendix I) which reviewed the work before the Commission and expressed the hope that the continuing spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding would again be demonstrated in the efforts of the Delegates to find solutions to the Commission's problems.

Item 2. Agenda. The agenda was adopted without change.

Item 3. Publicity. At the Chairman's suggestion, a Committee on Publicity consisting of the Chairman of the Commission and the Chairmen of the Standing Committees on Research and Statistics, on Finance and Administration, and on Regulatory Measures, with the Executive Secretary, was approved by the Plenary.

Item 4. Panel memberships. 5. Administrative Report, 6. Auditor's Report, 7. Financial Statements 1967/68, 8. Budget Estimate 1968/69, 9. Budget Forecast 1969/70, and 29. Date and place of 1970 Annual Meeting. These Items were referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration.

Item 12. Annual Returns of Infringements, 13. Simplification of International Trawl Regulations, 14. Topside Chafer, 15. Mesh Measuring. These Items were referred to the *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations with Mr A. J. Aglen (UK) as Chairman.

Item 19. Limiting Fishing as a Conservation Measure. This Item was referred to the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures.

Item 20. Conservation Measures for Atlantic Salmon. At the suggestion of the United Kingdom, the Plenary agreed that this Item be referred to a joint meeting of panels.

Item 25. Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics. The Chairman of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, Mr Sv. Aa. Horsted (Denmark), was invited to present the Provisional Report of the Standing Committee which had been completed during the previous two weeks. Mr Horsted explained that the full report of the Standing Committee with summary section and appendices covering the work of the subcommittees and the Standing Committee's consideration of the Second Report of the Joint ICES/ICNAF Working Party on North Atlantic Salmon would be presented to the Plenary for approval after the last meeting of the Committee. Mr Horsted then reviewed the Provisional Summary Report, emphasizing particularly that part of the Report which contained the deliberations of the Committee on the questions posed to it by the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures. The Chairman of the Commission thanked Mr Horsted for his complete and clear presentation.

(over)

Item 10. Status of Proposals. The Chairman referred to the report of the Depositary Government on the status of proposals adopted by the Commission for changes in the Convention and for international regulation of fisheries (Comm. Doc. 68/10 and addendum). The Executive Secretary reviewed the status of the proposals for changes in the Convention noting that the 1963 protocol relating to measures of control and the 1964 protocol to facilitate entry into force of proposals adopted by the Commission still required ratification, approval or adherence. The Delegate of Portugal informed the Plenary that his Government wished to ratify the protocols on the date of ratification by the last Member Country. The Danish Delegate advised that he expected ratification to be deposited within the next few weeks. The Delegate from the Federal Republic of Germany expected the protocols to be ratified this summer. The Polish Delegate informed the Plenary that only procedural matters had slowed ratification by Poland but these matters should be cleared in the near future and ratification deposited.

The Executive Secretary reviewed the status of proposals for trawl regulations and pointed out that with the deposition of the Polish acceptance of the 10 proposals from the 1965 Annual Meeting, these proposals would enter into force for Subareas 1, 2 and 3, together with the amendment proposed by the 1966 Annual Meeting (130 mm) in Subarea 1, on 21 September 1968. The effect of this is that all regulations will be in force on 21 September 1968, except

(1) the 1963 proposal relating to chafing gear in Subarea 5,

(2) the 1967 proposals relating to mesh measurement in Subareas 1-5.

The Portuguese Delegate informed the Plenary that all proposed ICNAF trawl regulations are at present in force for Portuguese vessels fishing in the Convention Area.

The Chairman asked that Delegates continue to press for early ratification where required.

Item 11. Amendments to Convention. The Chairman drew attention to the memorandum by the United States proposing an amendment to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (Comm. Doc. 68/18) to provide greater flexibility in the types of fisheries regulatory measures which may be proposed by the Commission under the terms of Article VIII, para. 1 of the Convention. At the suggestion of the US Delegation, the Plenary agreed to defer consideration of this Item to a later meeting in order to give the Delegates from Member Countries time for further study of the subject.

Item 16. Exchange of Inspection Officers. The Chairman drew attention to reports of exchanges between Canadian and US fisheries enforcement officers in 1967 (Comm. Doc. 68/5 and 68/22) and between US and Spanish fisheries officers in 1968 (Comm. Doc. 68/21). The Canadian Delegate reported that a Canada-France exchange would take place in June of 1968. The Polish Delegate, in referring to Comm. Doc. 68/5, expressed regret that the first attempt at a Canada-Poland exchange had not been successful. He pointed out that exchanges were welcomed and that a further attempt will be made to complete a Canada-Poland exchange in 1968. The US Delegate expressed the belief that these exchanges were extremely beneficial and were not impracticable. He encouraged all nations to enter into the national exchange practices. The Portuguese Delegate invited exchange in Subareas 2, 3 and 4 where the Portuguese vessel *Gil Eannes* would be available for such participation in 1968. The USSR Delegate expressed the hope that USA-USSR exchange could be arranged for 1968. The French Delegate confirmed that plans are being made for the Canada-France exchange.

(over)

Item 17. International Inspection Scheme. The Chairman referred to the report from the Special Meeting of the *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations, held on 30-31 May 1968 in London, to consider the suitability of the NEAFC scheme as a basis for an ICNAF inspection scheme (Comm. Doc. 68/23). The Plenary agreed to defer this Item to a later meeting of Plenary.

Item 18. First Meeting of Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures. The Chairman referred to the report from the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures held on 30 January-1 February 1968 in London (Comm. Doc. 68/6). The Plenary agreed that the following terms of reference proposed by the Standing Committee be adopted:

(a) to consider possible measures for the regulation of fishing in relation to the stocks of fish, or of any particular species of fish in the ICNAF Area, or any part therof;

(b) to consider the economic and administrative problems involved in the application of such measures and, in consultation with the Research and Statistics Committee, the scientific and statistical information required for their solution, and

(c) to make appropriate recommendations to the Commission.

The Plenary also adopted the following amendment to Commission Rule of Procedure No. 16 to take account of the new Standing Committee (Comm. Doc. 68/16):

> "Rule 16(d). There shall be a Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures consisting of one nominee from each Contracting Government who may be assisted by experts or advisers and by observers from non-Contracting Governments, and from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission and the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. The Committee shall (a) consider possible measures for the regulation of fishing in relation to the stocks of fish, or of any particular species of fish in the Convention Area, or any part thereof, and (b) consider the economic and administrative problems involved in the application of such measures and, in consultation with the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, the scientific and statistical information required for their solution, and (c) make appropriate recommendations to the Commission. The Committee shall choose its own chairman. The Executive Secretary shall be an *ex officio* member of this Committee without vote."

The Plenary adjourned at 1320 hours.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No. 2112
(B. b. 68)

Proceedings No.8
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Opening Statement at the First Plenary Session of ICNAF

by the Chairman, Mr V. M. Kamentsev

"Gentlemen:

May I call the First Plenary Session to order.

At the present Meeting we have to consider a number of serious problems which are of vital importance for fisheries of our countries.

View points of the members of the Commission coincide to a large extent and this allows us to make an optimistic evaluation of its possibilities.

The Northwest Atlantic is one of the oldest oceanic areas of fishing where fishermen of many countries conduct their fishery since old times, and we all are interested in a national fishing and in the maintenance of fishery resources in the area of the Convention of 1949 at the level of maximum sustainable yield.

The experience of the last years points to the need of adopting some international measures which would prevent further increase of intensity of fishing which is carried out in some cases without due regard to the state of fishery resources, which may cause damage to their normal reproduction.

In these circumstances it is necessary to combine and co-ordinate efforts of scientists of our countries directed to the rapid elaboration of a scientific basis for international regulation of fishing, the assessment of fish stocks and the estimation of annual sustainable yield.

On the basis of many-year observations and surveys carried out by scientists and also judging from the conclusions which are drawn by fishermen, the need in regulation of the size of catch becomes ever more obvious.

We rest great hopes on our scientists working in the Commission who, without any exaggeration, are the most qualified representatives of fishery science devoted to the study of problems of fisheries in the Northwest Atlantic.

We have a right to expect from them in the nearest future scientifically grounded recommendations which we will have to put into practice in the common interests of our countries.

However, even at the present Meeting of the Commission has an opportunity to do much for solving the task of rational exploitation of fishery resources in the Convention Area without waiting for final results of scientific surveys.

One should recognize the fact that the Commission has not yet fully utilized all means, rights and possibilities which it now has at its disposal within the frames of the present Convention.

Nevertheless it is probably necessary to examine the question relating to the need of further improvement of the Convention signed 20 years back, and modification of it to meet requirements of the present situation, so that the Commission might take rapidly and efficiently measures required for the ensuring of the fulfilment of tasks set before the Commission.

It is necessary to combine our efforts in order to ensure effective control for the implementation of the trawl regulations adopted by the Commission.

(over)

The Governments of our countries agreed to take such measures which are required for the realization of the provisions of the Convention.

Herefrom it follows that there is the need in carrying out national inspection to ensure the observance of the Convention's provisions and ICNAF recommendations by fishermen as well as the need in the elaboration of some effective scheme of international inspection. Such a scheme could be a useful supplement to the national inspection, and it would promote the development of mutual confidence between fishermen of various countries and the formation of their belief that the regulations adopted by the Commission are equally binding for the captains of all fishing vessels without any exception.

Exchanges of national enforcement officers also serve this purpose to a certain extent.

It goes without saying that it is impossible now to enumerate fully all serious problems facing the Commission.

The experience of the Commission's work shows that the most difficult problems can be successfully solved in common interests providing there is a sincere desire of all the ICNAF members to co-operate on the equal and just basis.

May I express my hope that this spirit of co-operation and mutual understanding will be demonstrated again at the present Meeting.

Thank you for your attention.

May I now come to the consideration of the Agenda."

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No. 2113
(B.c.68)

Proceedings No. 9

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of the First Meeting of the

Standing Committee on Finance and Administration

Tuesday, 4 June, 1500 hrs

F&A Item 1. Opening. The Chairman, Mr R. Green (USA), opened the meeting and welcomed the representatives who were present from all Member Countries except France and Italy.

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

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

F&A Item 4. Panel Membership. The Executive Secretary reviewed Comm. Doc. 68/1 and the Panel membership in relation to current exploitation in the subareas. The Norwegian Delegate reported that final catch figures for Subareas 2 and 3 will be forwarded at an early date to the Secretariat and that his Government wished now to apply for membership in Panel 3 and may apply at a later date for membership in Panel 2. The Danish Delegate reported that his Government was giving further consideration to possible application for membership in Panel 3. The Delegate from Iceland reported that in view of the decrease in Icelandic fishery in Subarea 3, there would be no application for membership in Panel 3. The Delegate for Poland asked for consideration of application for membership in Panels 4 and 5. The UK Delegate informed the Plenary that there were no plans for application for additional panel membership. The Committee therefore unanimously

recommends

that Norway and the Federal Republic of Germany be admitted to membership in Panel 3 and that Poland be admitted to membership in Panels 4 and 5.

F&A Item 5. Auditor's Report. The Auditor's Report for the fiscal year ending 30 June 1967 as published in Annual Proceedings Vol. 17, p. 10-12, was presented by the Executive Secretary for consideration by the Committee. The Delegation of the USA raised three points regarding the Report:

1) that the supplementary appropriation of $550 to the 1966/67 budget should, in their view, have been made from the surplus but unappropriated funds available in miscellaneous income and not from the Working Capital Fund as it appeared from Exhibit II of the Auditor's Report,

2) that the Romanian contribution of $714.28 to the Working Capital Fund on joining the Commission should, in their view, not have been a deduction against other Member Countries assessments on the 1967/68 billing as it appeared from Exhibit III of the Auditor's Report,

3) that the Exhibits as presented in the Auditor's Report were difficult to follow and would, in their view, be clearer if presented on a cash flow basis.

(over)

After considerable discussions in which it became obvious that the problems posed required more detailed review and study by a small group, the Committee agreed to defer further consideration of the item to a later meeting.

F&A Item 6. Administrative Reports and Financial Statements for 1967/68. The Executive Secretary reviewed the Administrative and Financial Statements (Comm. Doc. 68/8) pointing out that the estimated total obligations incurred during the year were about $800 less than the amount appropriated from the Member Governments and from the Working Capital Fund as approved by the Commission at its 1967 Annual Meeting. The US Delegation drew attention to the need for Commission approval of the ICNAF staff assessment scheme based on amounts of income tax, the amounts to be determined by the Executive Secretary in consultation with the appropriate Canadian Government authorities. It was agreed that a suggested statement of income and expenditure for the fiscal year ending 30 June 1968, estimated from 15 May 1968 on a cash flow basis, should be circulated by the US Delegation for examination.

The Committee agreed to continue discussing this item at the next meeting and adjourned at 1610 hours.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No. 2115
(B. b. 68)

Proceedings No.10

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Ceremonial Opening Meeting

Tuesday, 4 June, 1000 Hrs.

Opening Session of the 18th Annual Meeting of the Commission was convened at Church House, Great Smith Street, London on 4th June 1968. The Chairman, Mr. V. Kamentsev (USSR) welcomed the Commissioners, Advisers, Observers and Guests and thanked Her Majesty's Government for the excellent meeting accomodation and hospitality.

The Chairman then introduced Mr. Norman Buchan, M. P., Joint Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Scotland, who welcomed the Commission on behalf of Her Majesty's Government as follows:

"It is a very great pleasure for me to welcome you to London on behalf of Her Majesty's Government for this, the 18th Annual Meeting of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. Although some of the Commission's Committees and Working Parties have met here from time to time this is the first occasion that the Commission has held its Annual Meeting in this country. As a founder member of the Commission we are very pleased to be your hosts and we very much hope that you will enjoy your short stay here.

"I have not had the opportunity of attending earlier meetings of the Commission but I recognise here today some familiar faces; friends from many countries whom I have met in connection with other international meetings, and I am very glad of the opportunity of meeting you here once more.

"In welcoming you here, Mr. Chairman, it might be useful if I were to say a word or two about the work of the Commission.

"As I see it, your work over the 18 years of the Commission's existence can be divided into three broad phases. In the early years - the first phase - the Commission was mainly concerned with the research which was necessary to provide a proper and sound basis for regulatory measures. I know that a great deal of collaborative study was given by the scientists to the fisheries in the Convention Area and the stocks on which they depend, and only when that work was done was the Commission able to enter the second phase and to approach its real task of considering the regulations needed to achieve the objectives for which the Convention, and the Commission, was established.

"In that second phase the scientific work has, of course, continued, but as it has developed the emphasis has greatly changed and more time and energy has been devoted by the Commission to conservation measures to protect the stocks. The regulations which it has recommended to Governments - I might almost say the mass of recommendations it has made - bears eloquent testimony to the labours of the Commission. Many of these recommendations are however not yet in force. I know that the time lag between the making of recommendations and their taking effect has caused a good deal of concern, and that the Commission has devoted much thought to ways of reducing it. I was very happy to learn therefore that the log jam had recently been broken and that there is now a prospect of many of the outstanding recommendations becoming effective fairly soon. This is welcome news and will bring to fruition much of the Commission's work in this second phase.

"And now I come to the third phase of its work, of which I believe the Commission is only at the beginning.

"The development of fishing power and intensity have already shown that the measures which the Commission may recommend under the Convention are not by themselves sufficient to secure the objectives of the Convention. Some widening

(over)

of the Commission's powers therefore seem essential: but I think it goes deeper than that and affects the philosophy embodied in the Convention itself. In 1949 it seemed possible that the general aim of rational utilisation of marine resources could be defined in terms of the maximum sustainable catch, which is the phase embodied in your Convention. I am sure that this concept has not outlived its usefulness; but it is, I suggest, becoming increasingly clear that it is perhaps not a complete definition of what the objectives should be if one takes economic considerations into account. In many fisheries a situation which has yielded the maximum sustainable catch may be thoroughly unsatisfactory from the economic point of view because an excessive amount of effort is being deployed to obtain that catch. The scientists tell us that in some cases very large reductions could be made in the effort deployed without any appreciable loss of catch; clearly, if ways could be found of securing this all round reduction of effort while maintaining the catch, the profitability, the cost efficiency, of fisheries would be greatly increased. I have no doubt there will be complex and difficult questions to solve; but the problems should be stimulating. The situation is perhaps more acute in the North East Atlantic; but I am encouraged to see that you are already giving thought to the issues involved.

"This I think illustrates how, as the fisheries develop and your activities expand, you find yourselves increasingly dealing with problems which are common to both side of the Atlantic, and increasingly you are working closely with your sister Commission for the North East. I am sure this is desirable and it is a process which is of course facilitated by the fact that so many countries are members of both Commissions. The same process is seen to work in the field of international inspection and enforcement of your regulations, to which you will be giving consideration; I believe this co-operation is valuable and it is perhaps a good augury for the future that, in a related field, the member States of the two Commissions have been able to agree on the new Convention dealing with the policing of the fisheries in the whole of the North Atlantic.

"When I look at these developments and the possibilities they open up, I feel sure that you have much useful work to do. The way in which the Commission is beginning to grapple with the problems gives ample grounds for confidence that it will continue to show the resource and adaptability needed to tackle whatever problems the future may have in store.

"In wishing you well in your deliberations I should like to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that Her Majesty's Government will continue to do everything in its power to support and advance the aims of the Commission. May I add the personal hope that you will not be so exclusively preoccupied with your business as to have no time left over to see something of London and enjoy your visit to this country. We are very glad to have you here. I wish you success in your work and a happy stay in London."

The Chairman of the Commission thanked the Under Secretary for his excellent review of past developments in the work of the Commission and his encouragement and assurance of good prospects for its work in the future. He then declared the 18th Annual Meeting of the Commission open.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 2116
(B.g.11.68)

Proceedings No. 11

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

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

Tuesday, 4 June, and Friday, 7 June

1. Mr A. J. Aglen (UK) kindly agreed to be Chairman. He referred to Plenary Agenda Item 12, Annual Return of Infringements, and reviewed Comm. Doc. 68/11. The Delegate from Iceland reported verbally that no infringements had been recorded. The Norwegian Delegate noted that the number of inspections were not recorded in the document. He reported that the Norwegian fleet did not use topside chafers and that 130 mm mesh size was used in Subarea 1 where no regulations were in force. Delegates from the Federal Republic of Germany and Denmark reported that returns were not available but that they would be next year. The Committee expressed the hope that Member Countries would take note that returns were particularly desirable next year since regulations would then be in effect in all Subareas.

2. Under Plenary Agenda Item 13, Simplification of International Trawl Regulations, the Committee, after some discussion,

recommended

i) that the Simplified Guide to Trawl Regulations prepared at the 1967 Annual Meeting and circulated from the Secretariat be updated by the Executive Secretary and Mr Wm. Sullivan, Jr. (USA), and

ii) that, in future, the Executive Secretary update the Guide and circulate it as an ICNAF Notification Series Document.

3. Under Plenary Agenda Item 14, Topside Chafer, the Chairman of the R & S Subcommittee on Gear and Selectivity reported on the results of the Subcommittee's deliberations on topside chafers. The Committee, having heard the report, noted that experiments were continuing to improve the topside chafer. The Delegate for Norway repeated pleas made at previous meetings for the abolition of topside chafer gear. He pointed out that Norwegian vessels do not use topside chafers in Subarea 1. It was his view that only the Polish type chafer should be used, if any. The Committee agreed that there was nothing to recommend to the Commission at this time. It was pointed out that Romanian approval of the 1963 proposal relating to the use of chafing gear in Subarea 5 was needed before the proposal could enter into force.

4. Under Plenary Agenda Item 15, Mesh Measuring, the Committee, after hearing the Chairman of the R & S Subcommittee on Gear and Selectivity, noted that there was no scientific basis for choosing any one mesh measuring gauge. It did note, however, that the thickness of the NEAFC gauge was 2.0 mm while the ICNAF gauge was 2.3 mm thick. After discussion regarding the possible need for uniformity of thickness, the Committee agreed to the proposal of the Canadian Delegation that mesh measuring gauges of 2.0 mm thickness of NEAFC or of 2.3 mm of ICNAF were acceptable for use in the ICNAF area.

5. The meeting was adjourned at 1700 hours and was reconvened on Friday, 7 June at 1505 hours, by the Chairman who asked Dr A. Bogdanov (USSR) to present Res. Doc. 68/58, Comparative Selectivity of Trawl Nets Made of Kapron and Manila. Dr Bogdanov reported, for information of the Committee, that the selection factor for Kapron is higher than other polyamide materials and, as shown in Res. Doc. 68/58, the mesh size for Kapron with the same selectivity as prescribed by trawl regulations should be 111 mm in Subarea 1 and 97 mm in Subareas 2-5.

The Chairman of R & S drew attention to a recommendation which would be

(over)

presented to the Plenary proposing a joint ICES/ICNAF Working Group on Selectivity Analysis which would take this matter into account.

6. The work of the *ad hoc* Committee being completed, the meeting adjourned at 1530 hours.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No. 2117
(B.c.68)

Proceedings No. 12

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Second Meeting of

Standing Committee on Finance and Administration

Wednesday, 5 June, 1630 hrs

1. Under F&A Item 5, Auditor's Report and F&A Item 6, Administrative Report and Financial Statements for 1967/68, at the Chairman's suggestion, a small group was appointed to study the problems raised under F&A Items 5 and 6 at the First Meeting of F&A and to report back to the Committee at its next meeting. The group, as appointed, consisted of Mr E. B. Young (Canada), Mr Wm. Sullivan, Jr. (USA) and the Executive Secretary, with Mr A. J. Aglen (UK) and Mr R. Lagarde (France).

2. Under F&A Item 11, Relief for the Commission in the Canadian Income Tax Field, the Chairman asked Mr E. B. Young (Canada) to report on the progress toward possible relief for the Commission in the Canadian Income Tax field. Mr Young reported that Canadian Government Order-in-Council P. C. 1967-2313 dated 14 December 1967 specified ICNAF as an international organization under the Privileges and Immunities (International Organizations) Act. ICNAF, therefore, qualifies under Section 3 of this Act for a tax credit system in accordance with Section 41 (4) of the Canadian Income Tax Act, which allows that a federal tax credit can be provided for a Canadian resident if he (or she) is an employee of ICNAF and is required to pay a levy imposed by ICNAF to defray its expenses.

An ICNAF staff assessment scheme was set up with Canadian Government approval, effective 1 January 1968, based on the federal tax portion only of the basis tax for Canadian employees of ICNAF. The Nova Scotia taxation authorities have been approached regarding a possible amendment to the Nova Scotia Income Tax Act to provide for a tax credit similar to that allowed by the Canadian Income Tax Act. In the case of the Assistant Executive Secretary, the ICNAF levy or staff assessment is the equivalent of Canadian Income Tax on his ICNAF salary.

The Executive Secretary reported on the application for refund of Canadian Excise Tax paid by the Commission on certain of its publications distributed outside Canada and for refund of Nova Scotia Hospital Tax paid by the Commission on certain of its publications distributed outside of the Province of Nova Scotia. The total amount of the refunds would amount to about $1,500.

In reply to the UK Delegate, the Executive Secretary reported:

1) that the ICNAF staff assessment, when in complete effect, would amount to about $10,000 annually, and

2) that the amount of the present staff assessment was not reflected in the budget estimate for 1968/69 or the budget forecast for 1969/70.

Following a motion of the Polish Delegate, seconded by the US Delegate,

F&A

recommends

i) that a commendation be sent to the Canadian Government for its efforts in providing financial relief for the Commission in the Income Tax field (ICNAF staff assessment scheme),

ii) that the ICNAF staff assessment scheme as set up by the Executive Secretary and the Canadian Government authorities be approved.

(over)

3. Under F&A Item 10, Report of Subcommittee on Financial Regulations, the Chairman asked Mr E. B. Young (Canada) to present the Report from the Subcommittee on Financial Regulations which was set up by the Commission at the 1967 Annual Meeting to review the ICNAF Financial Regulations and a Norwegian proposal that the size of the Standing Committee be reduced (Appendix I). Following a highlighted review of the Report, the UK Delegate thanked the Subcommittee for its work and the Report and spoke on the advantages of the new Rule 16 (b) which reduced the size of the Standing Committee and, in his view, increased its effectiveness.

The Delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany drew attention to Rule 4.10 regarding the loss of voting power by a Contracting Government which is more than two years in arrears in annual payments and contributions. A brief discussion followed on whether voting privileges could be altered through changes in the Rules of Procedure.

The US Delegate read a proposed addendum to Rule 6 of the redrafted Financial Regulations to take in the ICNAF staff assessment scheme. The Committee agreed that the proposed addendum to be identified as Rule 6.4, should be prepared for examination at the next Committee meeting.

The Committee agreed to defer consideration of the adoption of the Subcommittee's report to the next meeting.

4. The meeting adjourned at 1710 hrs.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 1982
(B.R.&.A.)

Proceedings No. 12
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of the Subcommittee on Financial Regulations[1]

The Subcommittee met in Montreal, 5-6 February 1968, to review the ICNAF Financial Regulations, including consideration of the bank interest question raised at the 1967 Annual Meeting, the crediting of Canadian Income Tax if the Canadian Government action is favourable, and a Norwegian proposal that the size of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration be reduced. (*Vide* 1967 Meeting, Proceedings No. 11 (F&A Items 10 and 13) and No. 23 (Section 9)). Mr Blyth Young (Canada), Mr William L. Sullivan, Jr. (USA), and the Executive Secretary were present. Written comments from the UK were presented.

The Subcommittee reviewed the Financial Regulations and the portions of the Rules of Procedure and the Rules of Procedure for the Panels which deal with financial matters. The Subcommittee concluded that the Financial Regulations contained so many omissions and ambiguities and so much unnecessary detail that it would be preferable to rewrite them than to attempt to revise them, and

recommends

that the revised Financial Regulations set forth below be adopted by the Commission.

The Subcommittee also concluded that several amendments to the Rules of Procedure are called for and

recommends

that the amendments set forth below be adopted by the Commission.

No changes were found necessary in the Rules for the Panels, but the Subcommittee noted that Panel A has not yet adopted the Rules for the Panels and

recommends

that it do so.

The Subcommittee took note of the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures that the Rules of Procedure (No. 16) be amended to include that Standing Committee. The Subcommittee also

recommends

a change in Rule No. 16 to reduce the size of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, and accepted the UK proposal that the number of the Committee be set at five.

The proposed change is included in the amendments to the Rules of Procedure below.

The most notable feature of the proposed new Financial Regulations is the bringing together and clarifying in Rule 4 of various provisions found in several parts of the present Regulations dealing with funds of the Commission. Included is the establishment of a Miscellaneous Fund, which it was felt would clarify the handling and disposition of certain funds available to ICNAF.

The present Financial Regulations take note that unforeseen and extraordinary expenses may be encountered, such as, for example, in dealing with a fire which destroyed Commission equipment and stores, but do not provide how they are to be met. Proposed Rule 4.6 deals with this omission.

[1]Circulated earlier as Comm. Doc. 68/7.

(over)

Rule 4 also deals with the crediting of bank interest and the crediting of Canadian Income Tax. The latter had not been resolved favourably at the time of the Subcommittee meeting, but the Subcommittee felt it should consider the matter since it was still possible that favourable action might be taken. If such taxes were to be refunded, they would fall under proposed Rule 4.4 (e). If the favourable action, however, were to provide for a staff assessment, in lieu of Canadian Income Tax for members of the Secretariat, the amount would be subtracted from the annual budget adopted under proposed Rule 2.3 prior to assessing annual payments on Contracting Governments in accordance with proposed Rule 4.8.

The Subcommittee provided in proposed Rule 4.4 (f) that bank interest be credited to the Working Capital Fund, considering that this Fund should continue to be used to the greatest extent possible to reduce fluctuations in the annual administrative budget assessed on Contracting Governments. No ceiling is provided on this Fund, as before, in order that the Commission may continue to exercise the greatest possible flexibility in dealing with anticipated capital and special expenditures which have in the past caused such fluctuations in the annual administrative budget and in payments assessed on Contracting Governments. However, proposed Rule 4.7 specifies that monies in the Fund determined during the annual review to be in excess of needs be transferred to the Miscellaneous Fund. Such monies would then be used to reduce the annual payments in the next financial year through the automatic transfer from the Miscellaneous Fund to the General Fund provided in Rule 4.8 (b).

The present Financial Regulations provide that annual payments not received from Contracting Governments by the following financial year shall be in arrears, but do not specify what shall happen if a Contracting Government falls seriously in arrears. Proposed Rule 4.10 remedies this omission.

Proposed Rule 4.12 provides that the annual payment of a new Contracting Government shall be on the basis of one Panel membership. The Subcommittee felt that such an increase in the initial payment would be more equitable to existing Contracting Governments but would not be so great as to discourage any prospective members with a real interest in ICNAF.

The Subcommittee felt that the Financial Regulations should recognize the Commission decision to base Secretariat salaries on those of the Public Service of Canada. This is provided in proposed Rule 6. Proposed Rule 6.3 ensures that the salary items presented to the Commission in the annual budget shall be complete, but does not detract from the ultimate responsibility of the Commission to determine actual salaries.

Since the Financial Regulations govern the actions of the Executive Secretary in handling Commission funds to a large extent, proposed Rule 11 changes the present Financial Regulations to provide that the Chairman shall rule on interpretation of the Rules. The Subcommittee felt that this would afford greater protection both to the Commission and to the Executive Secretary.

The Subcommittee proposes that the new Financial Regulations take effect on July 1 rather than on the date adopted to provide a more orderly transition.

The International Civil Aviation Organization,(ICAO), is a large international organization which also has its headquarters in Canada.

The Subcommittee took advantage of being in Montreal to consult with Mr Lewis, ICAO External Relations Office, on questions relating to the Canadian Income Tax and privileges and immunities of international organizations in Canada. These consultations opened a number of avenues of approach to various matters which might benefit ICNAF, but which could not be dealt with immediately for the most part. The Subcommittee therefore

recommends

that it be continued to explore these matters further.

In connection with these consultations, the Subcommittee felt that it might be beneficial to the Commission if arrangements could be made with Canada to handle income tax as handled by ICAO. Mr Young agreed to explore this further and report to the 1968 Annual Meeting.

In reviewing the Rules of Procedure and the Panel Rules for financial provisions, the Subcommittee noted several aspects which might be improved but which it considered outside its terms of reference. If continued as proposed above, the Subcommittee

recommends

that it also be empowered to review the Rules of Procedure and the Panel Rules *in toto*.

I. The Subcommittee

recommends

that the Financial Regulations adopted by the Commission 5 April 1951, 30 May 1960, 12 June 1965, 10 June 1966, and 9 June 1967, be repealed and the following Financial Regulations be adopted in lieu thereof.

Financial Regulations

The following Rules shall govern the financial administration of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries.

Financial Year

Rule 1

The financial year shall be the period July 1 to June 30.

Budget

Rule 2

2.1 The Executive Secretary shall prepare and submit to the regular annual meeting estimates in Canadian dollars for the administrative budget and the special projects budget covering income and expenditures for the following financial year. At the same time, he shall prepare a forecast budget for the subsequent financial year. He shall transmit these to all Contracting Governments at least sixty days before the opening of the regular annual meeting of the Commission.

2.2 The estimates and forecast shall be divided by categories, and shall be accompanied by such information as the Commission may specify from time to time, and as the Executive Secretary may deem useful.

2.3 The Standing Committee on Finance and Administration shall meet during each regular annual meeting of the Commission to examine the estimates and forecast and shall report thereon to the Commission. The Commission shall adopt the budget after considering this report.

2.4 The Executive Secretary may submit to the Commission supplementary estimates as he deems necessary. Supplementary estimates shall be prepared, considered, and acted upon in the same manner as regular estimates.

Appropriations

Rule 3

3.1 The appropriations adopted by the Commission in the budget shall constitute an authorization to the Executive Secretary to incur obligations and make payments for the purposes and up to the amounts so adopted.

3.2 Appropriations shall remain available for twelve months following the end of the financial year to which they relate to the extent that they are required to discharge obligations incurred during that financial year. At the end

(over)

of the twelve-month period any unliquidated prior year obligations shall be cancelled, or, where the obligation remains a valid charge, transferred as an obligation against current appropriations.

3.3 The Chairman of the Commission may authorize the Executive Secretary to transfer appropriations between categories in any budget adopted by the Commission.

Funds

Rule 4

4.1 There shall be established a General Fund, a Miscellaneous Fund, and a Working Capital Fund for purposes of accounting for the expenditures of the Commission.

4.2 The following monies shall be credited to the General Fund:

(a) Annual payments from Contracting Governments, except as provided in Rule 4.3 (a).

(b) Transfers from the Miscellaneous Fund as provided in Rule 4.8 (b).

(c) Appropriations from the Working Capital Fund for capital and special expenditures.

4.3 The following monies shall be credited to the Miscellaneous Fund:

(a) Annual payments from new Contracting Governments, as provided in Rule 4.12.

(b) All monies not otherwise specified in Rule 4.

4.4 The following monies shall be credited to the Working Capital Fund:

(a) Contributions from Contracting Governments; new Contracting Governments shall contribute as provided in Rule 4.12.

(b) Income from the sale of Commission publications.

(c) Appropriations remaining in the General Fund at the end of the financial year not required to discharge obligations in accordance with Rule 3.2.

(d) Appropriations remaining in the General Fund at the end of the twelve-month period specified in Rule 3.2 for prior year obligations, but not disbursed.

(e) Refunds, from any source, of prior expenditures of the Commission.

(f) Bank interest.

4.5 Monies available in the Working Capital Fund may be transferred to the General Fund temporarily to the extent necessary to finance appropriations pending receipt of annual payments by Contracting Governments.

4.6 The Chairman of the Commission, after consultation with Commissioners, may authorize expenditure of available funds, not appropriated, for unforeseen and extraordinary expenses necessary to the good conduct of the business of the Commission. Such funds may not be in excess of twenty percent of the annual administrative budget for the current financial year, and except to the extent recoverable from some other source shall be reimbursed through the submission of supplementary estimates. Monies available in the Working Capital Fund may be transferred to the General Fund to finance such authorized expenses.

4.7 The Standing Committee on Finance and Administration and the Commission shall review the amount available in the Working Capital Fund during each annual meeting. Insofar as possible the Commission shall anticipate capital

and special expenditures during the succeeding three years and shall attempt to maintain the Working Capital Fund at such a level that appropriations can be made from the Fund for such purposes instead of being included in the annual administrative or special projects budgets. However, the Working Capital Fund shall be maintained at a level, determined by the Commission, sufficient to finance appropriations in accordance with Rule 4.5 and for use in an emergency in accordance with Rule 4.6. Any monies determined to be in excess of the needs of the Working Capital Fund shall be transferred to the Miscellaneous Fund.

4.8 The Executive Secretary shall inform each Contracting Government of the annual payments due, in accordance with Article XI, paragraphs 3, 4, and 5, as soon as possible after the Commission has adopted the annual administrative and special projects budgets. In assessing the amounts due, the Executive Secretary shall make the following adjustments:

(a) Include supplementary appropriations for which assessments have not previously been made on Contracting Governments.

(b) Reduce the amount appropriated in the administrative budget by monies available in the Miscellaneous Fund, which shall be transferred to the General Fund on the first day of the financial year. At the same time the Executive Secretary shall inform each Contracting Government of any new contributions required for the Working Capital Fund, which shall be determined in the same manner as the annual payment to the annual administrative budget.

(c) Reduce the amount appropriated in the administrative budget by the amount of staff assessments, if any.

4.9 The Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, in reporting on an estimate for a special projects budget, shall recommend a scale for allocation of the budget to Contracting Governments.

4.10 Annual payments and contributions shall be due and payable in full within thirty days of receipt of the information from the Executive Secretary referred to in Rule 4.8, or the first day of the financial year, whichever is later. As of the first day of the following financial year, the unpaid balance shall be considered to be in arrears. Any Contracting Government more than two years in arrears shall not vote at any meeting until the unpaid balance has been received by the Commission.

4.11 All payments and contributions from Contracting Governments shall be made in Canadian dollars, unless, upon recommendation of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, the Commission specifies otherwise in adopting the budget.

4.12 New Contracting Governments shall make an annual payment within ninety days of depositing an instrument of adherence with the Depositary Government for that financial year. The payment shall be the same as for a Contracting Government with one Panel membership, provided that the payment shall be one-half this amount if the adherence is deposited during the last six months of the financial year. At the same time new Contracting Governments shall contribute 1,000 Canadian dollars to the Working Capital Fund

Accounts

Rule 5

5.1 The Executive Secretary shall establish detailed financial procedures in order to ensure effective financial administration and the exercise of economy.

5.2 The Executive Secretary shall maintain such accounting records as are necessary for each financial year, including:

(a) Income and expenditures.

(b) The status of appropriations, including:

(over)

(i) The original budget appropriation;
(ii) Transfers between appropriation categories;
(iii) Amounts charged against appropriation categories.

(c) The origin of miscellaneous income.

(d) The status of the Working Capital Fund

(e) Funds held in currencies other than Canadian dollars.

5.3 The annual accounts shall be submitted by the Executive Secretary to the Auditors not later than ninety days following the end of the financial year.

5.4 The Executive Secretary may, after full investigation, authorize the writing off of losses of cash, stores and other assets, provided that a statement of all such amounts written off shall be submitted to the Commission and the Auditors with the annual accounts.

Salaries

Rule 6

6.1 The Commission shall adopt from time to time a salary scale for the Executive Secretary and the staff based to the extent possible on the salary scale and position classification system of the Public Service of Canada.

6.2 The Executive Secretary shall consult appropriate Canadian authorities as he deems necessary concerning salary scales and position classifications and shall recommend appropriate modifications to the Commission.

6.3 The Executive Secretary shall include in the estimates for the following financial year salary amounts increased in accordance with the salary scale for each member of the staff whom he deems to be performing his duties in a satisfactory manner, and increased for the Executive Secretary (subject to review by the Commission). He shall also include such additional amounts as would be necessary to implement a recommendation for modification of the salary scale or position classifications.

Other Committees and Panels

Rule 7

Each other Committee and each Panel shall report to the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration on anticipated costs to the Commission if it were to adopt any program recommended by the Committee or Panel.

External Audit

Rule 8

8.1 The Commission shall employ external auditors who may be removed only by the Commission.

8.2 Having regard to the budgetary provisions for the audit, and after consultation with the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration relative to the scope of the audit, the Auditors shall perform such an audit as they deem necessary to certify:

(a) That the financial statements are in accord with the books and records of the Commission;

(b) That the financial transactions reflected in the statements have been in accordance with the rules and regulations, the budgetary provisions, and other applicable directives;

(c) That the monies on deposit and on hand have been verified by certificate received direct from the Commission's depositories or by actual count.

8.3 Subject to the directions of the Commission, the Auditors shall be the sole judge as to the acceptance in whole or in part of the certifications by the Executive Secretary and may proceed to such detailed examination and verifications as they choose of all financial records, including those relating to supplies and equipment.

8.4 The Auditors may affirm by test the reliability of the internal audit, and may make such reports with respect thereto as they may deem necessary to the Commission, to the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, or to the Executive Secretary.

8.5 The Auditors and their staff shall have free access at all convenient times to all books of account and records which are, in the opinion of the Auditors, necessary for the performance of the audit. Information classified in the records of the Executive Secretary as confidential, and which is required for the purposes of the audit, shall be made available on application to the Executive Secretary.

8.6 The Auditors, in addition to certifying the accounts, may make such observations as they deem necessary with respect to the efficiency of the financial procedures, the accounting system, the internal financial controls and, in general, the financial consequences of administrative practices. In no case, however, shall the Auditors include criticism in their audit report without first affording the Executive Secretary an opportunity of explanation to the Auditors of the matter under observation. Audit objections to any item in the accounts shall be immediately communicated to the Executive Secretary.

8.7 The Auditors shall have no power to disallow items in the accounts, but shall draw to the attention of the Executive Secretary for appropriate action any transaction concerning which they entertain doubt as to legality or propriety.

8.8 The Auditors shall prepare a report on the accounts certified, and on any matters on which the Commission by resolution thereon may from time to time give specific instructions.

8.9 The Auditors shall submit their report to the Commission not later than six months following the end of the financial year to which the accounts relate. The Standing Committee on Finance and Administration shall forward to the Commission its comments, if any, on the audit report.

Bonding

Rule 9

The Executive Secretary and such staff as he deems necessary shall be bonded in Canadian currency by any reputable Bonding Company in such amount as may be determined by the Commission from time to time. The cost of the premium therefor shall be assumed by the Commission.

Delegation of Authority

Rule 10

The Executive Secretary may delegate to other staff of the Secretariat such of his powers as he considers necessary for the effective implementation of these regulations.

Interpretation

Rule 11

The Chairman may rule, after such consultation with Commissioners as he deems necessary, in cases of doubt as to the interpretation and application of any of these Rules.

(over)

Applicability

Rule 12

12.1 These Rules shall become effective on the first day of the financial year following their approval by the Commission. All previous Financial Regulations shall become null and void at that time.

12.2 These Rules may be amended only by the Commission.

II. It is

recommended

that the Rules of Procedure for the Commission adopted 5 April 1951 and 30 May 1953 be amended as follows:

Rule 11 (a) Delete 2nd sentence, and delete in 4th sentence "prepare and submit to the Chairman a draft of the Commission's budgets (Article XI of the Convention) for each year and"

Rule 13 Delete

Rule 15 Delete "in North America"

Rule 16 (b) Replace with the following: "There shall be a Standing Committee on Finance and Administration consisting of one nominee from each of five Contracting Governments who may be assisted by experts and advisers and which shall advise the Commission on matters relating to the Executive Secretary and his staff, on the budget of the Commission, on the time and place of meetings of the Commission, and on publications of the Commission. The Committee shall choose its own Chairman from among the nominees. The Chairman shall have no vote but his Contracting Government may designate an alternate nominee who shall cast its vote. The Executive Secretary shall be an ex-officio member of this Committee without vote."

Rule 23 (a) Delete everything after "Convention" and insert: "Area, the Chairman's Report of the annual meeting, and a financial statement."

Rules 15-24 would be renumbered to take into account the deletion of Rule 13 and the lack of a Rule 14 (deleted by 1953 Annual Meeting).

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 2118
(B.e.68)

Proceedings No. 13

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of the Joint Meeting of Panels

Thursday, 6 June, 1200 hours

1. The Chairman of the Commission, Mr V. Kamentsev (USSR), opened the meeting which was convened to consider under Plenary Agenda Item 20, Conservation Measures for Atlantic Salmon, the Canadian proposal concerning conservation measures for Atlantic Salmon in the Convention Area (Comm. Doc. 68/20). He drew attention to relevant sources of information in the Report of the Third Meeting of the ICES/ICNAF Joint Working Party on North Atlantic Salmon October 1967 (Res. Doc. 68/1), the Second Report of the ICES/ICNAF Joint Working Party on North Atlantic Salmon, London, May 1968 (Res. Doc. 68/106), and the Provisional Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, 1968.

2. At the Chairman's request, the Canadian Delegate introduced Comm. Doc. 68/20 and referred to the Canadian proposal to the 1967 Annual Meeting that high seas salmon fishing in the Convention Area be prohibited. No action was taken by the Commission at that time since the available scientific evidence on which to base a decision was considered insufficient. He pointed out that Canada was still concerned about the future of the salmon resource that was small and provided a small catch from stocks that were at a low ebb. Strict control by the Canadian Government of its fisheries in the rivers, inshore waters and outside Canadian fishing limits were in effect. He proposed that pending development of adequate scientific information, there be no increase in offshore fishing of Atlantic salmon in the ICNAF Area.

3. The Danish Delegate pointed out that it was considered dangerous last year to apply restriction without adequate research. He fully appreciated the position of the Canadian Government and its desire for arrangements to maintain the present state of the fishery for fear of over-exploitation before adequate research could provide sound advice. He pointed out, however, that the Provisional Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics showed no reason for such fear and repeated that the Danish delegation was not in a position to accept the Canadian proposal.

4. The US Delegate reported that it had been found impossible after 90 years experience in the salmon fishery in the North Pacific to effectively conserve stocks subjected to a high seas fishery. He shared the Canadian concern. He proposed that the Commission consider the desirability of prohibiting salmon fishing on the high seas.

5. A recent increasing development in offshore salmon fishing in the century-old Norwegian salmon fishery was reported by the Norwegian Delegate who expressed his Government's concern about possible over-fishing and his sympathy for the Canadian proposal although there had been no relationship shown between Greenland and Norwegian salmon stocks. However, he could not support the Canadian proposal because of practical difficulties including legislation and enforcement.

6. Deep concern was also expressed by the UK Delegate who, in supporting the Canadian proposal, said that there was evidence that without any increase in the number of boats engaged in the offshore fishery the catch could rise from its present level to 800 tons. Without restriction, much greater catches could be envisaged, providing a serious threat to the stocks. Salmon research in all areas was showing reason for apprehension; therefore, it was compatible with research to have restriction. He pointed out that countries are interested in the contribution stocks can make to the livelihood of their people and that economic value as well as weight of catch must be recognized. He did not accept that the position could be judged solely in terms of maximum sustainable catch if this catch was to be obtained on the high seas at the expense of the home fisheries of the countries where the fish originated.

(over)

7. The Canadian Delegate pointed out that the maintenance of the salmon resource was dependent upon expensive outlay in the country of their origin. It would be very difficult to find continuing Government support for conservation programs in fresh waters when any good results were to be nullified by unlimited high seas fisheries. He pointed out that the Canadian proposal does not limit the livelihood of the Greenland inshore fishermen and that the estimated value of $100 per salmon contributes greatly to the livelihood of people in the outlying parts of Canada's salmon areas. He emphasized that the Canadian proposal was in the best interest of all concerned with Atlantic salmon in the ICNAF Area.

8. Following discussion of possible recommendations for the Commission, the Canadian Delegate proposed that a draft resolution be prepared calling attention of Member Governments to the serious danger to Atlantic salmon resources posed by the growth of the offshore fishery and recommending that Member Governments consider preventing increase in fishing and placing a high priority on salmon studies relating to the problem.

9. With the unanimous approval of the meeting, the Chairman appointed Dr A. W. H. Needler (Canada), Mr Lund (Norway), and Mr Lokkegaard (Denmark), to draft a resolution from the Joint Meeting of Panels along the lines proposed by the Canadian Delegate for consideration at a later session of the Plenary during the present Annual Meeting.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 1330 hours.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No. 2119
(B.b.68)

Proceedings No. 14

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of the Second Plenary Session

Thursday, 6 June, 0905 hours

1. The Chairman, Mr Kamentsev (USSR), re-introduced Agenda Item 11, Amendments to the Convention, and asked the US Delegation to present its memorandum proposing an amendment to the ICNAF Convention to provide greater flexibility in the types of fisheries regulatory measures which may be proposed by the Commission under the terms of Article VIII, paragraph 1 of the Convention (Comm. Doc. 68/18).

2. The US Delegate then presented the following statement on the amendment to the Convention:

"The Commission has become increasingly concerned about the status of the fisheries stocks in the ICNAF Area. I feel at this point it might prove profitable to refer briefly from the ICNAF Convention preamble: "... the Governments ... sharing a substantial interest in the conservation of the fishery resources of the Northwest Atlantic Ocean, have resolved to conclude a Convention for the investigation, protection, and conservation of the fisheries in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean, in order to make possible the maintenance of a maximum sustained catch from those fisheries ..."

"The United States submits that ICNAF and its Member Nations have fallen somewhat short of the demanding goals described in this preamble. True, we have come far in our 18 years, but in many ways we have achieved only one-third the goal set forth in our Convention. That third is the investigation of the fisheries resource in the ICNAF Area. Unfortunately, we have not wholly succeeded in our primary mission - the protection and conservation of the resource.

"The changes which these fisheries have seen in the past 18 years were not anticipated in 1949. The original Convention contains only five types of regulatory measures to protect and conserve the fishery. Of these, only one has ever been used, and with limited success. Yet the resources in the long-term have seriously declined. One may then infer that if only one of the five types of regulatory measures has been found useful, and still the stocks decline, that the types of measure presently incorporated in the Convention are inadequate to the task of maintaining a maximum sustainable catch. Logically, it follows that either of two options is open to us:

a) continue as we are with further deterioration in the fishery, a most unwelcome development for all members;

or

b) to revitalize and improve the ICNAF mechanism through amendment of the Convention in order to permit promulgation of adequate and efficacious control measures to do the job we have set out to do.

"The United States believes that the latter alternative is the only possible one. It is imperative that this Annual Meeting take the first step to correct this.

"The United States is firmly convinced that the only logical and practicable route is amendment of the Convention. Toward this end, we submitted and the Executive Secretary has circulated to the members a proposed amendment (Comm. Doc. 68/18) which we hope has met with the approval of the Member Governments.

"This amendment would allow the Commission to propose various management measures, including national catch quotas. It would allow the Commission to include technical and economic considerations in developing regulations. It would allow the Commission to select the most appropriate management technique for any circumstance which may develop. The future of ICNAF lies squarely with the ability

(over)

of the Commission to solve the problem of exploitation of cod and haddock and the problems facing other species as well through use of such controls.

"Therefore, the United States has come to this 18th Annual Meeting with a sense of urgency, and of good will. We stand ready to help, to join with the nations who also highly value the resources in the ICNAF Area, in the solution of the most serious problem facing this fishery."

3. The Delegates from all Member countries participated in the discussion which followed. Many Delegations agreed that the Commission needed greater flexibility in the types of fishery regulatory measures it might propose and that the US draft Protocol (attachment to Comm. Doc. 68/18) would provide such flexibility. The position of the USSR Delegation is stated in Appendix I. Most Delegations felt that the language of the US proposals through the use of "scientific investigations, or economic or technical considerations, or both" in Articles I and II of the draft Protocol tended to imply that the Commission might be authorized to make proposals on the basis of economic or technical considerations without regard to scientific considerations. There was unanimous agreement that the first and fundamental basis was scientific investigations providing biological assessments of the state of the stocks and their yields.

4. In recognition of the implication, the Norwegian Delegate proposed

(a) that Article I of the US draft Protocol amending paragraph 2 of Article VII should be changed, in part, to read as follows:

"2. Each Panel, upon the basis of scientific investigations, and economic and technical considerations, may make recommendations to the Commission for joint action by the Contracting Governments within the scope of paragraph 1 of Article VIII."

and

(b) that Article II of the US draft Protocol amending paragraph 1 of Article VIII should be changed, in part, to read as follows:

"1. The Commission may, on the recommendation of one or more Panels, and on the basis of scientific investigations, and economic and technical considerations, transmit to the Depositary Government appropriate proposals, for joint action by the Contracting Governments, designed to achieve the optimum utilization of the stocks of those species of fish which support international fisheries in the Convention Area."

5. This proposal of the Norwegian Delegate was supported by the UK Delegate who suggested the use of "taking into account" for "and" but who agreed that the use of "and" was acceptable. He further suggested that the preamble to the Text of the Convention might be amended to read "... to make possible the rational exploitation of those fisheries ..." instead of "... to make possible the maintenance of a maximum sustained catch from those fisheries ..." However, there was only minority support for the UK amendments to the preamble.

6. The Polish Delegate was supported by a number of delegations when he pointed out that the US memorandum had been circulated only recently and that more time was needed for consideration and discussion of this important problem. He proposed that the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures be requested to study the problem and report to the Plenary at the 1969 Meeting. He further proposed that a questionnaire be prepared on the matter and circulated to Member Governments for comments which would then be made available to the Plenary at the 1969 Meeting.

7. At this point, the US Delegate agreed to accept the proposed Norwegian amendments to the US proposals and suggested that a working group might be set up to speed up consideration and gather ideas with a view to going as far as possible toward getting proposals and amendments before this year's meeting. A motion to accept amendments to the language of the US draft Protocol which, in Article I and Article II, would change "or" to "and" and delete the phrase "or both", and to circulate the amended Protocol, was put forward by the US Delegate.

8. The UK Delegate accepted the US amendments to the Protocol and withdrew his proposal to amend the preamble to the Text of the Convention but proposed leaving the words "rational utilization" in Article II of the Protocol, rather than change them to "maximum sustained catch" to agree with the present wording in paragraph 1 of Article VIII of the Convention, as suggested by the Danish Delegate. Following discussion, substitution of "optimum utilization" for "rational utilization" was proposed as a compromise.

9. The Polish Delegate repeated his proposal detailed in paragraph 6 above and suggested that the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures, assisted by a body of legal specialists, be asked to deal with the problem and report to the 1969 Annual Meeting.

10. The Norwegian Delegate suggested that a small *ad hoc* group or the sponsors of the various proposals meet to attempt to arrive at a compromise proposal.

11. The UK Delegate, recognizing the difficulty which could be created if the draft Protocol was presented to Governments, proposed that a resolution be drafted inviting Member Governments to consider the amended US draft Protocol and present comments to the 1969 Annual Meeting of the Commission. This proposal was unanimously supported.

12. At the Chairman's request, Mr J. Graham of the UK Delegation agreed, with the assistance of others, to prepare a draft text of the resolution for consideration at a later Plenary Session.

13. The meeting adjourned at 1145 hours.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 2119
(B.b.68)

Proceedings No. 14
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

USSR Statement on the US Proposed Amendment to the Convention re Fishery Regulatory Measures

1. In the opinion of the Soviet Delegation, the improvement of the Convention to ensure the better implementation of its purposes and tasks deserves the approval.

The delay in adoption by the Commission of new proposals and changes of the Convention can be explained to a considerable extent by the fact that the mechanism of making the proposals and changes and their entry into force is not clearly specified in the Convention. As the practice showed the existing mechanism is not satisfactorily efficient, and in fact sometimes it does not meet the requirements of the Convention's provisions. If necessary, the Soviet Delegation could prepare in future appropriate proposals and submit them for consideration by the ICNAF Member Countries.

Proposals submitted by the US Delegation make changes of substance in the Convention itself and for this reason they need thorough and detailed study and further clarification.

The proposals of the US Delegation were received by the Soviet Party only recently and in this connection the Soviet Delegation is not prepared to state the official point of view on the essence of the said proposals.

In the opinion of the Soviet Delegation, the US proposal is to substitute the list of concrete measures which may be adopted by the Commission in accordance with sub-paragraphs a, b, c, d, e, of paragraph 1 of Article VIII by a rather broad and vague wording.

Since changes of the Convention are subject to approval by all the Governments and ratification by the legislative bodies, one can presume even now that the proposed and practically unlimited extension of functions of the international organization would evoke serious difficulties because the powers and functions of the Commission consisting of the representatives of the Governments should be defined absolutely clearly.

2. It would be difficult to change paragraph 2, Article VII, and paragraph 1, Article VIII and at the same time to leave Article VI in its present form.

3. The US draft Protocol contains absolutely new criteria that is "economic and technical considerations" which can be interpreted and understood in different ways.

Besides, the introduction of economic criteria would in fact change the essence of the Convention, the present purposes of which are the investigation, protection and conservation of fishery resources to make possible the maintenance of a maximum sustained catch. In particular, this would require a change of the preamble where the said purposes are set forth.

Since many Delegations at the present meeting are not prepared to give their definite position on this matter, the Soviet Delegation proposes that the US proposal be discussed further at the next Annual Meeting.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No. 2121
(B.b.68)

Proceedings No. 15

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of the Third Plenary Session

Friday, 7 June, 0910 hours

1. The Chairman, Mr V. Kamentsev (USSR), opened the meeting with representatives from all Member Countries, except Italy, present.

2. The Chairman asked for comments on the Report of the Ceremonial Opening Meeting (Proc.10). The Report was accepted without comment.

3. The Report of the First Plenary Session (Proc.8) was read by the Executive Secretary and adopted without comment.

4. The Chairman asked the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (Mr Sv. Aa. Horsted (Denmark) to report on the status of the Committee's deliberations. Mr Horsted detailed corrections to the Provisional Report of the Committee and reported that the full Report would be available for consideration by Plenary at its last session.

5. Under Plenary Item 28, Reports of Panels, Reports of Meetings of Panel 1 (Proc.6), Panel 2 (Proc.7), Panel 3 (Proc.3), Panel 4 (Proc.4), Panel 5 (Proc.5), and Panel A (Seals) (Proc.2) were presented by the Panel Chairman and adopted by the Plenary without change.

6. Under Plenary Item 21, UN Resolution 2172 (XXI), Dr A. W. H. Needler (Canada), who represented the Commission at meetings of the UN Group of Experts in Geneva in 1967 and in New York in 1968, reviewed the Resolution which called for: (1) a survey of activities in marine science and technology, and (2) proposals for more effective international cooperation in the study and the exploitation of marine resources including conservation. In relation to the survey, material has been put together by the UN Secretariat based on replies to a quentionnaire and a factual report completed. In relation to the international cooperation item, principal items in the report recommend: that IOC be strengthened and sponsored by UNESCO, FAO, WMO and the UN; and that it will carry out cooperative international studies of the waters of the ocean and on marine geology; and that FAO remain, as at present, the foremost international body for fisheries. Mineral resources would be dealt with by the UN and its Economic Commissions. The report of the Secretary General will go before the Economic and Social Council of the UN and then to the UN General Assembly.

The Plenary, at the suggestion of the Norwegian Delegate, who was supported by the Delegates of Canada and United Kingdom, agreed that the survey question sent to the Commission for reply had already been answered in national submissions by the ICNAF Member Governments and no Commission reply was necessary.

7. Under Plenary Item 22, Cooperative Systematic Studies in the North Atlantic, the Plenary heard the Chairman of the Environmental Subcommittee, Dr H. W. Graham (USA), report that the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics had accepted a recommendation for the formation of a Coordinating Group with representatives from IOC, ICES and ICNAF for the coordination of hydrographic work being undertaken under the auspices of the various international bodies. The Secretary General of ICES, Mr Hans Tambs-Lyche, reported that the ICES recommendation in relation to this item was similar. The Plenary, in approving the Research and Statistics recommendation, was assured that adequate financing was available for ICNAF representation.

8. Under Plenary Item 23, Commission Observers at Other International Meetings, Mr D. McKernan (USA) reported on the November 1967 meeting of INPEC, Mr G. Mocklinghoff (Fed. Rep. Germany) on the May 1968 meeting of NEAFC, Dr H. A. Cole (UK) on the October 1967 meeting of ICES, Dr A. W. H. Needler (Canada) on the 3rd Meeting of COFI in April 1968. The Chairman drew attention to Mr A. Lee's (UK) report (Comm. Doc. 68/3) on the October 1967 meeting of IOC.

(over)

9. Under Plenary Item 24, Appointment of Commission Observers, the Plenary agreed that the Chairman of the Commission and the Executive Secretary should be empowered to appoint Commission Observers to meetings of interest.

10. The Plenary adjourned at 1045 hours.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No.2122
(B.g.p.)

Proceedings No.16

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Meeting of Standing Committee on

Regulatory Measures

Wednesday, 5 June, 1500 hrs and Friday, 7 June, 1100 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Mr J. Graham (UK). Representatives from all Member Countries, except Italy, attended the two sessions.

2. Rapporteur. Mr B. B. Parrish (UK) was appointed Rapporteur.

3. Agenda. The provisional agenda was adopted.

4. Terms of Reference. The Chairman drew attention to the Report of the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures, London, 30 January -1 February 1968 (Appendix I; also circulated as Comm. Doc. 68/6) which set out the terms of reference of the Committee and to the new Rules of Procedure relating to its activities (Comm. Doc. 68/16), which had been approved by the Commission at its First Plenary Session. These defined the Committee's terms of reference as follows:

(a) to consider possible measures for the regulation of fishing in relation to the stocks of fish, or of any particular species of fish in the Convention Area, or any part thereof;

(b) to consider the economic and administrative problems involved in the application of such measures and, in consultation with the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, the scientific and statistical information required for their solution;

(c) to make appropriate recommendations to the Commission.

There was considerable discussion as to the way in which these terms of reference should be interpreted at this state in the Committee's activities. Some Delegations expressed the view that the Committee should not be concerned with recommending to the Commission specific regulatory measures for the fisheries in the Convention Area, but should concern itself with the principles underlying the application of different types of regulatory measure, particularly those based on limitation of catch and the consideration of the practical problems involved in applying them. It was pointed out that both of these types of consideration are covered by the Committee's terms of reference.

5. After note had been taken of the items in a Provisional Report of the Research and Statistics Committee dealing with questions posed by the Regulatory Measures Committee at its mid-term meeting in January 1968, the USSR Delegation presented a proposal for the Committee's consideration which might form the basis of the Commission's next step in the introduction of additional regulatory measures. The USSR statement and proposal was as follows:

"The establishment of catch limit is one of the most difficult problems, especially when fishing is carried out by several countries and various species of fish are caught.

"Now we have discussed this problem in detail, at first in January at the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures and then in the last few days at the Assessment Subcommittee and at the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics.

"The essence of this problem has become sufficiently clear, and I would like to state the viewpoint of the USSR Delegation on the problem and put forward our proposal.

(over)

"Just as everybody, we think the size of catch should be determined on scientific basis and that this size should not exceed the maximum sustainable yield. Therefore, all the countries should make maximum efforts to extend and expedite scientific surveys so that the size of the maximum sustainable yield for all main commercial species be determined as soon as possible.

"Unfortunately, the state of our knowledge is such that at present we cannot determine these values with sufficient scientific grounds.

"During the last few days the Assessment Subcommittee did a very big and excellent job.

"The Report prepared by the Subcommittee is of great value; it contains all data on the assessment of stocks, and for the time being it is impossible to make a better review.

"But the Subcommittee, of course, could not give, and nobody at present can give, well-grounded answers to all the questions asked in January by the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures.

"It will take several years of research to answer all these questions.

"At the same time the fishing intensity increases and certain main species are already over-exploited; over-exploitation of some other species may happen before we get adequate scientific evidence for determination of the maximum sustained catch.

"The USSR Delegation presumes that the following measures should be taken:

(1) Research work. To expand considerably and to expedite joint, coordinated scientific surveys and to set the task to get as early as in 1970 more well-grounded data for determination of the maximum sustained catch for the main commercial species. The Soviet Union is prepared to take an active part in joint, coordinated surveys and to carry out on reciprocal basis the exchange of all necessary scientific data, materials and statistics.

(2) Fishing. As an urgent measure we propose that starting from January 1969 and until the results of the said surveys are received, all the countries should not increase their catch of the main commercial species against the average catch for the last three years. Exception should be made for those countries whose fishery has just started to develop in the ICNAF Area. In future, when more well-grounded data on the assessment of stocks are received, the size of catch can be reviewed on the judgment of the data. Such an assessment should be obviously made annually. If the above proposal is adopted, the USSR is prepared to limit the size of its catch starting from 1969.

"I ask the Chairman to include our present statement in the Report of the Committee so that our proposal could be discussed at the Plenary Session.

"I presume that my statement applies also to Item 19 of the Plenary Agenda."

6. In the course of a discussion of this proposal there was general agreement on the need for further research but a number of delegates drew attention to their inability, at this meeting, to express their countries' views on the second part of the proposal. The US Delegation then presented proposals regarding the principles which might be followed in the application of a catch or effort quota regulation system, with special reference to the method of allocating the quotas between countries. These were as follows:

"(1) For the present, global quotas should be considered only for species that are demonstrably overfished such as cod and haddock, and quotas should be developed first for those specific stocks such as Georges Bank haddock that:
(a) have been the subject of detailed population analysis, and
(b) are particularly vulnerable to over-exploitation.

(2) Global quotas should be adjusted annually in accordance with scientific forecasts of the sustainable catches that can be taken from the stock.

(3) Only 80% of the global quota or forecast sustainable catch should be allocated as country quotas, leaving the remainder available to any Member country. This would avoid the complete displacement of any ICNAF country not given a quota, and would also allow some latitude to take care of the problem of third parties and developing fisheries.

(4) Global quotas generally should be allocated among Member countries participating in a fishery in proportion to their average historical catch during a specified 10-year base period, subject to the special exceptions noted below.

(5) When quotas are allocated, coastal countries should be given a special preference based on the following principles:

(a) Account should be taken of the possible growth of the coastal country's harvesting capability, by providing for growth of the coastal country's quota as increased harvesting capacity can be demonstrated. Since 20% of the allowable catch is to remain unallocated, it would not seem necessary to place limitations on the increase.

(b) If a reduction in the total allowable catch should become necessary, the quotas of both coastal and distant water countries should be reduced, but because of the lack of mobility of the coastal fleets, the coastal country catch should be reduced less than that of the distant water country."

7. After further discussion it was agreed that insufficient time was available at this meeting for countries to study and express firm views on these important proposals, and that they should be considered further at a mid-term meeting of the Committee. At this meeting, attention should be paid especially to the principles and practical and administrative problems involved in the development of regulatory schemes based on limitation of catch, as embodied in the USSR and USA proposals. Items to which attention should be given include *inter alia:*

(a) the choice of fish stocks which should be protected;

(b) the allocation of quotas between countries, including

(i) the period of years for past catches to be taken as a basis for allocation;

(ii) the provision of an unallocated proportion of the global quota;

(iii) special provisions for coastal states with immobile fleets, and whose economies are heavily dependent on fishing;

(c) the enforcement and monitoring of the regulation;

(d) problems regarding the diversion of fishing effort following regulation.

(over)

The Committee accordingly

recommends

that the necessary arrangements be made for a meeting of the Committee to be held to consider such problems prior to the 1969 Annual Meeting.

Pending the outcome of these discussions, the Committee is not able to recommend to the Commission further specific regulatory measures at the present time.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 1978
(B.g.p)

Proceedings No. 16
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures

London, 30 January-1 February 1968[1]

1. Time and Place of Meeting

The First Meeting of the ICNAF Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures was held in Great Westminster House, London, from 30 January to 1 February 1968 through the kindness of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food.

2. Delegations

Representatives of 13 Member Countries, with advisers and experts, and observers from FAO, were present.

3. Welcome and Meeting Arrangements

Mr J. Graham, Fisheries Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, welcomed those present on behalf of Her Majesty's Government and expressed the hope that the meeting would be fruitful. The arrangements for the meeting were explained by the Executive Secretary.

4. Election of Chairman and Rapporteur

Mr Graham (UK) was elected Chairman of the Committee and the Executive Secretary was appointed Rapporteur.

5. Adoption of Agenda

After a short discussion, a Provisional Agenda, which had been circulated by the Executive Secretary, was adopted with modifications in Items 7, 8 and 9, and the transposition of Items 6 and 7 and of 9 (a) and 9 (b).

6. Objectives in the Management of ICNAF Fisheries

In a general discussion of the objectives which should govern the Committee's work, several members said that measures directed at securing the maximum sustainable yield from the stocks were not by themselves sufficient to ensure the efficient management of the ICNAF fisheries. The objective should not be just the conservation of the stocks; more attention should be paid now to the economic gain that could be secured and more emphasis placed on the profitability of fishing and cost/benefit analyses. Other Members thought that while the economic aspects of fishing were clearly important, the Committee's remit should be rather more narrowly confined and should continue to place primary emphasis on the maximum sustainable yield and the biological facts on which it was based which must continue to be the starting point for the regulation of the fisheries. In summing up the discussion, the Chairman said that there appeared to be no great diversity of view among the members and there was general agreement that the Committee should undertake a thorough examination of all aspects of the matter without, of course, any commitment of the Governments represented to the acceptance of the results which might emerge.

7. Terms of Reference for the Committee

It was noted that, in setting up the Standing Committee, the Commission had not prescribed its terms of reference but had indicated in broad terms the guidelines which should govern its work on the economic and administrative aspects of the problems of introducing regulatory measures and those of the R&S Committee on the related scientific aspects of these problems. The Committee had therefore

[1] Circulated earlier as Comm. Doc. 68/6.

(over)

to formulate its own terms of reference to enable it to discharge the task entrusted to it. A formulation was circulated which directed attention to measures for the control of fishing effort and catch. After a short discussion in which it was emphasized that the Committee should not confine itself to any particular type of regulatory measure, it was agreed that the terms of reference should be as follows:

(a) to consider possible measures for the regulation of fishing in relation to the stocks of fish, or of any particular species of fish in the ICNAF Area, or any part thereof:

(b) to consider the economic and administrative problems involved in the application of such measures and, in consultation with the Research and Statistics Committee, the scientific and statistical information required for their solution, and

(c) to make appropriate recommendations to the Commission.

The Committee recommended

that the Commission should make appropriate amendments to the Rules of Procedure (No.16) to take account of the new Standing Committee and requested that the Executive Secretary prepare a suitable draft for consideration by the Commission.

8. Problems in the Introduction and Application of Regulation of Fishing Intensity

It was generally agreed that fishing intensity could be regulated either by direct control of fishing effort or by catch limitation; and that support for either type of regulation might in some circumstances be derived from other measures such as closed areas or closed seasons.

It was pointed out that the circulated papers and previous discussion in the Commission had shown that mesh regulation, by itself, was not sufficient and that regulation of fishing intensity was required. The previous studies also indicated that the practical problems involved would make the regulation of fishing intensity difficult. Accordingly it was proposed that, in the first place, the Committee should examine the problems likely to arise from measures directly controlling fishing effort and those controlling catch, each of which could take a number of forms depending on whether they applied generally to all species or to particular species or to the whole Convention Area or to part of it only. This examination might indicate which types of regulation might involve the least practical difficulty and at the same time what further advice might be required from the R&S Committee in order to minimize the practical difficulties or for the effective operation of the regulation.

On the other hand, several members of the Committee thought that before the Committee became immersed in the study of detailed questions, it was necessary to have more information on the current situation of the fisheries in the ICNAF Area and the need for further regulation. It was noted that, while regulation of intensity of fishing might result in substantial economic gains, the gains in catch from the regulated stocks might be relatively small; it was felt therefore that the Committee should ask the R&S Committee for advice on the state of the various fish stocks, the yield that they could be expected to support and the extent to which fisheries for such stocks were conducted independently of other stocks. Several members of the Committee thought, moreover, that before new measures were considered it was necessary to see what effect the mesh regulations already recommended by the Commission but not yet in force would have. It was also stressed that the Convention did not permit the Commission to recommend measures for the control of fishing effort as such and that while it could propose a global catch limit it was unable to recommend catch quotas for individual Member Countries. Broad agreement was reached that the Committee should request further information from the R&S Committee.

Many members of the Committee expressed the opinion that the problems involved in direct control of fishing effort were likely to be more intractable than those involved in catch limitation, more particularly because there were no generally accepted standard units for the measurement of effort. Although some members of the Committee expressed a contrary opinion, it was felt that the Committee should concentrate in the first place on the control of catch and that the

guidelines proposed by the United States Delegation at the 1967 Annual Meeting of the Commission as amended below should form the basis of the request for information directed to the R&S Committee:

1) To elucidate the possibility of estimating the total annual catch so as to maintain the maximum sustainable yield, as a basis for regulating the total catch;

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) Timetable.

After further discussion, it was agreed that these amended guidelines should be supplemented by the following questions proposed by the Canadian member of the Committee:

1) Which stocks are agreed to be demonstrably fully exploited or over exploited (identified by species and ICNAF subareas or, where appropriate, divisions)? What sustainable yields (catch quotas) could these stocks support, and what would be the effect of effort restrictions in obtaining those yields?

2) Which of these stocks can be fished independently of other species?

3) What are the total yields of demersal species which could be supported by the stocks in each subarea? In which way would these total yields be affected by regulating the fisheries identified in 1)?

4) What additional information is required for the regulation of fishing intensity a) through limitations of effort, and b) through limitation of catch and what time is required to get it? What continuing study and year-to-year adjustment would be required for a) and for b)? Which method, a) or b), is preferable as regards effectiveness and work needed for continued study and year-to-year adjustment?

In further discussion of the practical difficulties, the Committee took the guidelines proposed by the United Kingdom Delegation at the 1967 Annual Meeting of the Commission as a basis.

Many members of the Committee felt that a catch quota would not produce the maximum economic benefits unless the quota were allocated among Member Countries and unless there were appropriate reductions in inputs at the national level. Some members considered it essential that fishermen and the Commission as well as Governments should be assured that the enforcement of the restrictions was effective; and for this reason some members considered that countries should apply restrictions by tonnage or licensing rather than by national catch quotas alone.

It was also noted that the narrower the scope of any restrictions the greater the difficulties of enforcement would be, as there would be the temptation to mis-state areas of capture. From this point of view only, it was desirable that any restrictions of catch should apply to as large an area as possible.

As regards the allocation of quotas, it was recognized that it would be difficult to formulate principles on which this could be based. Many members felt that it was premature to express an opinion about these principles and that they would require much further consideration. In a preliminary discussion, however, some members mentioned that allocation would need to start from actual performance during some recent period but that other factors would have to be taken into account.

(over)

The Committee did not attempt to enumerate these in detail but factors mentioned included the position of fishermen who would not have easy access to alternative fishing grounds and the problem of providing for new members of the Commission and also non-member countries.

It was also suggested that these problems might be eased if the scheme could provide compensation for countries which undertook to abstain from particular fisheries.

It was recognized that any division of global quotas between countries might need to be subsequently changed to take account of new factors, but it was suggested that there should be some limitation on the extent of such changes from year to year. This would not, however, affect general adjustments of catch quotas to take account of changes in abundance due to natural fluctuation.

9. Future Work

The Committee agreed to meet again during the 1968 Annual Meeting of the Commission when it would give further consideration to the economic and practical problems set out in the guidelines mentioned above. It was felt that this discussion would be facilitated if the R&S Committee could provide a progress report on the matters referred to it in Section 8 above.

10. Approval of Report

The Committee approved this report for submission to the Commission.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 2124
(B.c.68)

Proceedings No. 17

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of the Third Meeting of the Standing Committee

on Finance and Administration

Friday, 7 June, 1545 hours

1. The Chairman opened the meeting and requested consideration of the Reports of the First (Proc. 9) and Second (Proc. 12) Meetings of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration. The Reports were adopted as read by the Executive Secretary.

2. Under F&A Item 10, Report of Subcommittee on Financial Regulation, the Committee adopted the Report (Proc. 12, Appendix I) which contained revised Financial Regulations to come into effect on 1 July, 1968, and which amended certain of the Commission's Rules of Procedure and empowered the Subcommittee to review the Commission's Rules of Procedure and Panel Rules *in toto*. The Committee also adopted an addendum to Rule 6 of the Commission's revised Financial Regulations as follows to take in the ICNAF staff assessment scheme:

> "Rule 6.4. There shall be an assessment on the salary of each member of the staff, based on the amount of relief from Canadian Income Tax, the amount to be determined by the Executive Secretary in consultation with the Canadian authorities. The staff assessment shall be applied in accordance with Rule 4.8 (c)."

3. Under F&A Item 14, Time and Place of 1970 Annual Meeting, Dr A. W. H. Needler (Canada), on behalf of the Canadian Government, invited the Commission to consider holding its 1970 Annual Meeting during the first full week in June of 1970, with the exact date to be set at the 1969 Annual Meeting. F&A

recommends

that the kind invitation extended by Canada to the Commission to hold its 1970 Annual Meeting in St. John's, Newfoundland, during the first full week in June 1970, be accepted with thanks.

4. Under F&A Items 5 and 6, Auditor's Report and Administrative Report, the question raised by the USA concerning the $550 supplementary appropriation for 1966/67 as shown in Exhibit II to the Auditor's Report (Annual Proceedings, Vol. 17, p. 11) was considered and, taking into account the following points

(a) that the appropriation specified that it was "from the surplus but unappropriated funds available in miscellaneous income" (1967 Meeting Proceedings No. 11, F&A Item 6);

(b) that the other supplementary appropriations for 1966/67 specified that it was "from the Working Capital Fund" (1967 Meeting Proceedings No. 11, F&A Item 6);

(c) that Financial Regulation 7.1 specifies that "miscellaneous income" is credited to the General Fund; and

(d) that the Committee generally understood, at its 1967 meeting that the supplementary appropriation of $550 was to be from the surplus account in the General Fund.

F&A

recommends

(over)

that the Auditor's Report be returned to the Auditor for re-examination and comment regarding the source of the supplementary appropriation of $550 toward the 1966/67 budget, the Executive Secretary to circulate the explanation by mail for approval of the Report or of any revised Report which the Auditor may see fit to submit.

The Committee also considered the crediting of the Romanian contribution to the Working Capital Fund of $714.28 (Auditor's Report, Exhibit III). It felt that the Financial Regulations at the time were so ambiguous that no valid judgment can be made as to whether the crediting as reflected in the Auditor's Report or the view expressed by the USA is correct. Therefore, F&A

recommends

that no further action be taken on the crediting of the Romanian contribution to the Working Capital Fund of $714.28.

Finally, the Committee considered the form of the financial statements attached to the Auditor's Report and to the Administrative Report (Comm. Doc. 68/8) as well as a sample statement submitted by the USA. It felt that some revision in the form of the statements would assist in consideration of ICNAF finance. Therefore, F&A

recommends

that the Executive Secretary discuss with the Auditor the possible revision of the financial statements included in future Auditor's Reports, and consider the possible revision of the financial statements included in future Administrative Reports, bearing in mind the sample statement submitted by the USA.

Further, under F&A Item 6, the Committee again reviewed the financial statements for 1967/68 in the Administrative Report (Comm. Doc. 68/8) and, taking into account the effect of the recommendations dealing with financial matters recorded above, F&A

recommends

that the Administrative Report with Financial Statement for 1967/68 be adopted.

5. Under F&A Item 7, Budget Estimate 1968/69, the Executive Secretary presented proposed estimates of $105,700 which include salary adjustments (Comm. Doc. 68/9) with anticipated revenues from the ICNAF staff assessment fund and from surplus totalling about $10,700. About $95,000 would be required to meet ordinary expenditures. A further $8,000 would be required to meet special expenditures in connection with the Marine Food Chain Symposium (Appendix I). F&A

recommends

(i) that the ordinary expenditure of the Commission for the fiscal year 1968/69 be $105,000,

(ii) that these expenditures be met by appropriating $95,000 from Member Governments and the use of $10,700 in revenue from the staff assessment fund and surplus,

(iii) that the contingency amount of $2,000 in the personal services sub-section of the estimates be transferred to the contingency section of the estimates,

(iv) that $8,000 be appropriated from the Working Capital Fund to meet special expenditures in connection with the Marine Food Chain Symposium.

6. Under F&A Item 8, Budget Forecast 1969/70, the Executive Secretary presented forecast estimates of $107,700 which, with anticipated revenues from the ICNAF staff assessment fund and surplus making a total of about $11,700, would require an appropriation of about $96,000 to meet ordinary expenditures

(Appendix II). F&A

recommends

(i) that the Commission give consideration at the 1969 Annual Meeting to authorize appropriations from Member Governments for ordinary expenses for the fiscal year 1969/70 of about $96,000, the additional amount of $11,700 to meet the total ordinary expenditures of $107,700, to come from the ICNAF staff assessment fund and surplus.

During discussion of the budget forecast it was pointed out that estimates of the cost of publications had increased from $13,600 in 1966/67 to $15,000 in 1969/70. The Executive Secretary explained that this was due, among other things, to an increase in the cost of printing, an increase in the amount of statistics to be published (Statistics on fisheries in new Statistical Area 6 and on fisheries for seals) and an increase in the flow of scientific papers into the Commission in response to the need for greater research efforts to provide sound advice to the Commission.

7. Under F&A Item 9, Status of the Working Capital Fund, it was pointed out that the Working Capital Fund according to the Financial Statements for 1967/68 stands at about $15,600. This amount will be reduced by the $8,000 appropriated at 1 July 1968 to meet expenditures of the Marine Food Chain Symposium in July 1968. By the end of the 1968/69 fiscal year, the Working Capital Fund will stand at over $10,000. F&A

recommends

that the Commission accept the status of the Working Capital Fund as satisfactory.

8. Under F&A Item 12, Publications, the Executive Secretary reported on the excellent services provided by the editorial assistant. He referred the Committee to the Administrative Report (Comm. Doc. 68/8) for a detailed account of the Commission's publication record. Avenues are still being explored for the best way to reduce the Commission's inventory of back issues of some publications. The Executive Secretary reported that the Mapping and Survey Branch of the Canadian Department of Energy, Mines and Resources had revised and reprinted the coloured ICNAF map and that 1,000 copies had been purchased by the Commission for the cost of the materials. F&A

recommends

that the Canadian Government be thanked for revising and reprinting the ICNAF coloured map.

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

recommend

that the date of billing be 15 August 1969.

10. Following some discussion of the timing of the Research and Commission meetings and a review of the difficulties for the research workers in providing a well-considered report and for the Commissioners in digesting it, in so little time, the US proposed and the Committee adopted a recommendation that the Subcommittee on Financial Matters already established study the matter and make proposals for the 1969 Annual Meeting.

11. Under F&A Item 16, Election of Chairman, Mr R. Green was unanimously elected Chairman of the Committee for the year 1968/69.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No.2124
(B.c.68)

Proceedings No.17
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

1968/69 Expenditures to be Covered by Appropriations from Contracting Governments and from Other Sources

1.	Personal Services		
	(a) Salaries	$59,000[a]	
	(b) Superannuation and Canada Pension Plan	1,800	
	(c) Additional help	1,200	
	(d) Group medical and insurance plans	500	
	(e) Retroactive salaries	1,200	
2.	Travel	6,500	
3.	Transportation	500	
4.	Communications	3,500	
5.	Publications	14,000[b]	
6.	Other contractual services	4,000	
7.	Materials and supplies	3,500	
8.	Equipment	1,000	
9.	Annual Meeting	6,000	
10.	Contingencies	3,000	
Total ordinary expenditures			$105,700
Sources of revenue to meet ordinary expenditures			
	(a) ICNAF staff assessment fund	ca. $10,700	
	(b) Appropriation from Member Countries	95,000	$105,700
Special expenditures			
	Marine Food Chains Symposium		$8,000
Source of revenue to meet special expenditures			
	(Working Capital Fund)		$8,000

---

a)	Executive Secretary	$21,428
	Assistant Executive Secretary	14,007
	Editorial Assistant	8,076
	Senior Secretary	6,182
	Clerk Stenographer	5,211
	Clerk Typist	4,009
b)	Ann. Proc. Vol. 18	$1,500
	Stat. Bull, Vol. 17	5,000
	Res. Bull. No. 5	5,000
	Sampling Yearbook, Vol. 12	600
	Redbook 1968	1,000
	List of Vessels 1968	900

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.2128
(B.c.68)

Proceedings No.17
Appendix II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

1969/70 Expenditures to be Covered by Appropriations from Contracting Governments

1.	Personal Services		
	(a) Salaries	$60,000[a]	
	(b) Superannuation and Canada Pension Plan	2,000	
	(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	15,000[b]	
6.	Other contractual services	4,000	
7.	Materials and supplies	3,500	
8.	Equipment	1,000	
9.	Annual Meeting	4,000	
10.	Contingencies	1,000	
Total ordinary expenditures			$107,700
Sources of revenue to meet ordinary expenditures			
	(a) ICNAF staff assessment fund and surplus	ca. $11,700	
	(b) Appropriations from Member Countries	ca. 96,000	$107,700

---

a)	Executive Secretary	$21,428
	Assistant Executive Secretary	14,007
	Editorial Assistant	8,413
	Senior Secretary	6,379
	Clerk Stenographer	5,383
	Clerk Typist	4,133
b)	Ann. Proc. Vol. 19	$1,500
	Stat. Bull. Vol. 18	6,000
	Res. Bull. No. 6	5,500
	Sampling Yearbook, Vol. 13	600
	Redbook 1969	1,400

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 2125
(B.b.68)

Proceedings No. 18

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of the Fourth Plenary Session

Friday, 7 June, 1710 hours

1. The Chairman opened the meeting and asked the Executive Secretary to read the Report of the Second Plenary Session (Proc. 14), which dealt with Plenary Agenda Item 11, Amendments to the Convention. The Committee agreed that changes suggested by the US Delegate and additions suggested by the USSR Delegate should be included in the Report which should be redrafted and presented at the Fifth Plenary Session. The Report of the Third Plenary Session (Proc. 15) was read and adopted by the Plenary.

2. Further, under Plenary Agenda Item 11, the Chairman then called for consideration of the draft resolution requested by the Second Plenary Session relating to Articles VII and VIII which deal with regulatory measures. The Plenary, after discussion, adopted the resolution which is attached as Appendix I. Annex I is the US draft Protocol to the Convention, relating to regulatory measures, as amended by the Second Plenary Session.

3. The Chairman asked the Executive Secretary to read the Report of the Joint Meeting of Panels (Proc. 13) which dealt with Plenary Agenda Item 20, Conservation Measures for Atlantic Salmon. The Committee approved the Report subject to the incorporation of changes proposed by the Canadian, Danish, US and UK Delegates.

4. The Chairman drew attention to the draft resolution requested by the Joint Meeting of Panels relating to Plenary Agenda Item 20, the Canadian Proposal to Stabilize the Atlantic Salmon Fisheries in the North Atlantic Area at the 1967 Level.

The UK Delegation said that while it appreciated the reasons for which the Canadian Delegation had proposed a compromise resolution and had not objected to its preparation, it thought it premature to abandon consideration of the original Canadian proposal set out in Comm. Doc. 68/20 for stabilizing the high seas fishery. This proposal had been supported by several delegations and some, like the UK, would have preferred a complete ban on the high seas fishery. In the opinion of the UK, other delegations had under-estimated the threat to stocks which this fishery involved. There was a real risk of rapid escalation to a catch of the order of 2,000-2,500 tons in a few years and if action by the Commission had to await definite scientific proof of damage, the stocks might suffer irreparable harm meanwhile. Experience in the UK in the early 1960's showed how a drift net fishery could expand very rapidly when concentrations of salmon in the sea were discovered. The fishery was lucrative and encouraged diversion from other types of fishing. In consequence, the UK had prohibited drift net fishing in a wide area off the coast of Scotland.

In the UK view the same could happen in the ICNAF Area. There was a vast potential of fishing vessels in the North Atlantic which could be diverted seasonally to a high seas fishery. The effort diverted might be small in relation to the catches of other sea fish (which were reckoned in millions of tons) but the addition of even a few vessels to the salmon fishery, the total catch of which was of the order of 4,000-5,000 tons, would be significant when it was appreciated that one vessel had caught nearly a quarter of the high seas catch in 1967. Moreover, the European component of the stock of salmon in the ICNAF Area was vulnerable to capture in new fisheries such as those likely to develop off the Faroes. For these reasons the UK considered that the threat to the stock was real and imminent and called for an immediate holding operation. In addition the UK endorsed the views of the USA that the salmon stock could only be sensibly managed in the home waters of origin; but this would be impossible if the stock were exposed to indiscriminate capture on the high seas.

(over)

The Norwegian Delegate said he favoured the present resolution as a satisfactory compromise. The Canadian Delegate said he had accepted the compromise reluctantly as being inevitable rather than his wish. The US Delegate said there was little persuasion in the resolution and suggested it be reworded in stronger terms. The Danish Delegate reported that he could not accept the original Canadian proposal nor could he accept a stronger resolution but that his Government was prepared to give maximum cooperation in research. He affirmed that he would make sure his Government fully understood the degree of seriousness with which the countries regard the problem. The Norwegian Delegate said he was unable to commit his Goverrment on the original Canadian proposal and could only accept the present resolution.

The UK Delegate proposed, in view of the previously expressed opinion, that the draft resolution be amended as shown in Appendix II. There being no objection, the draft resolution, as amended by the UK Delegate, was approved by the Plenary.

5. The meeting adjourned at 1835 hours.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 2125
(B.b.68)

Proceedings No. 18
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Resolution Relating to a US Proposal for Amendment

of the Convention Articles Which Deal with Regulatory Measures

(Plenary Agenda Item 11)

The Commission

having considered Comm. Doc. 68/18 embodying a proposal from the delegation of the United States of America putting forward a draft Protocol for the amendment of Articles VII and VIII of the Convention:

taking into account the views expressed by Delegations of other Member Countries and noting that there was general agreement in principle that the Convention should be amended to allow the Commission greater flexibility in the proposals for regulatory measures which it may make to Contracting Governments

resolved

that Contracting Governments be invited to consider the draft Protocol amended as shown in Annex I by the US in the light of the discussion and be requested to inform the Commission of their views so that at its meeting in 1969 the Commission may reach agreement on further action to be recommended to Governments.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.2125
(B.b.68)

Proceedings No. 18
Appendix I, Annex 1

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Draft Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, Relating to Regulatory Measures

The Governments parties to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries signed at Washington under date of 8 February 1949, which Convention, as amended, is hereinafter referred to as the Convention, desiring to provide for greater flexibility in the types of fisheries regulatory measures which may be proposed by the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Paragraph 2 of Article VII of the Convention shall be amended to read as follows:

"2. Each Panel, upon the basis of scientific investigations, and economic and technical considerations, may make recommendations to the Commission for joint action by the Contracting Governments within the scope of paragraph 1 of Article VIII."

ARTICLE II

Paragraph 1 of Article VIII of the Convention shall be amended to read as follows:

"1. The Commission may, on the recommendations of one or more Panels, and on the basis of scientific investigations, and economic and technichal considerations, transmit to the Depositary Government appropriate proposals, for joint action by the Contracting Governments, designed to achieve the optimum utilization of the stocks of those species of fish which support international fisheries in the Convention Area."

ARTICLE III

1. This Protocol shall be open for signature and ratification or approval or for adherence on behalf of any Government party to the Convention.

2. This Protocol shall enter into force on the date on which instruments of ratification or approval have been deposited with, or written notifications of adherence have been received by, the Government of the United States of America, on behalf of all the Governments parties to the Convention.

3. Any Government which adheres to the Convention after this Protocol has been opened for signature shall at the same time adhere to this Protocol.

4. The Government of the United States of America shall inform all Governments signatory or adhering to the Convention of all ratifications or approvals deposited and adherences received and of the date this Protocol enters into force.

ARTICLE IV

1. The original of this Protocol shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, which Government shall communicate certified copies thereof to all the Governments signatory or adhering to the Convention.

2. This Protocol shall bear the date on which it is opened for signature and shall remain open for signature for a period of fourteen days thereafter, following which period it shall be open for adherence.

(over)

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, having deposited their respective powers, have signed this Protocol.

Done at Washington this _____day of_____1968, in the English language

For Canada:

For Denmark:

For the Federal Republic of Germany:

For France:

For Iceland:

For Italy:

For Norway:

For Poland:

For Portugal:

For Romania:

For Spain:

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

For the United States of America:

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No.2125
(B.b.68)

Proceedings No.18
Appendix II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Resolution Relating to the Conservation of Atlantic Salmon

(Plenary Agenda Item 20)

The Commission

calls the attention of Member Governments to the serious concern expressed by several Delegations who considered that the high seas fishing for salmon should either be prohibited or stabilized at its present level in view of the potential danger which it presents to the Atlantic salmon resources and

recommends to Member Governments

that they consider urgently the desirability of preventing increase in high seas fishing for salmon by their nationals in the ICNAF Area for the time being, and that high priority be given to studies of the effects of such high seas fishing on the resources.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.2078
(B.b.68)

Proceedings No. 19

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of Fifth Plenary Session

Saturday, 8 June, 1010 hours

1. The Chairman, Mr V. Kamentsev (USSR), opened the meeting with representatives of all Member Countries present.

2. The Chairman called for consideration of the Reports of the Second (Proc. 14) and Fourth (Proc. 18) Plenary Sessions. The Reports were adopted by the Plenary.

3. Under Plenary Item 25, Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (Proc. 1, being Redbook 1968, Part I), Mr Sv. Aa. Horsted (Denmark), Chairman of the Standing Committee, presented the Report which was adopted with its recommendations and conclusions by the Plenary.

4. Under Plenary Item 26, Report of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, Mr Green (USA), Chairman of the Standing Committee, presented the Reports of the First (Proc. 9), Second (Proc. 12), and Third (Proc. 17) Meetings of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration. The Reports were adopted unanimously with their recommendations and conclusions by the Plenary. In accordance with the amended Commission Rule of Procedure 16 (b), the Plenary agreed that Canada, Denmark, United Kingdom, USSR and USA should each nominate one member to form, as at 1 July 1968, the new Standing Committee on Finance and Administration. (The new Standing Committee met on 8 June 1968 and elected Mr R. Green (USA) Chairman under the amended Commission Rule of Procedure 16 (b)).

5. Under Plenary Item 27, Report of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures, the Chairman drew attention to the Report of the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures, London, 30 January-1 February 1968 (Proc. 16, Appendix I, also circulated as Comm. Doc. 68/6), and to the Report of the Meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures (Proc. 16) which considered Plenary Agenda Item 19, Problems of Limiting Fishing as a Conservation Measure. The Polish Delegate referred to previous discussions reported in Proc. 16 and stated that the Polish Delegation was not in a position to accept the idea of freezing catch quotas either on the basis of the average catch for the last 3 years or on the grounds of a proportion of the average historical catch covering the last 10-year period as proposed by the US delegation. Accepting this proposal might almost eliminate Poland from the ICNAF fisheries. It was felt that the Commission should find other criteria to make possible the maintenance of maximum sustained catch and of rational utilization. The Plenary adopted both Reports and agreed that the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures and a group of experts from the R&S Subcommittee on Assessments should meet, the former for 3 days and the latter for 4 following days, towards the end of January 1969 in London.

6. Under Plenary Item 20, Conservation Needs for Atlantic Salmon, the Executive Secretary was instructed to inform the Norges Jeger - OG Fiskerforbund, a Nordic sport and hunting organization, that its letter requesting control be placed on the high seas salmon fishery in the North Atlantic had been received and the Commission informed of its contents. The Plenary agreed that such requests should only come to the Commission through national delegations.

7. The Chairman requested consideration of the Report of the Meeting of the *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations (Proc. 11) which dealt with Plenary Item 12, Annual Returns of Infringements; 13, Simplification of International Trawl Regulations; 14, Topside Chafer; and 15, Mesh Measuring. The Report was reviewed by the Chairman, Mr A. J. Aglen (UK), and approved by the Plenary.

8. Under Plenary Item 17, Form of International Inspection Scheme, the Chairman drew attention to the Report of the Special Meeting of the *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations (Appendix I; also circulated as Comm. Doc. 68/23), which had considered the possible form of an international inspection scheme for ICNAF based on the NEAFC scheme, in accordance with a decision of the 1967 Annual Meeting.

(over)

In the discussion which followed, delegates agreed that an adequate and uniform scheme of inspection was desirable. However, some delegates felt that it would be difficult to accept inspection of gear and catch below decks. The Polish Delegate proposed that, as a first step, all Member Governments should be encouraged to establish effective national control systems and submitted the following draft resolution for consideration by the Plenary:

> "The Commission, endorsing the idea derived from the ICNAF Convention that priority should be given in respect of establishing the national control system, decides to encourage the lacking states of this system of control, to establish it at the earliest possible convenience.
>
> "The Commission considers that the national control system should be the proper basis on which can be established an international inspection scheme."

The US Delegate reiterated its view that a strong and effective system of international control should be instituted in the ICNAF Area as soon as possible and proposed that the Commission consider accepting the ICNAF modified NEAFC scheme subject to ratification of the Protocol Relating to Measures of Control. The US Delegate submitted the following draft resolution for consideration by the Plenary:

> "The Commission directs the Executive Secretary to submit the modified Scheme of International Enforcement included in the Report of the Special Meeting of the *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations (Appendix I, Annex 1) to Commissioners for a mail vote immediately on entry into force of the Protocol Relating to Measures of Control. The Secretary is authorized to consider that there has been the required two-thirds vote unless within three months from the date of his submission of the modified Scheme to Commissioners for the mail vote he has received more than one-third negative responses, and to forward the modified Scheme to the Depositary Government as a Commission proposal to the Member Governments."

The Chairman requested consideration of the draft Polish resolution. After a number of suggestions were made and accepted, the following amended resolution was adopted by the Plenary:

> "The Commission, endorsing the idea derived from the ICNAF Convention that priority should be given in respect of establishing the national control system, decides to encourage all member countries to strengthen their national control system at the earliest possible convenience, if necessary or possible."

The Chairman then asked for consideration of the US resolution. Attention was directed by some delegates to the possible validity of the procedures embodied in the resolution. At this point, the US Delegate requested that the US resolution be withdrawn from consideration by the Plenary.

The Plenary then accepted the Report of the Special Meeting of the *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations (Appendix I).

9. Under Plenary Item 29, Date and Place of 1970 Annual Meeting, the Canadian Delegate extended an invitation from the Government of Canada to hold the 1970 Annual Meeting in St. John's, Newfoundland, during the first full week in June 1970, the exact dates to be fixed later.

The Chairman asked the Canadian Delegate to thank the Canadian Government for the kind invitation and reminded delegates that the 1969 Annual Meeting would be held in Warsaw, Poland, during the first full week in June 1969.

10. Under Plenary Item 30, Press Statement, the Plenary agreed that the Committee on Publicity should be empowered to prepare a statement covering the activities, recommendations and conclusions of the 18th Annual Meeting for release to the press.

11. Under Plenary Item 31, Other Business, Captain T. de Almeida, on behalf of the Commission and his delegation, thanked Her Majesty's Government for the

excellent meeting facilities and the warm hospitality. He also commended Mr Kamentsev for his efficient work as Chairman of the 18th Annual Meeting. A detailed account of the statement by Mr J Gulland, Observer for FAO, is attached as Appendix II. The Observer for ICES, Mr Hans Tambs-Lyche, Secretary General of ICES, expressed his appreciation of the opportunity to attend an ICNAF meeting for the first time and reviewed the cooperative and coordinated work of ICES and ICNAF. The Observer for IOC, Mr O. J. Ostvedt, spoke of the value of the IOC/ICES/ICNAF Coordinating Group for coordinating work on North Atlantic oceanographic problems and programs. The Observer for Japan, Mr Furuya, expressed his country's continuing interest in the work of the Commission and indicated that Japanese fishing vessels would again be carrying out limited exploratory fishing in the Convention Area. The Observer for Cuba expressed his Government's appreciation for the invitation to attend, for the first time, a Commission Annual Meeting. He reported that Cuban fishing vessels operated in all subareas and took about 600 metric tons of cod.

12. The Chairman expressed his thanks to Her Majesty's Government for the cooperation and hospitality and to the Commissioners and their advisers and the Commission Secretariat for their good efforts on behalf of the Commission at its 18th Annual Meeting.

13. The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 1400 hours.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No. 2105
(B.g.11)

Proceedings No. 19
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Report of the Special Meeting of the *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations

London, 30-31 May, 1968[1]

The Special Meeting of the ICNAF *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations met at Church House, London, on 30-31 May 1968 to consider the possible form of an international inspection scheme for ensuring the application of the Convention and the measures in force under the Convention, in accordance with a decision of the 1967 Annual Meeting. Since Canada was unable to provide a Chairman, as requested, it was decided that Mr A. J. Aglen (UK) would take the Chair. Mr W. L. Sullivan, Jr. (USA) was selected as Rapporteur.

Representatives were present from the following Member Governments: Canada, Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, USSR, UK, and USA.

The Committee had before it the following material:

1. A summary of the decision of the 1967 Annual Meeting and the documentation (ICNAF Circular Letter 68/11).

2. A copy of the scheme of joint enforcement adopted by the Fifth Meeting of NEAFC, May 1967 (Comm. Doc. 68/17, Annex 1).

3. The assembled views of Member Governments regarding an international inspection scheme for ICNAF based on the scheme adopted by NEAFC. (Comm. Doc. 68/17, Annexes II-XII).

4. The report of the Sixth Meeting of NEAFC, May 1968, containing further considerations by its delegates of the NEAFC scheme of joint enforcement (Comm. Doc. 68/15).

At the suggestion of the Chairman it was agreed that the points set forth in ICNAF Circular Letter 68/11 could serve as the agenda. The Chairman reviewed the actions on this subject which had been taken at the recent NEAFC meeting. NEAFC reaffirmed the Scheme of Joint Enforcement and adopted arrangements set out in Comm. Doc. 68/15, Annex B, which it hoped would overcome the difficulties to which its previous recommendation had given rise.

The Committee then had a general discussion on the suitability of the NEAFC Scheme as a basis for an international inspection scheme in the ICNAF Area. The United States, whose views are set out more fully in Annex II to this report, were strongly in favour of an international inspection scheme and said they preferred a stronger scheme than the NEAFC which in their view was a minimal scheme. Portugal indicated that for the reasons set forth in Annex VIII to Comm. Doc. 68/17, it felt the need for a different scheme operated by agents of the Commission but was willing to fall in with the wishes of the majority. The USSR, whose views are recorded more fully in Annex III to this report, reaffirmed their support for the expeditious adoption by ICNAF of an international inspection scheme to supplement national inspection; but said that certain provisions of the NEAFC scheme relating to inspection of catch and inspection of nets below deck were unacceptable to them. Poland reiterated its view that inspection should be carried out on a basis of mutuality under bilateral agreements; and Poland and Romania said they shared the views of the USSR about inspection of catch and nets below deck.

In the light of the discussion the consensus in the Committee was that a scheme based on the NEAFC scheme afforded the best means of making quick progress in the introduction of international inspection arrangements in the ICNAF Area. The Committee agreed therefore to recommend that the NEAFC scheme

[1] Circulated earlier as Comm. Doc. 68/23

(over)

should be adopted with such modifications as were needed to make it compatible with the ICNAF regulations subject to arrangements similar to those adopted by NEAFC, in anticipation of bilateral exceptions which are provided for in paragraph 9 (ii) of the scheme, (set out in Annex B to Comm. Doc. 68/15) in order to facilitate acceptance by those countries to whom certain provisions of the scheme were objectionable.

In the light of this agreement the Committee examined the NEAFC scheme paragraph by paragraph and identified the alterations needed to suit ICNAF conditions, noting that it was desirable to keep these to the minimum in order that so far as possible the schemes on both sides of the Atlantic should be the same.

Paragraph by paragraph comments follow:

Preamble - It was agreed that the ICNAF scheme should refer to paragraph 5 of Article VIII of the ICNAF Convention.

Paragraphs 1-3 - No comments.

Paragraph 4 - The USSR reaffirmed its views that the scheme should not include vessels engaged in "the treatment of sea fish" or "examination of catch" and suggested that these be deleted. The general view was that they should be retained, bearing in mind the provisions of paragraph 9 (ii) and the device worked out in NEAFC.

Paragraph 5-8 - No comments.

Paragraph 10 - The USA suggested that sub-paragraphs (i) through (iv) could be omitted since these provisions are contained in the basic ICNAF regulations and that a brief note could be substituted that inspections would follow the procedures contained in the basic regulations. It was noted that this would have the advantage of automatically keeping the international scheme compatible with the basic regulations as they might be amended from time to time. While NEAFC needed these sub-paragraphs because there are no such provisions in its basic regulations, ICNAF does not need them. This was agreed together with a further suggestion that sub-paragraph (v) be somewhat revised in drafting the substitute for sub-paragraphs (i) through (iv).

The USSR reaffirmed its view that sub-paragraph (vi) should be revised so as to exclude inspection of nets below deck. This view was shared by some other Delegations, but the general view was that inspection below deck should be retained, and Members which object should refer to paragraph 9 (ii) and the device adopted by NEAFC. It was finally agreed that, since the wording of the sub-paragraph had been an attempt to reach a compromise with Members which object to inspection below deck, and since these Members have indicated that they will make reservations on this subject under paragraph 9 (ii), it would be preferable to revert to the original view of most Members that "all nets" should be subject to inspection.

Paragraph 11 - It was suggested that the affixing of identification marks be made permissive rather than mandatory. However, it was agreed that it should be left mandatory since this was designed to assist those Members who require such identification.

Paragraph 13 - The USA suggested that the paragraph be made more general to allow for inspections of catch which might be required under regulations adopted in future. The USA noted that the Commission appears to be moving inevitably toward some form of effort or catch limitation. The USSR on the other hand felt that the paragraph should be deleted in keeping with its general views relating to the inspection of catch. A Spanish suggestion that the Commission provide inspectors with a uniform and up-to-date set of regulations in force was supported by the USA but subsequently withdrawn. It was felt that the desired end could be achieved without including it in the scheme. The Rapporteur provided recent information concerning the entry into force of up-to-date regulations in Subareas 1, 2 and 3 on 21 September 1968.

(over)

The Committee agreed to leave to the Chairman and Rapporteur, with such assistance as might be offered, the task of drafting the amendments to give effect to the modifications of the NEAFC scheme which had been agreed. The amendments set out in Annex I to this report were subsequently approved by the Committee.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No.2105
(B.g.11)

Proceedings No.19
Appendix I
Annex I(a)

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Proposals for Changes by ICNAF in the Scheme of Joint Enforcement

Adopted by Fifth Meeting of NEAFC

1. Change "Contracting States" to "Contracting Governments" wherever it occurs in paragraphs (1), (8) and (9). In paragraph 4 omit "of any Contracting State".

2. Preamble - "Pursuant to paragraph 5 of Article VIII of the Convention.....".

3. Paragraph 10 - substitute the following:

(10)(i) Nets shall be inspected in accordance with the regulations in force for the Subarea in which the inspection takes place. The number of undersized meshes and the width of each mesh examined shall be entered in the inspector's report, together with the average width of the meshes examined.

(ii) Inspectors shall have authority to inspect all nets.

4. Paragraph 13 - substitute the following:

(13) The inspector shall have authority, subject to any limitations imposed by the Commission, to carry out such examination and measurement of the catch as he deems necessary to establish whether the Commission's recommendations are being complied with. He shall report his findings to the authorities of the flag state of the inspected vessel as soon as possible.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No.2105
(B.g.11)

Proceedings No.19
Appendix I
Annex I(b)

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

NEAFC Scheme of Joint International Enforcement for ICNAF

As Amended by the *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations

Recommendation

Pursuant to paragraph 5 of Article VIII of the Convention the Commission recommends the establishment of the following arrangements for international control outside territorial waters and fishery limits for the purpose of ensuring the application of the Convention and the measures in force thereunder:

(1) Control shall be carried out by inspectors of the fishery control services of Contracting Governments. The names of the inspectors appointed for that purpose by their respective governments shall be notified to the Commission.

(2) Ships carrying inspectors shall fly a special flag or pennant approved by the Commission to indicate that the inspector is carrying out international inspection duties. The names of the ships so used for the time being, which may be either special inspection vessels or fishing vessels, shall be notified to the Commission.

(3) Each inspector shall carry a document of identity supplied by the authorities of the flag state in a form approved by the Commission and given him on appointment stating that he has authority to act under the arrangements approved by the Commission.

(4) Subject to the arrangements agreed under paragraph (9), a vessel employed for the time being in fishing for sea fish or in the treatment of sea fish in the Convention area shall stop when given the appropriate signal in the International Code of Signals by a ship carrying an inspector unless actually fishing, shooting or hauling, in which case it shall stop immediately it has finished hauling. The master of the vessel shall permit the inspector, who may be accompanied by a witness, to board it. The master shall enable the inspector to make such examination of catch, nets or other gear and any relevant documents as the inspector deems necessary to verify the observance of the Commission's recommendations in force in relation to the flag state of the vessel concerned and the inspector may ask for any explanations that he deems necessary.

(5) On boarding the vessel an inspector shall produce the document described in (3) above. Inspections shall be made so that the vessel suffers the minimum interference and inconvenience. An inspector shall limit his enquiries to the ascertainment of the facts in relation to the observance of the Commission's recommendations in force in relation to the flag state of the vessel concerned. In making his examination an inspector may ask the master for any assistance he may require. He shall draw up a report of his inspection in a form approved by the Commission. He shall sign the report in the presence of the master of the vessel who shall be entitled to add or have added to the report any observations which he may think suitable and must sign such observations. Copies of the report shall be given to the master of the vessel and to the Inspector's Government who shall transmit copies to the appropriate authorities of the flag state of the vessel and to the Commission. Where any infringement of the recommendations is discovered the inspector should where possible also inform the competent authorities of the flag state, as notified to the Commission, and any inspection ship of the flag state known to be in the vicinity.

(6) Resistance to an inspector or failure to comply with his directions shall be treated by the flag state of the vessel as if the inspector were an inspector of that state.

(over)

(7) Inspectors shall carry out their duties under these arrangements in accordance with the rules set out in this recommendation but they shall remain under the operational control of their national authorities and shall be responsible to them.

(8) Contracting Governments shall consider and act on reports of foreign inspectors under these arrangements on the same basis as reports of national inspectors. The provisions of this paragraph shall not impose any obligation on a Contracting Government to give the report of a foreign inspector a higher evidential value than it would possess in the inspector's own country. Contracting Governments shall collaborate in order to facilitate judicial or other proceedings arising from a report of an inspector under these arrangements.

(9) (i) Contracting Governments shall inform the Commission by 1st March each year of their provisional plans for participation in these arrangements in the following year and the Commission may make suggestions to Contracting Governments for the co-ordination of national operations in this field including the number of inspectors and ships carrying inspectors.

(ii) The arrangements set out in this Recommendation and the plans for participation shall apply between Contracting Governments unless otherwise agreed between them; and such agreement shall be notified to the Commission:

> Provided, however, that implementation of the scheme shall be suspended between any two Contracting Governments if either of them has notified the Commission to that effect, pending completion of an agreement.

(10) (i) Nets shall be inspected in accordance with the regulations in force for the subarea in which the inspection takes place. The number of undersized meshes and the width of each mesh examined shall be entered in the inspector's report, together with the average width of the meshes examined.

(ii) Inspectors shall have authority to inspect all nets.

(11) The inspector shall affix an identification mark approved by the Commission, to any net which appears to have been used in contravention of the Commission's recommendations in force in relation to the flag state of the vessel concerned and shall record this fact in his report.

(12) The inspector may photograph the net in such a way that the identification mark and the measurement of the net is visible, in which case the subjects photographed should be listed in the report and copies of the photographs should be attached to the copy of the report to the flag state.

(13) The inspector shall have authority, subject to any limitations imposed by the Commission, to carry out such examination and measurement of the catch as he deems necessary to establish whether the Commission's recommendations are being complied with. He shall report his findings to the authorities of the flag state of the inspected vessel as soon as possible.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No.2105
(B.g.11)

Proceedings No.19
Appendix I
Annex II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Statement by the USA on the form of an international inspection scheme

The United States considers it essential that a strong and effective system of international inspection be instituted in the ICNAF area as soon as possible. The United States does not consider the Scheme adopted by NEAFC to be strong and effective, rather, it considers it minimal. However, the US is willing to accept the NEAFC Scheme as the basis for an ICNAF system in the interest of bringing such a system into effect as quickly as possible. Certain modifications will be necessary to make the minimal NEAFC Scheme compatible with the basic ICNAF regulations in force.

The United States trusts that operations under the minimal Scheme will soon demonstrate that it is possible to improve the Scheme so that it will be truly strong and effective. The United States believes that the inspector should be permitted to examine all nets and catch aboard a vessel, since such examination might indicate infractions of the regulations which would otherwise go unnoticed. For example, the inspector might find that the nets on deck are small meshed and the fish on deck primarily of non-regulated species indicating no violation; but if further examination indicated most fish on board to be regulated species and all nets stowed below deck to be small meshed also he would reasonably conclude that the vessel was not complying with the Regulations.

Nevertheless, the United States is willing to accept the compromise set forth in paragraph (10)(vi) which would restrict the examination of nets below deck to those which are wet if all other Members will likewise accept the compromise without reservation. This would prevent fishermen from putting a small meshed net used in violation of the Regulations below deck to avoid inspection.

The United States also believes that there should be general authority for the inspector to examine the catch for additional reasons to the one cited above. The Commission should not have to amend the international inspection system whenever it adopts a new Regulation. Rather, the system should be general enough to permit the inspector to undertake any examination necessary to ascertain whether any Regulation is being complied with. The present Convention permits the adoption of Regulations which would require the examination of catch, and the Commission appears inevitably moving toward some form of catch limitations which would require examination of catch.

The United States considers, of course, that the inspectors will use discretion in examining nets and catch only to the extent necessary to observe compliance with any Regulations in force.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No.2105
(B.g.11)

Proceedings No.19
Appendix I
Annex III

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Statement by the USSR on the form of an international inspection scheme

The Soviet Delegation considers that the joint enforcement system could be a useful supplement to an effective system of national inspection, but that it cannot substitute for national inspection on the high seas, which some Members of ICNAF unfortunately have not yet established.

The Joint Enforcement Scheme adopted at the Fifth NEAFC Meeting probably gives a sound basis for developing an appropriate scheme in ICNAF, having due regard to specific provisions of the regulatory system found in the Northwest Atlantic.

1) The ICNAF Regulations do not prescribe a minimum size for fish caught. However, they do include the allowable size of the bycatch of regulated species when fishing for non-regulated species with small mesh nets.

It is quite obvious that in such a situation only national inspection can ascertain whether the catch is in accordance with the regulations in force since national inspection is carried out not only on the high seas but also in the home ports, where the necessary facilities are found for weighing the catch and systematically examining the fishing log books.

For this reason we think that the examination of catches on a foreign vessel by an inspector probably is not required in the ICNAF Area.

2) In the ICNAF Area different minimum mesh sizes are found for different subareas. Fishing of non-regulated species with small mesh nets is allowed. Consequently, a vessel may have in its holds a wide assortment of nets which may be used in accordance with the Regulations applicable in the area with regard to the species of fish. For this reason the only task of the inspector is to ascertain whether the mesh size in the codend of a trawl which was on deck and used in that place is in accordance with the Regulations in force there. It is quite obvious that the inspector would not have any grounds for the examination of nets in the hold since the presence of nets by itself without any connection being established to the subarea where they were used would not give the inspector any basis on which to judge whether the Regulations were being observed.

The inspector should reach a conclusion whether the inspected vessel observes the Regulations in force. This is his only duty. Therefore, we cannot agree in principle with charging the inspector with duties which are beyond the scope of the Convention.

We understand that at present the Joint Enforcement Scheme is not perfect in all its details. Perhaps practice will show the way in the future to improve the Scheme. However, it is important to start this great enterprise, on which we have been working for a number of years.

Proceeding from the above, our Delegation confirms the desire and readiness of the Soviet Union to bring the Joint Enforcement Scheme into force and to send appropriate inspection vessels to the ICNAF Area, as soon as all other Members of ICNAF are prepared to bring the Scheme into effect.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

RESTRICTED

Serial No.2105
(B.g.11)

Proceedings No.19
Appendix II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Statement to the Fifth Plenary Session of ICNAF

by Mr J. Gulland, FAO Observer

"Mr Chairman, I would like to thank ICNAF, on behalf of FAO, for the opportunity once more to take part as observers, in the activities of your Commission. I would also like to record my personal pleasure in meeting once more so many old friends.

"The collaboration between FAO and ICNAF has been a long and close one, especially in the work of your R&S Committee, and its activities on statistics, and in stock assessment, dating back to the time of the first stock assessment working group, and earlier. This collaboration is proving increasingly valuable to FAO outside the ICNAF Area. In many parts of the world, fisheries are now facing the same problems of the rational exploitation of the resource as have been faced in the ICNAF Area. The experience gained by FAO in working with ICNAF in the problems of the Northwest Atlantic is proving very helpful in tackling similar problems in other parts of the world.

"In particular the proposal made at this meeting to amend the Convention is very interesting at a time when FAO is responsible for drawing up a draft convention for the southeast and southwest Atlantic. There is no doubt that the conservation measures listed at the time ICNAF began its work are proving inadequate and that a high degree of flexibility is required to deal with the rapidly changing pattern of world fisheries. At the speed with which conventions and similar international agreements come into force, action is needed now to equip ourselves with the tools for tackling regulatory problems of 1975.

"I would also like to say a few words regarding the maximum sustainable yield, as the aim of management measures. The economic objections to this concept have been made clear in your discussions, but it is also true that the taking of the maximum sustained yield from particular stocks is likely to be incompatible with obtaining the greatest total yield from the ocean as a whole. For instance the excessive fishing required to take the last few percent of the maximum catch from the cod stock in Subarea 1 would produce a much bigger catch if engaged on one of the less heavily fished stocks, either in the ICNAF Area or elsewhere. FAO is, for these reasons, watching with great interest the work of your new Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures, and is indeed collaborating closely with it in its work. Naturally its progress may be at first slow, though I have listened with interest to the concrete proposals for study put forward at this meeting, especially that for reserving 20% of the total when allocating catch quotas to countries. This may, at least in the short term, solve some of the problems of satisfying special interests, such as those of coastal states, or developing countries. In the longer term there must be some wider system of continuing readjustment of all the quota. For instance a share of the quota might only be tenable for 10 or 20 years, so that each year 10% or 5% of the quota would be available for redistribution, perhaps being allocated to the country prepared to pay the highest licence fee.

"Another problem in the ICNAF Area which is of far from local interest is that of the mobile fleets. A rough calculation shows that the share of these fleets in the total catch by ICNAF Member Countries (not only in the ICNAF Area) has increased from 13% in 1954 to 23% in 1966. The operation of these fleets has led to what has been described in the R&S Committee as pulse fishing, that is, within a period of a few years fishing on a stock increases from very little, past the optimum level, and then perhaps decreases to very little again after the stock becomes seriously depleted. These developments can occur too fast for proper scientific studies to be made, let alone appropriate conservation measures to be introduced, before serious damage is done to the stock. To avoid this

(over)

danger,and the opposite danger of under-exploiting the resource, by a complete ban on any increase of fishing, it may be desirable to consider the restriction of the increase in fishing to some moderate rate, e.g. 20% per year, to allow scientific studies to keep pace with the practical developments.

"In conclusion, Mr Chairman, may I thank you again for the opportunity to be here, and hope for the continued cooperation between FAO and ICNAF and its various committees and subcommittees."

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1968

Officers

Chairman of Commission	-	Mr V.M.Kamentsev (USSR)
Vice-Chairman of Commission	-	Dr A.W.H.Needler (Canada)
Executive Secretary	-	Mr L.R.Day (ICNAF Secretariat)

Panels

Chairman, Panel 1	-	Mr O. Lund (Norway)
" Scientific Advisers	-	Dr J. Messtorff (Fed. Rep. Germany)
Chairman, Panel 2	-	Mr G. Mocklinghoff (Fed. Rep. Germany)
" Scientific Advisers	-	Dr A.S.Bogdanov (USSR)
Chairman, Panel 3	-	Dr F. Chrzan (Poland)
" Scientific Advisers	-	Dr H.A.Cole (UK)
Chairman, Panel 4	-	Captain T. de Almeida (Portugal)
" Scientific Advisers	-	Dr R. Monteiro (Portugal)
Chairman, Panel 5	-	Mr R.W.Green (USA)
" Scientific Advisers	-	Dr G.F.M.Smith (Canada)
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	-	Mr Sv. Aa. Horsted (Denmark)

Finance and Administration

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

Regulatory Measures

Chairman of Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures	-	Mr J. Graham (UK)