



PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
19TH ANNUAL MEETING
1969

CONTENTS

- Proceedings No.1 - Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, with Appendices (published as Redbook 1969, Part I, and not included hereunder)
- Proceedings No.2 - Report of Meeting of Panel A (Seals), with appendices
- Proceedings No.3 - Report of Meeting of Panel 3, with appendix
- Proceedings No.4 - Report of Meeting of Panel 4, with appendices
- Proceedings No.5 - Report of Meeting of Panel 5, with appendices
- Proceedings No.6 - Report of Meeting of Panel 1, with appendix
- Proceedings No.7 - Report of Meeting of Panel 2, with appendix
- Proceedings No.8 - Report of First Plenary Session, with appendix
- Proceedings No.9 - Report of First Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration
- Proceedings No.10 - Report of Ceremonial Opening Meeting
- Proceedings No.11 - Report of Meeting of Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures, with appendix
- Proceedings No.12 - Report of Second Plenary Session
- Proceedings No.13 - Report of Joint Meeting of Panels 1-5, with appendix
- Proceedings No.14 - Report of Second Meeting of Standing Committee on Finance and Administration, with appendices
- Proceedings No.15 - Report of Third Plenary Session, with appendix
- Proceedings No.16 - Report of Joint Meeting of Panels 4 and 5, with appendices
- Proceedings No.17 - Report of Fourth Plenary Session, with appendices
- Proceedings No.18 - Report of Fifth Plenary Session
- Proceedings No.19 - Report of Sixth Plenary Session, with appendices

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Index to Major Items

Amendments to Rules of Procedure	
Commission	Proc.14, 18, 19 with App.I
Panel	Proc.14, 18, 19 with App.II
Annual Meeting 1971, 1972	Proc.14
Conservation	
Atlantic salmon	Proc.13, 17
Georges Bank haddock	Proc.16 with App.II, 19
Browns Bank haddock	Proc.16 with App.III, 19
Red and silver hakes	Proc.5 with App.II and III, 19
Seals	Proc.2, 17 with App.I
Convention Articles	
Status	Proc.15
Amendments	
re regulatory measures	Proc.15 App.I, 19
re panel membership	Proc.15 App.II, 19
Finance	
Regulations	Proc.14
Staff assessment scheme	Proc.9
Auditor's Reports	Proc.9
Budget 1969/70	Proc.14 with App.I
1970/71	Proc.14 with App.II
Staff compensation scheme	Proc.9
Future work of Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures	Proc.19 with App.III
Inspection scheme	
Exchange of national officers	Proc.15
Form of inspection scheme	Proc.17
Panel memberships	Proc.3, 9
Regulatory schemes	Proc.11 with Appendix, 17
Trawl Regulations	
Infringements	Proc.15
Mesh measuring	Proc.15
Simplification	Proc.15
Status	Proc.15
Topside chafing gear	Proc.15



Serial No.2280
(S.e.69)

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Meeting of Panel A (Seals)

Tuesday, 3 June, 1400 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Mr H.J.Lassen (Denmark). Representatives of the member countries of the Panel and Observers from Poland, USA and USSR were present.
2. Rapporteur. The Chairman proposed and the Panel agreed that Dr G.F.M. Smith (Canada) should act as Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda, as circulated, was adopted with the deletion of Item 5.
4. Reception of Briefs. The Chairman introduced Mr Colin Platt (International Society for the Protection of Animals) and Dr Elizabeth Simpson (World Federation for the Protection of Animals), both of whom had briefs to present to the Panel.

Mr Platt's brief appears as Appendix II and Dr Simpson's brief as Appendix III.

After presentation of the briefs and after the statement of Mr Lund, Mr Platt and Dr Simpson withdrew from the meeting.

Mr Lund (Norway) informed the Panel that Norway was in full agreement with the view that seals should be killed only by humane methods and that Norway had regulations to this effect and had appointed inspectors on the hunt. Norway had also, on the request of ISPA, given a representative for this society accommodation on board a Norwegian sealer in 1968. The inspectors' reports and the report by the representative of ISPA as well had been satisfactory and Norway was prepared to consider eventual further reasonable suggestions. However, some pseudo-scientific and irresponsible press reports have complicated the cooperation with animal protection societies. Dr Needler (Canada) observed that some parts of Dr Simpson's brief were inaccurate and misleading. The Canadian sealing regulations apply everywhere, not only in the Gulf, and the Canadian Minister of Fisheries had been partially misquoted by implication as he said he had not observed any cruelty.

5. Panel Membership. All Panel members were present and there were no new applications for membership.
6. Scientific Advisers Report. The Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel A, Dr G.F.M.Smith (Canada), read the report containing a report on a joint meeting with the Assessment Subcommittee. This appears as Appendix I.

Both Mr Lund (Norway) and Dr Needler (Canada) asked for further particulars concerning the position suggested by its Scientific Advisers that the Front and Gulf herds should be considered as a unit. It was pointed out by Dr Needler that the position was not definite but merely that there was increasing evidence of mixing and the two breeding areas could not be considered as entirely discrete and separate as had once been supposed.

7. Conservation Measures. Dr Needler (Canada) stated that some conservation measures of harp seals are necessary. Quotas on catch was one possible way of doing this but recently the Canadian industry had suggested an alternative of a later opening date and the hunt being applied to moulted juvenile seals rather than whitecoats. This possibility would lead to higher prices for pelts and possibly reduce some of the publicity regarding the killing of baby seals.

Mr Lund (Norway) agreed that some further conservation measures seemed to be necessary but that no final decision could be reached at this meeting as further discussion with the industry was necessary in order to consider the scientific reports and the information received from the Canadian delegation concerning an alternative solution. Norway was prepared to participate in another meeting in the autumn to discuss possible further conservation measures. (over)

Dr Needler (Canada) stated that Canada, as yet, had no firm proposal to present. He suggested an interim meeting of Panel A at ICNAF headquarters during the week of 22 September 1969 to extend the discussion of these matters. Dr Needler (Canada) further stated that the Canadian proposal to ICNAF on seal conservation (Comm.Doc.69/18) was being withdrawn.

3. Future Research. It was noted that the Panel member countries already engaged in research were continuing their efforts and that Denmark was appointing a scientist to do seal research in the Greenland area. This would be a welcome addition to the knowledge of the harp seals in the northern part of their environment.

9. Next Meeting. It was agreed tentatively that the next Panel A meeting should be an interim meeting at ICNAF headquarters, possibly in the week of 22 September 1969, but the exact date would be fixed by correspondence. The next regular meeting would be held at the time and place of the 1970 ICNAF Meeting.

10. Approval of Report. It was agreed that the report of this meeting would be approved by the circulation of a draft among Panel members.

11. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 1510 hrs.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel A

Thursday, 29 May, and Friday, 30 May

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr G.F.M.Smith (Canada).
2. The meeting was attended by representatives from Panel members and also by representatives of the Assessment Subcommittee.
3. Dr F.D.McCracken (Canada) was elected Rapporteur.
4. Chairman's Report. Documentary material has been received from Canada, Denmark, Norway and USSR.

The following documents are pertinent: Comm.Doc.69/18; Res.Docs.69/7, 9, 28, 31, 32, 54, 82, 95.

A. Status of the Fishery

The 1969 catch of harp seals is not yet tabulated but provisional minimum estimates for the Gulf and Front by Canada and Norway are as follows:

Harp Seals, 1969

	Juvenile	Older	Total	
Gulf	35,000+	-	35,000+	Canada only
Front	175,000+	43,000+	218,000+	Canada and Norway
Total	210,000+	43,000+	253,000+	

The 1968 total for the Gulf and Front was about 190,000 and for 1967, 331,000.

The Gulf catch of juveniles by Canada in 1969 was limited by poor ice conditions and the season was terminated before the vessels quota of 50,000 was taken. Landsmen's catch in 1969 for the Gulf is not yet known.

The Front catch for 1969 is also estimated on the basis of a complete report from Norway and estimates for Canada. The total, however, seems to be in excess of the figures here presented and, therefore, considerably larger than the 1968 Front catch of 128,000.

B. Research

Canada continued routine age sampling and maturity studies in the Gulf and initiated studies of food habits. 1,400 young were tagged in the Gulf. Some age samples were obtained on the Front.

Norwegian sampling for age analysis and maturity was continued.

5. Review with Assessments Subcommittee. A joint meeting between Panel A Advisers and Assessments Subcommittee members was held on 29 May 1969.

The available documents were reviewed and some additional material was introduced at the meeting.

It is noted that the international statistics have not yet been fully assembled. Attention was drawn to the fact that Canadian statistics for 1967 did not include small vessels as a separate item and the number of vessels did not appear in the 1967 and 1968 Canadian statistics.

The joint group noted that there was some difference of opinion between the Norwegian and Canadian investigations on the estimation of age of maturity for female harp seals.

(over)

Some manuscript graphical material was introduced indicating a decreasing catch per ship, in spite of the improved capability of vessels and greater experience of crews.

The degree of distinctness between the Gulf and Front herds appears more doubtful than was once suggested and the two should probably be considered as one unit at least for management purposes.

In tagging pups for immediate recapture and hence estimation of exploitation rate, the investigators pointed out that marked pups could not be randomly distributed throughout the population nor were the catching vessels randomly distributed. This leads to bias of unknown size and direction in the estimate of exploitation rate.

The joint meeting has the following points to offer to Panel A:

- a) The stock of harp seals on the Gulf and the Front should be considered as a whole because of increasing evidence of intermixing;
- b) Catches in the last few years have been such as to reduce the stock, and continuation at the same level will result in further decline;
- c) It is estimated, on the basis of available evidence, that a Gulf and Front total catch of about 150,000 pups can be taken on a continuing basis from the present stock size;
- d) It was thought that a catch in excess of 150,000 pups will allow the stock to decline further and a lower total catch will allow a gradual stock increase and a greater yield in later years. If adults are to be taken, the catch of pups must be correspondingly reduced.

6. On 30 May, the Scientific Advisers met alone to continue discussions and have the following comments to make:

Some of the Advisers believe that the suggested catch limitation of 150,000 pups in the Gulf and Front, in total, was perhaps too definite and too low and that catches of 175,000 pups or even somewhat more might be taken while maintaining present stock levels.

7. A closing date of 25 April along with a continued prohibition against killing of adults in whelping patches is desirable in order to keep the kill of mature females at a minimum.

To avoid excess disturbance of the formation of whelping patches, we recommend that opening dates not be earlier than 7 March for the Gulf and 12 March for the Front.

8. Future Research. It was recommended that research along the lines outlined in the Scientific Advisers' Report for 1968 be continued. The Advisers welcome the entrance of Denmark into seal research in the Greenland area, which will provide information on the herd in its more northern environment. Among the desirable research possibilities in this area are age sampling, tagging, food studies and studies on growth and maturity. A description of this fishery in the Greenland area would be useful.

9. Publication of Statistics. A small working group consisting of Dr Sergeant and Mr Øritsland were requested to consult directly with the ICNAF Secretariat regarding the technical problems of detail and page layout for the publication of the international seal statistics as part of the ICNAF Statistical Bulletin.

10. USSR Seal Statistics. The Scientific Advisers expressed their appreciation for the submission by the USSR of their seal catch statistics on the Front for the years 1961 and 1963 (Res. Dec. 69/95).

11. Predation on Salmon by Seals. The Advisers note that the Joint ICES/ICNAF Salmon Working Party would be interested in receiving information about the extent of predation on salmon by seals during the migration of both salmon and seals to and from the Greenland area.

12. Dr G.F.M. Smith (Canada) was re-elected Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel A for 1970.



Serial No.2280
(B.e.69)

Proceedings No.2
Appendix II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

ISPA Brief
for Presentation to the Seal Panel
of the
International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries

by Colin Platt
International Society for the Protection of Animals

1. This brief is presented on behalf of the 136 member organizations in over fifty countries that comprise the International Society for the Protection of Animals (ISPA).
2. Following negotiations with the Norwegian Department of Fisheries during the early part of 1968, Dr Erling Sgngen, Assistant Professor of Pharmacology, Veterinary School, Oslo, was appointed the official ISPA observer and he sailed with the sealing vessels *Meltshorn* and *Polarbjorn* at the 1968 hunt in the Northwest Atlantic.
3. Your attention is respectfully drawn to Dr Sgngen's report and to the accompanying ISPA brief which I presented to a meeting held at the Norwegian Department of Fisheries in Oslo during October 1968. It was our intention that the recommendations contained in this brief should run concurrently with the existing Norwegian Sealing Regulations.
4. In his report, Dr Sgngen stated that he found no evidence of cruelty in the areas he observed but considered that circumstances could arise under the existing regulations whereby cruelty could possibly be caused. It was with a view to eliminating this possibility that ISPA made recommendations to the Norwegian Department of Fisheries.
5. Dr Sgngen was asked to make a particular study of traumatic reflex actions. His observations are contained in Section 10 of the report. I would particularly draw your attention to his reference to the ventral muscle reflexes of the neck. This we feel is a matter for further research as some doubt appears to exist amongst sealers as to whether the animal is unconscious.
6. It is understood that the Norwegian authorities have accepted the ISPA recommendations and that some have already been implemented.
7. ISPA has now made recommendations concerning both the "Front" and the "Gulf" areas which, if adequately enforced, would go some way to preventing the occurrence of unnecessary suffering. We recognize that the adoption of these recommendations and their inclusion within the sealing regulations of the countries concerned is a significant step forward but stress the need for adequate enforcement. Fisheries officers should, in our view, be on board every sealing vessel and, on the ice, slaughtering should take place only under the supervision of such officers.
8. The implementation of one set of sealing regulations for the whole of the Northwest Atlantic including the Gulf of St. Lawrence is needed. This could be instituted under the auspices of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. The catch quota imposed on 'whitecoats' in the "Gulf" for example, however much it is welcomed, is of little real value to the conservation of the seal herd as a whole so long as killing remains unrestricted in the "Front".
9. The internationally accepted policy

"That an animal should be humanely rendered insensible to pain until death supervenes"

still does not apply to all seals killed in the Northwest Atlantic. It is well within the competence of this meeting to adopt this policy for the slaughtering of seals.

(over)

A Brief for Presentation to the Norwegian Department of Fisheries, Oslo

Thursday, 10 October 1968

Subject Sealing in the Front Area of the Northwest Atlantic

1. This brief is presented on behalf of the animal welfare organizations in over fifty countries (including Norway) represented by membership within the International Society for the Protection of Animals (ISPA).
2. The observations and recommendations made by ISPA observers in the Northwest Atlantic during the seal hunts of 1966, 1967, 1968 and, in particular, those of Dr Erling Søgne in the "Front" area during the 1968 hunt form the basis of this brief.
3. It is our submission that in any hunting based industry the possibility of suffering to the animals involved is ever present. It is with the intention of reducing these possibilities as far as is humanly possible that ISPA observers have been present at the seal hunts.
4. Your attention is respectfully drawn to the Report by Dr Erling Søgne, and particularly to his summary and concluding remarks. In support of these the Directors of ISPA urge the Norwegian Department of Fisheries to consider the implementation of the following recommendations as soon as is practically possible:
 - a) The "hakupik" should be standardized in design, weight, length and quality and should at all times be in good operative condition;
 - b) All "hakupiks" should be inspected by the Department of Fisheries representatives before departure of the sealing fleets to ensure that only approved "hakupiks" are conveyed to the sealing grounds;
 - c) That no abuse of the gaff hook should be permitted and the stunning or killing of seals with this implement should be forbidden;
 - d) That the long gaff hook used to haul seals on board the ship must only be used on dead and exsanguinated seals;
 - e) That stamping upon or kicking the seal to bring about unconsciousness or death should be strictly forbidden;
 - f) That exsanguination is the final act of killing the seal and must take place immediately, following effective and humane destruction of the brain;
 - g) The act of skinning the seal must not take place before it has been exsanguinated;
 - h) An officer of the Department of Fisheries should accompany each sealing fleet, i.e. one officer on the western ice and one off Newfoundland as their presence would act as a deterrent to any possible breaches of the regulations;
 - i) That on ships where no fisheries officer is on board, the regulations should be effectively enforced by the ships' officers and that expediency should never take preference over the necessary care and attention required to kill seals humanely. N.B. In recommending this, ISPA is not implying that ships' officers have failed to enforce the regulations. In fact, the ISPA observer had the highest regard for those that he met and sailed with, but felt that circumstances could arise when the necessity to keep the ship moving, could influence some sealers into employing methods they would not normally use;
 - j) That all sealers must be proficient in the correct use of the approved "hakupik".
 - k) No trainee should be permitted to use the "hakupik" on a live seal until he has gained proficiency with its use. On the ice, the trainee should at first be accompanied by an experienced seal hunter;

- 1) That all seal hunters have in their possession a copy of the current regulations and be familiar with its contents. They should be firmly instructed that whatever the circumstances their first duty is to kill the seals humanely.
 - m) Before the departure of the sealing fleets a demonstration should be given to all sealers to indicate the basic anatomy of the seals skull and location of the vital parts of the brain. This instruction should be carried out by a member of the veterinary profession.
5. In conclusion, the Directors of ISPA convey their gratitude to the Norwegian authorities for the courtesy extended to their representatives and for the facilities afforded to their observer during the 1968 seal hunt.

The Norwegian Seal Hunt at Newfoundland, 1968

Report by

Erling Sognen
dr.med.vet
Norges Veterinærhøgskole, Oslo

With a fellowship granted by the International Society for the Protection of Animals and the Norwegian Federation of Animal Welfare Societies, I went to the 1968 seal hunt off the coast of Newfoundland.

I embarked on the sealing vessel *Polarbjørn* in Alesund, Norway, March 9th and returned to Alesund April 25th with the sealer *Melshorn*.

During the hunt I concentrated on a practical study of the methods employed to kill the seals. Due to the working conditions and the short notice to join the expedition a more scientific approach to the problem would have been difficult. I think it would also have been unnecessary. I must point out that animals younger than 3-4 weeks were not killed this year because of the late commencement of the hunt.

The following information regarding Norwegian sealing involvement in the Northwest Atlantic was required by ISPA.

1. State area(s) visited

The vessel *Polarbjørn* operated at the Front - i.e. the coast off Labrador and the northeast of Newfoundland. The hunt started in the northern part of the area, and the vessel went in a southern direction during the first week of the hunt. The greater part of the sealing took place northwest, north and northeast of Funk Island. After I left the vessel *Polarbjørn* the vessel went in a northwestern direction during the last week of the hunt.

2. Duration of stay in area(s)

The vessel *Polarbjørn* arrived at the sealing ground on March 21st, 1968, the day before the annual seal hunt commenced. On April the 18th I left *Polarbjørn* and went on board the sealing vessel *Melshorn* in order to return to Norway. During the crossings of the North Atlantic Ocean in both directions I had the opportunity to collect information about sealing methods and about attitudes of the hunters to the problems connected with sealing in general and the killing of seals in particular.

3. Approximate number of seals killed

I have been informed that there have been 10 Norwegian sealing vessels at the Front. Mean catch per ship was about 10,000 seals. Total catch for the vessels *Polarbjørn* and *Melshorn* were 10,559 and approximately 12,000 respectively.

4. Species of seal involved, i.e. Harp or Hood seals

The vessel *Polarbjørn* had a catch of 10,189 harp seals and 370 hood seals.

5. Age group of seals killed, i.e. pups or adults

Of the harp seals 7,188 were from 3 to 6 weeks old and the remaining 3,001 were one year old or more. Although great efforts were made in order to find hood seals, only a very limited number was caught. Two hundred and sixty-three were animals from 3 to 6 weeks, and 107 were adult animals.

6. The methods employed to kill the seals

The adult animals were all shot in the head or neck by expert marksmen using guns and ammunition of the standards prescribed by the Norwegian Ministry of Fisheries. Some of the young animals were shot from the vessel, but most of them were killed with several blows in the head of a special blunt sealer's pick "hakapik". Immediately after the blows in the head the animals were turned on their backs, and the arteria axillaris on both sides were opened for exsanguination. Exsanguination took place under high pressure and lasted for about 30 seconds to one minut, skinning was then performed and lasted for about 1 to 2 minutes.

7. Were the methods humane?

When compared with accepted methods employed in hunting and slaughterhouses I would say that the methods were humane.

8. Did the seals suffer and if so in what way?

As a rule the animals were rendered unconscious with the first gunshot or with the first blow of the "hakapik". In the very few cases when the first shot or blow did not result in unconsciousness one must presume that the animals suffered until unconsciousness was achieved with additional shots or blows.

9. What proportion of the craniums were effectively crushed when clubs were used?

Clubs were not used. The Norwegian hunters observed used the "hakapik" which is a heavy wooden 1.2-1.5 m long rod or stick made from the stem of young birch trees and provided with an iron pick weighing not less than 400 g.

In most cases the first blow with this instrument crushed the skull of the young seals. In some very few cases, reliable signs of fracture or fissures could not be observed. In addition to the first blow(s) with the blunt end, the sealers observed gave at least one blow with the sharp end of the instrument. All skulls observed, except one, were therefore perforated with one or more holes produced by the sharp end of the "hakapik".

10. What reflex action was exhibited particularly the caudal reflexes during skinning?

Normal agonist reflex actions were seen in the animals shot in the head as well as those killed with the "hakapik". The most predominant reflex movement was a "swimming" action with the caudal part of the body. These movements were seen in fully exsanguinated animals with totally fractured skulls and destroyed brain tissue. Usually these reflex actions lasted for about one minute after the blows to the head, but they might be seen up to two minutes after the blows and the bilateral opening of the arteria axillaris.

In some very fat animals among the young harp seal pups about 4-5 weeks old, one might observe persistent reflex actions of this kind. The "swimming" movements seemed to be evoked if one tried to move the animal or if the animal was scratched on the ventral side.

If reflex actions were evoked during skinning, the process was usually stopped because of the risk for damaging the skin.

In the same group of animals contractions of the ventral muscle groups of the neck might result in a lifting of the head of the animals. Many of the sealers believed that these animals were not dead, and I was asked to examine the cases carefully.

I have not seen similar reactions in other animals, and my immediate impression was that the animals were conscious. The muscles were in a state of contraction. The eye reflexes were in some cases difficult to observe because of the layer of blubber on the head of the animals which tended to press the eyelids together when the animals were in dorsal position. In other cases the palpebral reflex seemed to be present. In other cases all eye reflexes were certainly absent.

I examined the brain tissue in most of these cases and found that it was severely damaged also in the caudoventral regions of the brain into which most of the sealers tend to place the sharp end of the "hakapik". Exsanguination was usually completed.

Based on these observations I presume that the lifting of the head of these animals is a reflex action which is performed in an unconscious state. But this particular phenomenon in my opinion deserves more careful studies.

11. How efficient were the sealers - particularly the riflemen and those armed with clubs?

Traditionally, Norwegian sealers are selected from among the fishermen and combined farmers and fishermen living on the coast of northern and northwestern Norway. They are young people accustomed to hard work, and their physical

condition is good. Most of them are experienced sealers. On board the Norwegian vessels sealing off Newfoundland the number of sealers per ship was from 15-25.

Normally two or three of the crew are inexperienced. On board *Polarbjørn*, however, more than half of the crew were starters. This extraordinary situation gave me the opportunity to compare the efficiency of skilled and unskilled (trained and untrained) huntsmen.

Some of the inexperienced huntsmen failed in hitting the skull of the first animal with the first blow, or the blows were not sufficiently heavy. However, practically all the new huntsmen were able to kill the second or third animals with well-directed blows. Two of the men had to kill more animals before their blows were sufficiently efficient.

During the first days of the hunt the inexperienced sealers as a rule tended to give an unnecessary high number of blows (5-7), although the first blow with the blunt end as a rule rendered the animal unconscious, and the second blow with the sharp end probably was totally lethal.

Experienced huntsmen killed the animal with two blows - first one blow with the blunt end and then one blow with the sharp end.

Additional blows were often given. As a rule the huntsman turned the animal on the back after the last blow and made a deep incision in the midline along sternum and thereafter cut the arteria axillaris bilaterally.

Exsanguination usually took place under pressure in the course of 30-60 seconds. During the exsanguination the huntsman as a rule was occupied with the killing or skinning of other animals. In cases of single animals he might sharpen his knife or simply take a short rest until exsanguination was completed.

Some huntsmen would crush the skull of 4-6 animals, then exsanguinate all of them and skin the exsanguinated animals.

The riflemen on board Norwegian sealing vessels are as a rule expert marksmen. The economic success of the expedition depends to a large extent upon their marksmanship. When herds of old harp seals are hunted, the wounding of one animal will cause the whole herd to run into the water.

In most cases the animals are killed with one shot in the head or in the upper cervical region.

I saw a few cases when animals shot from the sealing vessel were not dead when the sealers picked them up. These animals were usually given a couple of blows with the "hakapik" in addition to the shot.

Some of the inexperienced sealers seemed to have difficulties in judging whether the animals were dead or not. They appeared to take for granted that the shot animals were dead and had sometimes to be told to give final blows to the shot animal when this was necessary.

In summary it may be said that the riflemen killed the animals very efficiently, and so was the case with the experienced sealers armed with "hakapiks". The inexperienced sealer in some cases misdirected his blows, and this may result in inefficient killing.

12. What regulations are already in force and how effective are these regulations?

Regulations determining the time limit for the seal hunt and directions for the hunting procedure were given in Royal Council of 19th January 1968. The following regulations are valid for all Norwegian sealers:

- 1) It is forbidden to kill adult harp seals when they are with the pups on the sealing ground;
- 2) Aircraft or helicopters are forbidden for hunting purposes, but are allowed for the purpose of tracing the animals when operating from land bases;
- 3) The sealers have to use humane hunting methods and to do their best to prevent unnecessary suffering to the animals;
- 4) The use of line, net or other form of trap for the purpose of killing the seal is forbidden. Only the following weapons are permitted:

- a) Rifle and ammunition of specified standard;
- b) Clubs of specified standard;
- c) "Hakapik" with wooden shaft of length from 110 to 150 cm and with diameter from 3 to 5 cm. It should be provided with an iron hammer with a 12-18 cm long sharp pick.

It is permitted to direct blows only upon the head of the animals.

- 5) It is forbidden to use hooks or to skin the animals before they are certainly dead.
- 6) The captain of the vessel is responsible for the maintenance of these regulations.

As far as I could observe, these regulations were effective on board the vessel *Polarbjørn*.

I had the opportunity to observe the crews from several other vessels at work over a distance through binoculars. I never saw them do anything to the effect of breaking these regulations.

I do not know to what degree my presence influenced the working procedure on board *Polarbjørn* and the other vessels operating in the same area.

Additional comments and suggestions

Methods

The method of killing animals with a shot in the head or neck is generally accepted. In the annual seal hunts in different areas the shooting of the seals is carried out by first-class marksmen. I think one should accept this way of killing the animals without objections.

The use of the "hakapik" for the purpose of killing the young animals has been demonstrated before several Norwegian veterinary specialists in different relevant fields. In cooperation with Dr Birger Rasmussen and Mr Øritsland, I had 5 young seals about 5-6 weeks old brought to the Marine Research Station after the seal hunt this year. The killing of the animals was performed with the "hakapik" and carried out by a Norwegian sealer. I had invited the following veterinary specialists to observe the act:

From the Veterinary College:

1. Sigurd Ledaal. Director of the slaughter house in Sandnes, at present Associate Professor at the Department of Food Hygiene at the Veterinary College of Norway;
2. Nils Koppang, Associate Professor in Pathology;
3. Øystein Sjaastad, dr. med. vet. and Associate Professor in Physiology;
4. Isak Foss, Associate Professor in Anatomy;
5. Mrs Inger Johanne Jebsen Haave. Representative for the Norwegian Association for the Protection of Animals.

In addition to these veterinary specialists, Dr Rasmussen and Mr Øritsland from the Marine Research Station in Bergen, inspector captain Berg from the Ministry of Fishery, and captain Nils Pilskog from the sealing vessel *Melshorn* were present.

The animals were killed in the way described above. I invited the observers to give critical remarks and to express their opinion about the method used.

No objections have been expressed by the observers. In his comments, the director for the slaughter house in Sandnes pointed out that the exsanguination of the animals was extremely rapid compared with that seen in other species.

Although the animals were killed in the ordinary way, they showed less reflex actions than usual. I made the observers aware of this fact.

In my opinion, it is difficult to find a better method for the killing of a large number of animals under the conditions offered in the sealing areas.

It must, in this connection, be pointed out that the "hakapik" is a useful implement also for the purpose of transporting skins on the ice and to get up from the water when the sealer occasionally falls into it. It is also useful for the purpose of moving ice-floes when it is necessary.

The efficiency of the sealers

As often as possible, I accompanied the sealers on the ice, observed the procedure of killing, the reflex actions of the animals and the fractures of the skulls. In order to study the method of killing the animal with the "hakapik" and to be able to discuss the matter with sealers, I carried out a limited number of killings personally. I noticed that when the animals were not exsanguinated immediately after the destruction of the brain, the heart was in action from 4-6 minutes after the blows. This was also the case with the animals whose brains were totally destroyed by shots (expansion bullets). I noticed that the eye reflexes were difficult to interpret in some cases. I killed the animals by crushing a large area of the skull with the first blow of the blunt end and then introduced the sharp end into the caudoventral part of the brain. Immediately after the last blow the animal was bled from both arteria axillaris cut through an incision along the sternum. I think this is a technique to be recommended.

The main reason for failure in killing the animals efficiently is the lack of training and instruction of young sealers. They very soon find out how to kill efficiently, but before this experience is gained they may have caused unnecessary suffering to some animals.

It is also necessary that the sealers are instructed in determining whether an animal is dead or not, and they ought to be shown the localization of the brain and to know which parts of it it is necessary to destroy. I have discussed this matter with Captain Berg, the representative for the Norwegian Ministry of Fishery who was on board *Polarbjørn* in order to plan future regulations. We cooperated in a very pleasant way, and I think most of the suggestions concerning animal protection will be positively accepted in the Ministry of Fishery.

Standardization of the "hakapik"

The shaft of the "hakapik" is made from the stem of young trees. In my opinion the quality and shape of these shafts was too uneven. Many of the "hakapiks" on board *Polarbjørn* were not suitable for their purpose because the shafts were not sufficiently straight. However, because of the surplus of "hakapiks" on board *Polarbjørn* all the sealers were able to find one which was fairly well shaped. I think that also the iron part of the implement ought to be standardized in cooperation with active sealers.

The use of hooks to kill animals

Some of the Norwegian sealers have preferred to kill the animals with heavy iron hooks. The same hooks are used for the transport of the skins on the ice and the transport of the small animals to the vessel. These hooks were forbidden for the purpose of killing seals this year. I saw several modifications of these hooks and heard about others. Some of the sealers regretted that it was forbidden to kill animals with the hooks, and this matter was often discussed on board *Polarbjørn*.

It is likely that the sealers will apply for permission to use the hooks in the future, especially for the purpose of killing and fetching single young seals caught while the vessel passes through the ice-floes. I have had these hooks demonstrated for the purpose of forming an opinion on the matter. I am convinced that the hooks on board *Polarbjørn* had too little weight for the purpose of killing animals, and it must be strictly forbidden to use them.

I have seen and heard about several modifications of the hook which I think could be used, because they were heavier and better shaped for the purpose. It is possible that one ought to discuss the use of a heavy, modified hook for the combined purpose of killing and transporting single animals caught near the vessel. It is also possible that the "hakapik" could be modified so that the demand for the hook disappeared. I have seen such modifications of the "hakapik" made by the sealers on board *Polarbjørn*.

Additions to the Regulations

Bamboo rods with hooks

For the purpose of getting small animals that have been shot on board the vessel without sending a man out, a long bamboo rod with an iron hook in the end is used. In the Regulations it should be stipulated that these rods must not be used unless the animals are certainly dead.

The use of the shoe heel

I have never seen, but I have been told that sealers in situations when their tools are not at hand, have kicked the animals in the head with their shoe heel. I have been told that this may occur when the animals are not properly killed by the shot or by the blow from the "hakupik". In order to avoid possible bad habits of this and a similar kind, kicking with the shoe heel should be forbidden in the regulations.

The authority of the ship's officers

On board a sealing vessel, it is necessary that the ship's officers are authorized to keep strict discipline, although most of the sealers know their jobs and do not need very much direction.

Especially when the animals are shot from the vessel or killed with "hakupik" by men sent out while the ship is waiting just the time necessary to kill and bring the animals on board, it is necessary to work rapidly. In such situations the inexperienced sealer may be told to hurry up. Although it is not necessarily intended, he may feel pressed to act faster than he should. I think it would be wise to discuss with the authorities whether it could be stated in the regulations that no ship's officer is allowed to give orders to the effect that the sealer is forced to modify the usual procedure of killing the animal.

I must state that I never saw a ship's officer give orders with the result suggested, but I can imagine that young sealers may be influenced under these circumstances. I think it would be an advantage if they know that they are free to take the time they need in order to carry out their work properly.

Finally I must point out that the ship's officers I have met would correct the sealers if they objected to their working methods.

Conclusive remarks

My experience concerning Norwegian sealing methods are limited to the observations made during my stay on board the sealing vessel *Polarbjørn* from March 22nd to April 18th 1968.

I had the opportunity to examine the killing methods closely, and in my opinion they are acceptable when compared with methods used in slaughter houses.

Untrained sealers may cause suffering to the first animals they kill because of misdirected blows. Instruction courses for inexperienced sealers might reduce the number of such cases to a minimum. In a matter of a few hours it should be possible to instruct the sealer about the anatomy of the brain, the determination of death, the killing procedure and their duty and right to work properly when taking the lives of animals.

The regulations should be altered to the effect that exsanguination is the last part of the killing procedure, and it should be effected immediately after the last blow on the head. This is in fact what the sealers do.

Furthermore, the regulations should positively forbid the use of hooks for killing animals, but it may be discussed whether a modified heavy hook should be permitted. Special warnings concerning the use of long bamboo rods with hooks and against the kicking with the shoe heels should be taken into the regulations.

The regulations should state the right and duty to kill the animals properly in all situations.



Serial No. 2280
(B.e. 69)

Proceedings No. 2
Appendix III

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Brief presented for the World Federation for the Protection of Animals
by Dr Elizabeth Simpson to the Seal Panel at the Nineteenth Annual Meeting
of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries held
in Warsaw, June 3rd, 1969

Mr Chairman, Gentlemen,

I am here to present a brief on behalf of the World Federation for the Protection of Animals. This Federation has been active in its concern about the methods by which seals are being killed, not only in territories under the jurisdiction of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries but in all areas, particularly where commercial exploitation is highly organized and large numbers of seals are killed in a short time. In two such areas, the Gulf of St. Lawrence in Canada, and the Pribilof Islands in Alaska, USA, the World Federation for the Protection of Animals has sent out teams, including a veterinary pathologist, to investigate the manner in which the seals are killed, and to make recommendations.

In the case of the Pribilof Islands, the report and recommendations made in 1968 to the United States Department of the Interior were met with the following response, and I quote from a letter sent by the Director of this Department to the World Federation for the Protection of Animals, - "We appreciate your interest in this matter. We believe that your organization, through the work and report of Dr Simpson, has been most helpful in presenting a factual report on the Pribilof sealing operations and is making recommendations for improvement...These recommendations...have been largely adopted."

In the Gulf of St. Lawrence, where annual observations of sealing have been carried out by the World Federation for the Protection of Animals since 1966, the conditions have been gradually improving, in that more care now appears to be taken to ensure that the skulls of whitecoat seals are crushed before skinning commences. However, the situation is by no means perfect, and there is some doubt, not only in the mind of the World Federation for the Protection of Animals, but also in the mind of the Canadian Minister of Fisheries, Mr Jack Davis, about whether this hunt can ever be made reasonably humane. Following Mr Jack Davis' visit to the sealing operation in the Gulf of St. Lawrence in March of this year, he stated that he was impressed by the general brutality of the hunt and was seriously considering making the Gulf of St. Lawrence a sanctuary for seals. This statement is a measure of the seriousness with which the Canadian Government views the humane aspects of the hunt.

The Seal Panel of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries in Hamburg in 1967 agreed to consider the humane aspects of seal hunting under its jurisdiction. The World Federation for the Protection of Animals welcomes Item 8 of the Agenda of this meeting, in which consideration of conservation measures and requirements including a proposal for a catch quota and open and closed seasons for the Front area will be given. In instituting control measures of this sort, it is hoped that controls for humane killing can be introduced alongside, as the Canadian Government have attempted to do in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. In addition, the World Federation for the Protection of Animals request that provision should be made for independent observers to witness the operation of measures designed to control the numbers of seals killed, and the manner in which they are taken.

Serial No.2285
(B.e.69)Proceedings No.3ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969Report of Meeting of Panel 3

Tuesday, 3 June, 1515 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Professor F. Chrzan (Poland). Representatives of Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, USSR, UK and USA attended. Denmark was represented by an observer.
2. Rapporteur. Dr H.A.Cole (UK) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda as prepared, with the deletion of Item 4 which is to be considered by a Joint Meeting of Panels, was adopted.
4. Panel Membership. Denmark referred to the regular fishing by Faroese vessels in Subarea 3 and applied for membership. This application was unanimously approved.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr Cole (UK) presented a summary of the status of fisheries and research carried out during 1968 (Res.Doc.69/93) and the Report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers (Appendix I). He called special attention to the recent mesh assessment for cod from Div.3N and 3O which indicated that mesh size increases up to six inches would result in long-term benefit. For practical reasons it was necessary to consider Subareas 2 and 3 together in relation to the appropriate minimum mesh size.
6. Conservation Requirements. Canada confirmed that the St. John's, Newfoundland, laboratory would undertake new mesh assessments for Div.3K and 3L, and possibly Div.3M, as well as Subarea 2 and would present these next year.

Dr Cole remarked that the Panel Advisers hoped that the appropriate mesh size for Subareas 2 and 3 would be given close consideration next year.
7. Future Research. The Chairman called attention to the Report of the Chairman of Scientific Advisers which indicated that existing research programs would in general be continued. There were no further remarks.
8. Next Meeting. It was agreed that this would be held in conjunction with the 1970 meeting of the Commission at St. John's, Newfoundland.
9. Approval of Report. It was agreed that a draft would be circulated for approval as amended without a further meeting.
10. Appointment of Chairman. Mr A. Volkov (USSR) was elected Chairman for the two ensuing years.
11. Adjournment. There being no further business, the Panel meeting was adjourned at 1540 hrs.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR



THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No.2285
(B.f.69)

Proceedings No.3
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 3

Saturday, 31 May 1969

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Dr Cole (UK). Advisers were present from the following member countries of Panel 3: Canada, France, Germany, Norway, Poland, Portugal, USSR, UK and USA. Observers were present from FAO and ICES.
2. Dr A.W.May (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The agenda as distributed for the meeting of Panel 3, where relevant, was adopted for the Meeting of Scientific Advisers.
4. The Chairman presented his summary report on status of the fisheries in Subarea 3, and research carried out during the past year. After some discussion and amendments, the report was approved for presentation to the Panel (Res.Doc. 69/93).
5. The Assessments Subcommittee Chairman summarized the conclusions of the Subcommittee as applicable for Subarea 3. The Advisers were informed that recent assessments had indicated that the level of fishing effort in Subarea 3 as a whole was at the point where at least 80 percent of the maximum long-term cod yield per recruit was being harvested. Since then the cod catch has increased substantially, and in Div.3NO is particularly dependent on newly recruiting year-classes.

A recent mesh assessment for Div.3NO cod has indicated that mesh increases beyond that presently in use (4 1/2"), and up to 6", would result in long-term benefits to the fishery. It was noted that deficiencies in sampling caused some difficulty in making this recent assessment. The Assessments Subcommittee using data to be provided by the laboratory at St. John's, Newfoundland, will during the next year undertake a revision of mesh assessments in Div.3K and 3L, and possibly Div.3M, as well as Subarea 2. In this connection, it was also noted that a review of the adequacy of sampling in the ICNAF Area as a whole will be undertaken later this year.
6. The Advisers were informed that all countries present intend to continue research along the past lines, and as described in research programs circulated some months ago. Particular note was taken of selectivity work to be undertaken by Germany and, concerning the Polish-type chafer, by Poland. It was also noted that the Assessments Subcommittee would be evaluating herring data during the next year with a view to assessing the state of herring stocks in the ICNAF Area, including Subarea 3.
7. It was agreed that the next meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 3 should be held in St. John's, Newfoundland, preceding the 1970 Annual Meeting.
8. Dr Cole (UK) was re-elected Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel 3.

RESTRICTED

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR



THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 2290
(B.e.69)

Proceedings No. 4

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Meeting of Panel 4

Thursday, 5 June, 1100 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. Amendments of Panel Rules of Procedure. Discussion and approval of the amendments to the Panel Rules of Procedure as set out in Comm.Doc.69/5 were deferred for a joint meeting of Panels.
5. Review of Panel Memberships. Representatives of the members of the Panel: Canada, France, Poland, Portugal, Spain, USSR and USA were present. Italy was not represented. There were no new applications for Panel membership.
6. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr R. Monteiro (Portugal), Chairman of Scientific Advisers to the Panel, presented his summary report on the status of the fisheries and on the research in the subarea during 1968 (Res.Doc.69/96) and also the Report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers (Appendix I). The Panel approved these reports without change.
7. Review of Conservation Measures and Requirements. It was agreed that this item was covered in the reports of the Scientific Advisers.
8. Additional Regulation of the Haddock Fishery (Comm.Doc.69/20). Canada presented a proposal (Appendix II) for the regulation of the haddock fishery in Div.4X and recommended its adoption. The proposal was supported by the USA and in principle by the USSR and Spain. After some discussion of difficulties in implementing the statistical requirements of the proposal, there was general agreement that these and most other difficulties and methods in the implementation of the Canadian proposal were also inherent in the US proposal for regulation of the haddock fishery in Subarea 5. It was agreed, therefore, that the Canadian proposal should be considered at a joint meeting of Panels 4 and 5 to take place 5 June at 1500 hours.
9. Future research required. 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.
10. Next Meeting. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Panel should be held at the time and place of the next ICNAF meeting. Scientific Advisers will meet during the previous week.
11. Other Business. There was no other business.
12. Approval of Panel Report. It was agreed to circulate the Panel report among the Panel members for approval.
13. Election of Chairman for the two ensuing years. On motion by Canada, seconded by USA, Mr R. Lagarde of France was elected Chairman.
14. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 1235 hrs.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 4

Saturday, 31 May, 1500 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr R. Monteiro (Portugal). Participants from Canada, France, Poland, Portugal, USSR and USA were present. Observers from ICES, Federal Republic of Germany and UK were also present.
2. Dr F.D.McCracken (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The Chairman proposed to follow the agenda of the Panel 4 meeting insofar as it was appropriate and agreed.
4. The Chairman read a Summary of Status of Fisheries and Research carried out in Subarea 4 in 1968 (Res.Doc.69/96). The Advisers discussed the report and agreed to accept it with some minor revisions.
5. Review of Conservation Measures. Mr Parrish, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Assessments, briefly reviewed results of considerations about the haddock stock in Div.4X. The Advisers agreed to draw to the attention of the Panel that section of the Assessment Report dealing with Div.4X haddock. It was also agreed that further examination of the data on this stock should be carried out in 1969 and in particular a better estimate of fishing effort should be obtained.
6. Future Research Required. Attention was drawn to the need for better sampling of both the haddock and cod stocks in Subarea 4.

The Advisers noted that the Assessments Subcommittee proposes to carry out at their next meeting assessments on herring stocks in the ICNAF Area. All countries fishing herring in the subarea were urged to cooperate in providing the necessary basic data.

Attention was drawn to the need for sampling of herring in the newly developing mid-water trawl fishery in Div.4V.
7. Date and Place of Next Meeting. It was agreed that the next meeting should be held on the Saturday preceding the 1970 ICNAF Annual Meeting.
8. Approval of Report. It was agreed that a report would be prepared by the Chairman and Rapporteur and circulated in draft form for approval.
9. Chairman. Dr R. Monteiro was re-elected Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel 4.
10. The meeting adjourned at 1545 hrs.



Serial No.2290
(B.e.69)

Proceedings No.4
Appendix II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Canadian Proposal re Regulation of the Haddock Fishery

in Subarea 4, Division 4X

The haddock stock of Div.4X, like that of Subarea 5, depends on the year-class of 1963 with no later abundant year-classes yet evident. The slower growth rate of Div.4X haddock has made this year-class enter the fishery somewhat later than in Subarea 5 and persist somewhat better to this time. The Subcommittee on Assessments of the Committee on Research and Statistics has, however, pointed out the danger of permitting catches of haddock in Div.4X in excess of the long-term average of 20,000 to 25,000 tons. In order to protect the stock until an abundant new year-class appears, and to achieve some measure of restoration of its abundance, the Canadian delegation proposes that Panel 4 recommend the following measures to the Commission for recommendation to Contracting Governments:

- 1) the establishment of an annual quota of 18,000 tons of haddock in 1970, 1971 and 1972, the Commission to be authorized to increase the quota in the latter two years, on the basis of scientific evidence;
- 2) weekly reports of landings should be made to the Executive Secretary, who will notify each Party when 80 percent of the quota has been caught. After notification, all landings of haddock to be prohibited during the remainder of the year except for incidental catch;
- 3) the closure of Div.4X south of 43°00'N and west of 64°30'W during the months of March and April 1970, 1971 and 1972, to fishing any species of groundfish with any type of gear.



Serial No. 2282
(B.e.69)

Proceedings No. 5

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Meeting of Panel 5

Wednesday, 4 June, 1205 hrs

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Mr T.A. Fulham (USA).
2. Rapporteur. Dr W. Templeman (Canada) was elected Rapporteur.
3. Agenda. The agenda, as circulated, was adopted.
4. Adoption of Amendments to Panel Rules of Procedure (Comm.Doc.69/5). The question of amendments to Panel Rules of Procedure was referred to the Joint Meeting of Panels.
5. Panel Memberships. All Panel member countries (Canada, Poland, Romania, USSR and USA) were represented. There were no further applications for membership in the Panel.
6. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr G.F.M. Smith (Canada), Chairman of Scientific Advisers to the Panel, presented his summary report on the status of the fisheries and on research in the subarea in 1968 (Res.Doc.69/94), and also the Report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers (Appendix I). The Panel approved these reports with minor editorial corrections. Dr Smith also brought to the attention of the Panel the account of an informal meeting of ICNAF Advisers on Cooperative Research in Subarea 5 and Adjacent Waters held at Boothbay Harbour, Maine, 9-12 December 1968 (Res.Doc.69/1).
7. The Panel adjourned at 1230 hrs and reconvened at 1430 hrs.
8. Review of Conservation Measures and Requirements. The USA presented a review of research results on the haddock situation in Subarea 5, where haddock catches and stock have declined as a result of an increase in fishing effort and a lack of success of recent year-classes. Under the present fishing effort, the haddock stock is likely to become so low that good recruitment of haddock may become improbable. No improvement is in sight for at least the next three years.
9. Additional Regulation of the Haddock Fishery. The USA referred to the above, as outlined in Comm.Doc.69/20, and introduced in summary form the basis for a proposal for new conservation measures to protect the haddock of Subarea 5 and, while allowing some fishing, maintain the stock of haddock in this subarea at a level at which it could theoretically have a small increase in 1970. The representatives of all member countries expressed their great concern and agreed that the haddock stock in Subarea 5 is at such a low level that present conservation measures are inadequate. There was general agreement that these measures should include a closure of two areas of Georges Bank for the two haddock spawning months of March and April and that a yearly overall haddock quota should be set for Subarea 5, low enough to produce the necessary conservation effects. The preliminary period of agreement should be for three years beginning 1 January 1970. After the first year of this period the quota could, if considered advisable by the Commission, be revised upward but not downward.
10. The meeting adjourned at 1610 hrs.
11. Panel 5 reconvened at 1450 hours, 5 June.
12. The Rapporteur read the minutes of the previous meeting of the Panel. There were no comments.
13. It was agreed that the question of additional regulation of the haddock fishery be referred to the Joint Meeting of Panels 4 and 5.
14. The USA, referring to Comm.Doc.69/20, stated that the red hake of Subarea 5 are in a state of serious depletion, and introduced a new statement (Appendix II)

(over)

regarding the low levels of the red hake and silver hake populations in the subarea and the lack, and reasons for the lack, of adequate assessments for these species by the Research and Statistics Committee. The USA, therefore, made a proposal for regulating the red hake and silver hake fishery by establishing a closed season for these species for the four months January-April in the area of Subarea 5 outlined in the new proposal (Appendix II).

Following a discussion in which most Panel countries expressed their agreement with the details of area and months as outlined in Comm.Doc.69/20 rather than those in the new US proposal (Appendix II), the USA agreed to draft a new proposal to the Commission based on the area coordinates in Comm.Doc.69/20 and for a closure period of 3 months: January, February, March for red and silver hake and making allowance for small incidental by-catches from fisheries carried on for some other species. This proposal will be circulated to Panel members for approval prior to being presented to the Commission Plenary as Appendix III of the Report of the Meeting of Panel 5.

15. Review of the 10 Percent Annual Exemption. The USA reported on their operation of the 10 percent exemption (Comm.Doc.69/27). There were no comments and the report was accepted. Poland reported that their by-catch of protected fish in Subarea 5 was less than 10 percent.

16. Future Research Required. The research plans for the area are outlined in the Report of the Scientific Advisers and in the programs submitted by member countries. No additional research plans were presented.

17. Next Meeting. It was agreed that the next regular meeting of the Panel should be held at the time and place of the next ICNAF Meeting. Scientific Advisers will meet during the previous week.

18. Other Business. There was no other business.

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

20. Election of Chairman for the two ensuing years. On motion by the USA, seconded by Canada, Mr S. Perkowicz (Poland) was elected Chairman of the Panel for the following two years.

21. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 1610 hrs.



Serial No.2282
(B.f.69)

Proceedings No.5
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 5

Friday, 30 May, 1530 hrs

1. The Chairman, Dr G.F.M.Smith (Canada), opened the meeting with representatives from member countries, Canada, Poland, Romania, USSR and USA. Observers were present from France, Germany and UK.
2. Mr B.E.Skud (USA) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The Agenda for Panel 5 was adopted with minor revisions.
4. The Chairman presented his Report on the Status of Fisheries and Research Carried Out in 1968 (Res.Doc.69/94). The report was adopted with minor modifications. The Chairman also called attention to a report of an informal meeting of scientific advisers from Canada and USA on cooperative research in Subarea 5 (Res.Doc.69/1).
5. Review of conservation measures and requirements on haddock, cod, silver hake, red hake and herring. Dr Graham (USA) discussed the haddock fishery and called attention to Comm.Doc.69/20 and the report of the Subcommittee on Assessments, stressing the importance of these documents to the Panel members. It was agreed that a US Adviser should summarize the status of the haddock fishery at the Panel 5 meeting.

Dr McCracken (Canada) and Mr Hennemuth (USA) noted the Panel's interest in cod, which has shown a 10-15 percent increase in abundance in recent years. This increase may be due to a better than average year-class but no age composition data is available to substantiate this explanation.

Dr Graham (USA) cited the USSR and US Research Reports (Res.Doc.69/17 and 69/19) to indicate the decline in the stocks of silver hake. The total landings and the landings per day have decreased in both the northern and southern parts of Subarea 5. Mr Hennemuth (USA) explained that the intensive silver hake fishery developed so rapidly that the data necessary for assessment were not available. Dr Bogdanov (USSR) said that data from USSR catches and the age composition data clearly showed drastic changes in the stock abundance, but that the cause for these changes had not been determined. The Chairman reiterated the comments and it was agreed that the Panel's attention should be drawn to the decline in the silver hake stocks and the need for more intensive study of this species.

Dr Graham (USA) also cited the USSR and US Research Reports to show the decline in red hake abundance. Landings per day decreased from 15.7 metric tons in 1963 to 7.0 tons in 1968. He also pointed to the decline of red hake in the industrial groundfish fishery and the increased percentage contribution of other species in this fishery. USSR data indicated that the recruitment in recent years was poor. It was noted that the USA and USSR had acted to conserve red hake in statistical Subarea 6 and that the US considered it necessary to extend the protection to Subarea 5. It was agreed that the condition of the red hake stocks should be described to Panel 5.

The Chairman noted that the status of the herring fishery had been considered by the Subcommittee on Assessments.

6. The Chairman called for comments on the Environmental Survey of Georges Bank and Dr Bogdanov (USSR) said that USSR scientists were pleased with the results of the survey conducted by Canada, USSR and USA and that the cooperative venture should receive further support and that more of this joint research should be developed. Dr Graham (USA) also spoke favourably of the joint plankton work and further emphasized the value of the cooperative groundfish surveys which provided valuable information on spawning time. He also indicated that the surveys promise a means of estimating stock abundance that are independent of the commercial fishery and urged the extension of integrated surveys to other subareas. Dr McCracken

(over)

(Canada) discussed the Canadian participation in the survey and mentioned that similar work was being done on the Scotian Shelf.

7. Date and Place of Next Meeting. It was agreed that the next meeting would be held prior to the Panel Meeting at St. John's, Newfoundland.

8. Approval of Report. It was agreed that a report would be prepared and circulated for approval.

9 The meeting adjourned at 1645 hrs.



Serial No. 2282
(B.e. 69)

Proceedings No. 5
Appendix II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Proposal for Red and Silver Hake Management in Subdivision 5Zw of Subarea 5

Red Hake

The red hake stocks of southern New England do not support a separate species fishery. The red hake is, however, the economic backbone of a fishery, best termed the southern New England mixed groundfish fishery. Without the red hake this fishery is not a successful one, in economic terms, since it depends as well on several other groundfish species that are never present in high abundance.

The southern New England mixed groundfish fishery had been a healthy fishery until 1965, with only one period of exception. As a result of imports from Peru, the fishery suffered an economic setback during the period 1959 to 1961. It recovered rapidly, however, and by 1963 was again in good shape.

Foreign fisheries began intensive operations in the southern New England area in 1964. In 1965 the offshore foreign fishery virtually wiped out red hake stocks insofar as the American fisherman was concerned. For the first time in the twenty-year history of the fishery, the abundance of the red hake dropped to less than 20 percent of the long-term average in less than two years. Landings dropped from an average of about 35,000 tons a year to virtually nothing. At precisely the same time, as best we can determine, the catches of red hake by foreign vessels offshore increased from almost nothing to approximately the same amount.

Unfortunately it proved impossible for us to obtain useful, meaningful catch statistics concerning these foreign fleets. It has thus been impossible for us to calculate the necessary population parameters so that appropriate conservation measures could be proposed in ICNAF. We suffered not only severe economic dislocation but also were effectively prevented from analyzing the state of the stocks and managing them.

No one seriously questions that environmental changes may have played a role in the observed decreases in abundance in recent years. If in fact these environmental changes are operating to further reduce the abundance of the red hake, it simply increases the necessity for reducing the fishing pressure. Under these circumstances it is desirable to maintain as large a spawning stock as possible. While there is not enough evidence to demonstrate a significant relation between the size of the spawning stock and subsequent recruitment, it certainly makes no sense at all to decimate the stock each spring as it begins its inshore migration to the spawning areas.

The situation in red hake does not in fact appear to be much different from that we see in haddock today.

Silver Hake

At the present time silver hake abundance is less than half the long-term average of 20 to 25 thousand pounds/day for the typical vessel in the southern New England mixed groundfish fishery. The situation in silver hake differs from that of red hake in that this species not only has been reduced in abundance but has exhibited extreme variability in recruitment as well in recent years.

On the average silver hake spawn when four years old. In recent years the fishing pressure has been so severe as to reduce the average age of fish in the commercial catch to approximately two years, with virtually none of the fish being more than four years old. This raises once again the possibility that this population has been reduced to the point where successful spawning, whatever the environmental conditions, is unlikely.

(over)

The United States therefore proposes a closed season for red and silver hake during the months of January, February, March and April in the area bounded:

on the north by 40°39' north latitude;
on the south by 39°50' north latitude;
on the west by 71°41' west longitude; and
on the east by 70°00' west longitude.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR



RESTRICTED
THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Serial No. 2282
(B.e. 69)

Proceedings No. 5
Appendix III

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

US Proposal for Regulation of Red Hake and Silver Hake in Subarea 5

Panel 5 recommends

that the Commission transmit to the Depositary Government the following proposal for joint action by the Contracting Governments:

that the Contracting Governments take appropriate action to prohibit the taking of red hake, *Urophycis chuss* (Walb.), and silver hake, *Merluccius bilinearis* (Mitch.), during the periods January 1 to March 31 of 1970, 1971 and 1972 in the area bounded by 69°00'W, 39°50'N, 71°40'W and 40°20'N, provided however that during this period groundfish vessels may be permitted to take on each trip during which they fish in the said area red and silver hake in amounts not to exceed 10 percent each of the total catch taken in the said area on that trip.



Serial No. 2284
(B.e. 69)

Proceedings No. 6

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Meeting of Panel 1

Tuesday, 3 June, 1200 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 UK delegation suggested that Item 4 (Amendments to Panel Rules of Procedure) of the agenda be deleted as it has been decided that this Item will be considered in a Joint Meeting of Panels. This was adopted by the meeting.
4. Review of Panel Membership. No change in Panel 1 membership was proposed.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. A summary of the status of fisheries and research carried out in Subarea 1 (Res.Doc.68/97) was presented by Dr Arno Meyer (Fed. Rep. Germany). Dr Meyer 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. The Panel supported the good wishes and thanks to Dr Paul Hansen expressed by the Scientific Advisers. Dr Paul Hansen was for the very first time since the beginning of ICNAF activities not attending the meeting of the Commission.
6. Review of Conservation Measures and Requirements. The Chairman noted that all trawl regulations proposed by the Commission came into force on 21 September 1968. Acceptance of the method of measurement proposed in 1967 was, however, awaiting acceptance from Denmark, Fed. Rep. Germany, Poland and Portugal. The representatives of these countries stated that the proposal had been acknowledged and that official acceptance was expected soon. The Chairman expressed his appreciation and looked forward to early approval of the regulation regarding mesh measurement in Panel 1. It was noted that there were no requirements for new measures to be considered in Panel 1.

The Chairman reminded the Panel that, according to the R&S report and the Scientific Advisers' Report, the cod in Subarea 1 was subject to over-fishing, and it had been suggested that regulation of fishing intensity be considered. The Chairman also referred to the Report by the Scientific Advisers to Panel 1 where it was pointed out that a further increase in mesh size up to 150 mm would be beneficial and increase the yield. The members of the Panel should consider these problems very closely. As regards the problem of fishing for Atlantic salmon in the area, this problem would be discussed in a Joint Meeting of Panels as it concerns the whole Convention Area.
7. Future Research Required. The Panel noted the items of future research in the subarea referred to in the Report of Scientific Advisers. Special emphasis was laid upon research into the effect of a larger minimum mesh size, the problem of early estimates of the strength of pre-recruit year-classes, and the blood-type studies of Greenland-Iceland cod.
8. Date and Place of Next Meeting. It was agreed that the Panel should meet during the 20th 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. Mr Løkkegaard (Denmark) was elected Chairman for the two ensuing years.
12. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 1245 hrs.



Serial No. 2284
(B.f.69)

Proceedings No. 6
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 1

Saturday, 31 May, 0930 hrs

1. The Chairman, Dr A. Meyer (Fed. Rep. Germany), opened the meeting and asked Dr E. Smidt (Denmark) to extend the very best wishes and thanks of the Scientific Advisers to Dr P.M.Hansen, who for the first time since the very beginning of ICNAF activities was not attending the Annual Meeting of the Commission. He had acted as Chairman of Panel Advisers for many years and is now retiring. His fundamental scientific work in the Greenland area had been of substantial value to the work of Panel 1.
2. Dr J. Messtorff (Fed. Rep. Germany) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The agenda, as distributed by the Chairman, was adopted.
4. Advisers from all member countries of the Panel, except Spain, as well as observers from Canada, USA, ICES and FAO, were present.
5. The Chairman presented his summary report of the status of fisheries and research carried out in Subarea 1 in 1968 (Res.Doc.69/97). The report was adopted with minor changes.
6. In the discussion which followed on the present state of the cod stocks, the Scientific Advisers supported the findings of the Assessments Subcommittee relevant to Subarea 1, especially that
 - a) the rate of exploitation is close to the maximum sustainable yield per recruit. This was already stated in the last year's Assessment Report;
 - b) a reduction of the fishing mortality rate of up to 25% would not result in any significant reduction in yield and would increase the catch per unit effort;
 - c) the year-classes since 1963 that are now recruiting to the Subarea 1 cod fishery are less strong than those in the fishery in recent years. Therefore, the catch rate is likely to decrease in the immediate future whatever course of action might be adopted.

It was also pointed out that a further increase in mesh size would be beneficial to all nations fishing in Subarea 1. Assessments made in earlier years have shown that mesh sizes up to 150 mm would give increases in yield. Since the period on which these assessments were based, there have been changes in the growth of cod, possible increases in the girth of cod (and consequent reductions in the selection factors), as well as increased fishing. All these factors make a further enlargement of the minimum mesh size desirable.

The need for further research into these matters, including observations on girth/length relationships covering all seasons of the year was emphasized.

The problem of obtaining early and accurate estimates of the strength of pre-recruit year-classes was discussed. It was noted that Danish scientists were intensifying their surveys of young fish and that other countries might also take part in such work after 1970, not only off West Greenland but also off East Greenland.

The proposal for a review in 1971 of the environmental conditions in the ICNAF Area put forward by the Environmental Subcommittee was strongly endorsed. Studies on the ice conditions which were extremely unusual in 1968 and according to the most recent information even more in 1969, and which seriously affected fishery operations in the subarea as well as off East Greenland were particularly desirable.

(over)

7. The work carried on by Iceland and other countries on the blood-typing studies in relation to the movement of cod from Greenland to Iceland was reported. The importance of this to the work of the Panel was emphasized.

8. Dr A. Meyer (Fed. Rep. Germany) was re-elected Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel 1.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 1100 hrs.



Serial No.2281
(B.e.69)

Proceedings No.7

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Meeting of Panel 2

Friday, 6 June, 1210 hrs

1. The Panel met under its Chairman, Mr G. Mocklinghoff (Fed. Rep. Germany). All members (Canada, France, Germany, Poland, Portugal, Spain, USSR and UK) were represented.
2. Rapporteur. Dr J. Messtorff (Fed. Rep. Germany) was appointed rapporteur.
3. Agenda. After deletion of Item 4, the agenda as circulated was adopted.
4. Panel Memberships. There were no proposals or applications for additional membership.
5. Report of Scientific Advisers. Dr Bogdanov (USSR) presented his report on the status of fisheries and research in Subarea 2 in 1968 (Res.Doc.69/92) and the Report of the Meeting of Scientific Advisers to the Panel (Appendix I).
6. Review of Conservation Measures and Requirements. The Panel noted with interest that mesh increases to 130 mm or even 150 mm for Div.3N and 3O would produce long-term benefits to the cod fisheries and that a reassessment of mesh size increases for Subarea 2 and Div.3K and 3L was planned for the next year. Several delegations pointed out that a uniform mesh size for Subareas 1, 2 and 3 of at least 130 mm which is already in force in Subarea 1 would be desirable both for conservation and practical purposes. The Panel hoped that the results of the reassessment would be available as soon as possible and enable the Panel at its next meeting to come to conclusions on a possible increase of mesh size for Subarea 2. The Panel further suggested that during the next Annual Meeting of the Commission a joint meeting of Panels 1, 2 and 3 be held to discuss the possible introduction of a uniform mesh size in the respective areas.
7. Future Research. The Panel was satisfied with the plans for future research as reported in Appendix I.
8. Next Meeting. It was agreed that the Panel should meet again at the next Annual Meeting of the Commission.
9. Approval of Panel Report. It was further agreed that the Panel report should be prepared by the Chairman and Rapporteur in consultation with Panel members.
10. Dr Rodriguez Martin (Spain) was unanimously elected Chairman of Panel 2 for the two ensuing years.
11. Adjournment. There was no other business. The meeting adjourned at 1240 hrs.



Serial No.2281
(B.f.69)

Proceedings No.7
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Meeting of Scientific Advisers to Panel 2

Saturday, 31 May 1969

1. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Dr Bogdanov (USSR). Advisers were present from the following member countries of the Panel: Canada, France, Germany, Poland, Portugal, USSR and UK. Observers were present from FAO and ICES, and from Denmark and USA.
2. Dr A.W.May (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The agenda for Panel 2, as relevant, was adopted for the meeting.
4. The Chairman presented his summary report on the status of the fisheries and research in Subarea 2 during 1968 (Res.Doc.69/92). After discussion and amendments by the Advisers, this document as revised was approved for presentation to the Panel.
5. The Advisers noted that a recent mesh assessment for Div.3N and 3O indicated that mesh increases to 130 mm or even 150 mm would produce long-term benefits to the cod fisheries. It was further noted that any mesh increases in Subarea 3 should be examined in the light of fisheries for cod in Subarea 2, and the Advisers welcomed the decision of the Assessments Subcommittee that a reassessment of mesh size increases for Subarea 2 (and including Div.3K and 3L) was planned during the next year. The Advisers also took note of the fact that some trawlers fishing with 130 mm mesh in Subarea 1 now use this mesh size in Subarea 2.
6. The question of changes in cod girth relative to length was discussed briefly, and Canada promised to undertake an analysis of girth measurements made 10 years ago and to compare these with data to be collected this year.
7. It was noted that research programs for the current year had been distributed some time ago, and indicated that countries would be continuing research in the subarea as in the past. It was noted that Germany will conduct selectivity experiments in Subarea 2 this year.
8. It was agreed that the next meeting of Scientific Advisers should be held in St. John's, Newfoundland, preceding the 1970 Annual Meeting.
9. Dr Bogdanov (USSR) was re-elected Chairman of Scientific Advisers to Panel 2.



ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of the First Plenary Session

Monday, 2 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. Observers from FAO, ICES, INPFC, GFCM, NEAFC, SCOR and from the Governments of Cuba, Ireland and Japan were present. The Chairman's opening remarks, which reviewed the Commission's work over the 20 years since the Convention was adopted in 1949, and his hopes for its future accomplishments are attached as Appendix I.
- Item 2 Agenda. The agenda was adopted without change. The Plenary agreed that, where possible, there should be joint meetings of Panels held during the period of the Plenary Sessions.
- Item 3 Publicity. The Plenary agreed that a Committee on Publicity should be set up consisting of the Chairman of the Commission and the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (Mr Horsted) and the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Mr Green), with the Executive Secretary.
- Items 4 to 8
and 34 Panel Memberships, Administrative Report, Auditor's Report, Financial Statement and Date and Place of 1971 and 1972 Annual Meetings. These items were referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration.
- Items 13
to 17 Annual Returns of Infringements, Simplification of International Trawl Regulations, Topside Chafer, Mesh Measuring and Exchange of National Inspection Officers. These items were referred to an *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations.
- Item 20 Conservation Measures for Atlantic Salmon. It was agreed that this item would be considered in a Joint Meeting of Panels.
- Item 21 Conservation Measures for Seals. This item was referred to Panel A.
- Item 22 Additional Regulation of Haddock Fishery. It was agreed that this item should be considered in a Joint Meeting of Panels 4 and 5.
- Item 23 Regulation of Fishery for Hakes. This item was referred to Panel 5.
- Item 28 Report of 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 met during the previous two weeks. The complete report will be presented to the Final Plenary Session for approval. Mr Horsted then reviewed the Provisional Summary Report which highlighted the work of the subcommittee of Research and Statistics and the ICES/ICNAF Joint Working Party on North Atlantic Salmon.

The Chairman of the Commission thanked Mr Horsted for his excellent presentation and the scientists for their good efforts.

The Plenary agreed to adjourn for the remainder of the day in order that Commissioners could study the report with their Experts and Advisers.

The Plenary adjourned at 1300 hrs.



Serial No.2286
(B.b.69)

Proceedings No.8
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Opening Statement at the First Plenary Session
of ICNAF

by the Chairman, Mr V.M.Kamantsev

"Mr Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen:

"May I express, on behalf of the Commission and myself, deep gratitude to the Government of the Polish People's Republic for the excellent conditions created for our work in this beautiful palace and for the hospitality extended to us.

"May I also thank you, Mr Minister, for your warm words addressed to the Commission, and for the high praise of the Commission's activities and wishes for success in its work.

"We now meet here at a memorial time: 20 years have passed since the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries was signed.

"Entering the third decade of the Convention's existence, we can say without exaggeration that the conclusion of the Convention marked a turning point in the development of international cooperation for the purpose of a rational utilization of living resources of the sea in the common interests of nations.

"Our Commission has worked long and hard to overcome difficulties which it encountered. The Commission has gained invaluable experience in solving the problems of international regulation of fisheries.

"For the past two decades we have achieved much in the study of the state of fishery resources, the effect of fishing and environmental factors on the resources. International trawl regulations were worked out and are in force on this scientific basis. The Commission continues to improve these regulations.

"All this is good evidence of a big effort by the representatives of our countries directed to the achievement of the common aim, i.e. the maintenance of stable fishery resources in the Northwest Atlantic - a reliable source of welfare of all fishermen working in the Convention Area.

"During our joint work, continuously developing contacts between our scientists were especially useful. They not only promoted a better knowledge of the northwest part of the Atlantic but also contributed substantially to the oceanographic and fishery science.

"We should give further active support to scientific organizations of our countries and develop their activities.

"However, we are now facing new and no less complicated problems connected with the development of the technique of the world fisheries and the power of fishing fleets.

"We know well what consequences can result in the present situation from the fishery if conducted without due regard to recommendations made on the basis of scientific evidence by the scientists of our countries who work on the problems of the maintenance of fishery resources at the maximum sustainable level that can ensure their normal reproduction.

"The problem of rational utilization of living marine resources cannot be considered in isolation. This problem attracts ever greater attention of the United Nations Organization and its specialized agencies, as well as other international bodies with which we have developed and shall continue to further develop cooperation in the common interests of the whole of humanity.

(over)

"As I have already said, our scientists have achieved considerable success in the study of fishery resources of the Convention Area.

"Life demands from all of us, including the scientists, a greater purposefulness, more successful choice of main directions in research and in adoption of fish protection measures.

"Experience shows that we can do considerably more if we coordinate the common efforts of the scientists of all our countries directed to the assessment of the state of fish stocks and the determination of the size of an allowable catch, which is the most important task of the present moment.

"When solving the tasks before us we encounter ever more often the necessity of an effective and rapid implementation of the Commission's recommendations, the establishment of an efficient system of national and international enforcement and the provision of greater flexibility to the Commission in solving the problems with due regard, not only to scientific, but, also to economic and technical aspects.

"To this end, it is obviously necessary to broaden, proceeding from the requirements of the present situation, the frame of the Convention concluded more than 20 years ago.

"For this reason, our urgent task is the most prompt improvement of the Convention, the introduction of changes to the Convention which are dictated by life. A further delay can do serious harm to our cause.

"However, it is necessary to note that the Commission has not fully utilized all its possibilities within its functions prescribed by the Convention.

"One can say with confidence that even within the present frame, the Commission has sufficient rights and powers to ensure the maintenance of fish stocks at a maximum sustainable level.

"Out of five types of measures which ICNAF can recommend only two types are in fact utilized and, even then, not to the full extent. They concern minimum mesh size, the regulation of the use of topside chafers and the size of by-catch.

"As to the other three types of measures, the Commission has not yet made recommendations based on them, though the effectiveness of such measures in areas of other conventions does not evoke any doubt.

"I hope, however, that despite difficulties before us we shall continue to work persistently and successfully on the problems of further improvement of types and methods of regulation of fisheries.

"The experience of our joint work over many years inspires us with optimism and allows us to hope that common aspiration toward cooperation and mutual understanding will be again demonstrated at this meeting.

"Thank you for your attention."

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969Report of the First Meeting of theStanding Committee on Finance and Administration

Tuesday, 3 June, 0930 hrs

- F&A Item 1 Opening. The Chairman, Mr R. Green (USA), welcomed the meeting participants.
- F&A Item 2 Membership. In accordance with Commission Rules of Procedure 14(b) and the decision of the 1968 Annual Meeting, nominees and their Advisers from Canada, Denmark, USSR, UK and USA made up the Committee as follows:
- | | | |
|---------|---|---|
| Canada | - | <u>Mr E.B.Young</u> , Mr H.D.Pyke |
| Denmark | - | <u>Mr K. Lökkegaard</u> , Mr H.J.Lassen |
| USSR | - | <u>Mr A. Volkov</u> , Mr L.M.Zhel'tov |
| UK | - | <u>Mr A.J.Aglen</u> , Dr H.A.Cole |
| USA | - | <u>Mr Wm. L. Sullivan, Jr.</u> |
- F&A Item 3 Rapporteur. The Executive Secretary was appointed Rapporteur.
- F&A Item 4 Agenda. The agenda was adopted.
- F&A Item 5 Panel Membership. The Executive Secretary reviewed Comm.Doc.69/1 and the Panel membership in relation to current exploitation in the subareas. It was noted that Norway (Subarea 2), Denmark (Subarea 3) and Germany and Spain (Subarea 5) were fishing substantially in subareas other than those for which they held Panel memberships. The Committee agreed that it would wait for applications for Panel membership to come up through the Panels.
- F&A Item 6 Auditor's Report. The Executive Secretary reported that the Auditor's Report for 1966/67 (Ann.Proc.17, p.10-12) was returned to the Auditor for re-examination and comment regarding the source of the supplementary appropriation of \$550 towards the 1966/67 budget. The Auditor in his 1967/68 Audit Report considered that, in the 1966/67 Report, the supplementary appropriation of \$550 was erroneously charged against the Working Capital Fund and should have been a General Fund transaction in accordance with Financial Regulations. In the 1967/68 Report, the Auditor included an Appendix I to show an adjusted balance of surplus in clarification of the 1966/67 Audit Report.

Approval of the Auditor's course of action was received from 8 of the 14 member countries polled. F&A

recommends

- 1) that the Auditor's action in adjusting the 1967/68 Audit to show \$550 appropriated from surplus in the 1966/67 Audit Report instead of from the Working Capital Fund be approved;
- 2) that the carry-over to 1967/68 of \$6,000 appropriated in 1965/66 from the Working Capital Fund for the Marine Food Chains Symposium, be approved;
- 3) that the Auditor's Reports for 1966/67 and 1967/68 be adopted.

(over)

F&A Item 7 Administrative Report and Financial Statements. The Executive Secretary reviewed the Administrative Report and Financial Statements for 1968/69 (estimated from 15 May to 30 June) (Comm.Doc.69/10). Statements 1, 2 and 3 with Appendix I were considered in detail. The General Fund-Cash Flow Statement prepared at the request of the 1968 Annual Meeting was also examined. Estimated total obligations incurred during the year were \$6,139 less than the amounts appropriated from the member governments and from the Working Capital Fund as approved by the Commission at its 1968 Annual Meeting. Attention was drawn to the amount of \$18,137 left in the Working Capital Fund and to the Financial Regulation 4.7 regarding the level at which the Fund shall be maintained and the power of the Commission to determine that level. F&A

recommends

that the Administrative Report with Financial Statements for 1968/69 be adopted.

F&A Item 12 Relief for Commission in Canadian Income Tax Field. The Executive Secretary reported that the Staff Assessment Scheme approved for the Commission staff at the 1968 Annual Meeting was working satisfactorily and had provided \$9,885 to the Miscellaneous Fund in 1968/69. The Executive Secretary reported that this amount was only the amount of the Federal portion of the Canadian income tax and that the Nova Scotia Provincial portion was still not forthcoming because of further administrative requirements and Federal-Provincial negotiations.

F&A Item 13 Application of Canadian Government Employees Compensation Act. The Executive Secretary spoke briefly to this item as outlined in Comm. Doc.69/17. The Committee was pleased to learn that the Canadian Government Employees' Compensation Act could be applied to staffs of international commissions in Canada such as ICNAF and so provide for compensation for injury to an employee by accident arising out of, or in the course of employment, or for disablement caused by a specified industrial disease, except where the employee is disabled for fewer than a stated number of days. The nominee from USA (Mr Sullivan) was asked to draft an amendment to the Financial Regulations incorporating the scheme and its operation for study at the next meeting of the Committee. F&A

recommends

- 1) that steps be taken by the Executive Secretary to have the Canadian Government Employees' Compensation Act applied to the staff of the Secretariat, and
- 2) that the Commission express its thanks to the Government of Canada for making the scheme available.



Serial No.2286
(3.b.69)

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Ceremonial Opening Meeting

Monday, 2 June, 1000 hrs

The Opening Session of the 19th Annual Meeting of the Commission was convened at Jablonna Palace, Jablonna, near Warsaw, on 2 June 1969. The Chairman, Mr V.M.Kamentsev (USSR), expressed his great pleasure at being able to open an Annual Meeting of the Commission for the first time in Warsaw, the capital of the Polish People's Republic. He welcomed all present, Commissioners, Advisers, Observers and Guests.

The Chairman then introduced Mr J. Szopa, Minister of Shipping, who welcomed the Commission on behalf of the Government of the Polish People's Republic, as follows:

"It is my great privilege and honour, on behalf of Polish People's Republic, to welcome you, Mr Chairman, and you, Dr Needler, the Vice-Chairman of this organization, as well as all the representatives of the member countries, the Observers and the Experts, who have for the first time arrived at the capital of Poland - Warsaw - to take part in the XIX Session of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries.

"I have also the pleasure to welcome the representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, of the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission, and of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, and observers from Cuba, Ireland and Japan.

"I wish also to welcome Mr L.R.Day, the Secretary of the Commission, who has rendered so much assistance to Polish colleagues in the organization of this conference.

"Mr Chairman, gentlemen, this Commission incorporates in its membership a great majority of countries with long standing fishing traditions, with well advanced sea fisheries and numerous distinguished scientists, the researchers of the sea. This is a great pleasure for us, as the hosts, to be able to entertain here such an eminent group of economists, scientists and experts, who devote their great experience and knowledge to maintaining the rational exploitation of the fish resources in one of the richest areas of the Atlantic.

"The 1949 Convention, prepared by the Commission, undoubtedly presents an important legal act, which serves as a good basis for international cooperation. This cooperation is being steadily improved and more and more effectively fulfills its role to the satisfaction of the member countries, who sponsored its creation.

"Since its creation, the work of the Commission has resulted in considerable progress in the scope of fishery regulations. We are aware, however, that further steps will be necessary, the working out of which will not be an easy task. The actual Session is facing a number of important problems which involve detailed discussions in order to draw proper conclusions.

"Let me mention some of them:

"The observance of the regulations in respect of mesh size would create the necessity for a prompt implementation of an adequate control. This also involves the need for setting up bilateral agreements between member countries in the scope of exchange of inspectors aboard fishing vessels for the inspection of fishing gear.

"Another important task which requires a detailed analysis is the correct assessment of fish stocks of particular species in the ICNAF subareas. The results of research work, conducted within the program realized by the common effort of the scientists from member countries, may be of essential importance in helping to undertake further steps in the formulation of the conclusions and recommendations.

(over)

"We are all aware of how important is the representative quality of research materials and statistical data for the assessment of fish resources, the more so in view of the fact that the recommendations of the Commission have close bearing on economic consequences, which may be of drastic character for those member countries which are developing their fisheries.

"In spite of great technical progress all the world over and of steadily improving methods of scientific research, we may assume that in the marine environment there still occur a number of phenomena which as yet may not be authoritatively estimated and formulated by science.

"The migration of fish stocks, the changes in hydrological conditions, etc., upon which man can exert no influence, impede the scientific estimation of the actual resources of fish. The extent and the scope of investigations on fish over many years may give a rough picture in what state these resources of particular species are.

"There is an obvious necessity for a broad international cooperation to help to improve the standard of nourishment in the world and this is fully appreciated by our Government.

"For many years we have been a member of the Food and Agriculture Organization and acting within the scope of its activity we have declared our participation in the program of investigations of the natural protein basis of the seas and undertaken the training of fishery experts for developing countries, which also includes the building of a research vessel with up-to-date equipment for this purpose. We are also prepared to make bilateral and multilateral agreements for carrying out the research on marine resources and their rational utilization.

"Poland is especially interested in developing its own fisheries since we belong to those countries which suffered greatest destruction during World War II, that caused particularly great devastation in Polish fisheries.

"The Government of the Polish People's Republic pays great attention to the problem of developing its fishing industry in order to give us the possibility of filling up the deficiency in protein for human consumption. For, as it is known, the consumption of protein per capita in Poland is below the average standard among the countries belonging to this organization.

"Mr Chairman, I believe that with full consideration of the needs of one another and with good attitude to the situation of the countries developing their fisheries in order to utilize the natural resources of the sea - there do exist great possibilities for rational management of these resources for the common benefit.

"I do hope that I am expressing not only my own opinion that the resolutions and recommendations of the XIX ICNAF Session will make another step toward closer cooperation between member countries, and profiting by the privilege of the host, I wish the honourable participants both fruitful meetings and a pleasant time during their stay here."

The Chairman of the Commission thanked the Minister for his warm welcome and good wishes for a fruitful meeting and pleasant stay in Poland. He then declared the Nineteenth Meeting of the Commission open.



Serial No. 2291
(B.g.p)

Proceedings No. 11

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Meeting of Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures

Tuesday, 3 June, 1100 hrs

- Item 1 Opening. The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr J. Graham (UK), with representation from all member countries present.
- Item 2 Rapporteur. The Executive Secretary was appointed Rapporteur.
- Item 3 Agenda. The agenda was adopted.
- Item 4 Report from Research and Statistics. The Chairman asked for a progress report from the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics on the tasks set for it by the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures at its mid-term meeting in January 1968. The Committee agreed that the provisional 1969 Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics which had been presented at the First Plenary Session and which contained further reporting on the tasks set for it by the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures need not be dealt with further at this time. It was pointed out that the Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics and the Report of the January 1969 meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures (Appendix I, also circulated as Comm.Doc.69/2) would both be going forward to Plenary for consideration.
- Item 6 Administrative Aspects of Controlling Fishing. The Chairman called attention to the recommendation of the January 1969 meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures to add an item to the agenda of its 1969 meeting in Warsaw which would provide for discussion of the Commission's resources in relation to the administrative aspects of controlling fishing. Dr Needler (Canada) stated that the item was added to stimulate thinking about the administrative, practical and financial requirements for the Commission in controlling fishing in the Convention Area. Mr Lund (Norway) and Mr Aglen (UK) thought that such considerations were premature and suggested that Panels might keep administrative needs in mind when working out schemes for limiting effort in their subareas. Also the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics and other committees could be asked to submit suggestions for needs. Mr Terry (USA) proposed that the Committee keep the administrative question open for another meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures after the reaction of the Commission to the Committee's January 1969 report was known.
- Item 5 Principles and Problems of Limiting Fishing. The Committee agreed that there was nothing to add to or alter in the report of the January 1969 meeting before it went before the Commission.

The meeting adjourned at 1230 hrs.



Serial No.2150
(B.P)

Proceedings No.11
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Mid-Term Meeting of Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures
London, 27-29 January 1969

Time, Place and Participants

1. A mid-term meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures was held in West Block, Whitehall Place, London, from 27 to 29 January 1969 through the kindness of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. Delegates from 12 member countries, with advisers and experts, and observers from FAO (Annex I) were welcomed by Mr J. Graham (UK), Chairman of the Committee.

Agenda

2. A provisional agenda was circulated and after a short discussion was adopted (Annex II).

Working Papers

3. The Chairman drew attention to the working papers, the USSR proposal presented to the 1968 Annual Meeting of ICNAF (1968 Meeting Proceedings No.16, para.5), the US paper "Note by the United States Commissioners on Catch Quota Regulatory Systems", circulated by the ICNAF Secretariat in mid-December 1968, and a paper by Mr J. Gulland "Some considerations of the Problems of Controlling Effort in the ICNAF Area" which was also circulated in mid-December 1968. He pointed out that the ICNAF Assessments Subcommittee had just completed a meeting, under its Chairman, Mr B.B.Parrish (UK), at which provisional estimates of catch quotas for Subarea 1 cod and Subarea 5 haddock had been made. He proposed that the USSR and US papers be presented and examined in accordance with the guidelines set out at the 1968 June meeting of the Committee in London (Annex II) and in the light of those points raised in Mr Gulland's paper.

USSR and US Proposals

4. The USSR delegation, in introducing their proposals, said that fishing intensity was rather high. Much research work would be necessary before a precise assessment of all stocks in the ICNAF Area could be made, but this could be done for particular stocks. Until this research had been completed, their scientists considered it would be appropriate for countries to agree not to increase the scale of their fishing activities. In the meantime, the ICNAF Standing Committee on Research and Statistics could elaborate a program of research covering all species, which would take three or four years.

5. In presenting their paper, the US delegation drew attention to a change in their thinking since they made their original proposals in June 1968. They then proposed that where a species was regulated, 20 percent of the catch should be unallocated and remain free for fishing by all member states. Their present view was that this proportion should be used to make a second phase allocation to individual countries, taking into account special circumstances such as those of coastal states.

6. After some discussion of these proposals, the Committee agreed that it would be preferable for it to concentrate its attention onto problems of a general character, so as to provide guidelines for the negotiations of catch limitation schemes; the total catch for each scheme would depend on the particular conditions of the relevant stocks in the areas concerned. The Committee then proceeded to consider the problems involved.

Establishing a Catch Limitation Scheme

7. A scheme of catch limitation involves the establishment of (a) the total allowable catch, and (b) the proportions in which this total catch is to be shared between the participating countries.

Total Allowable Catch

8. It is for the Commission to decide whether a catch limitation should be introduced, to which areas it should apply, and to which species. The objective would be one of the following:

- a) to maintain the stocks in question at, or near to, the level producing the maximum sustainable yield;
- b) if the stocks in question are already overfished, to restore them to the level referred to in (a) or to take a step towards doing so; or
- c) to stabilize the position and prevent it getting worse.

The Commission would decide between these objectives which means, in effect, determining the mortality rates on the stock in question to be aimed at. The catch limit (total catch) needed to achieve the Commission's choice on mortality rates can be objectively assessed on the basis of scientific evidence; scientific evidence can also assist the Commission in choosing between the alternatives open to it.

9. The statement giving the conclusions of the Assessments Subcommittee gave figures illustrating the effect of various degrees of restriction on fish take for cod in Subarea 1 and haddock in Subarea 5. The Committee did not feel that there was any general guidance which it could usefully give on these questions which would have to be decided by the Commission in the light of the relevant scientific evidence and the state of the stocks in question. The Committee, therefore, concentrated its attention on (b) of paragraph 7 - the method of apportioning among participating countries the total catch determined by the Commission.

Apportionment of Quotas

10. The Committee first considered the various factors that would need to be taken into account determining each country's share. The majority of countries agreed that a small proportion of the total should be set aside to provide for new entrants and non-members. The remainder would then be allocated between countries participating in the fisheries. The Committee generally agreed that shares should be based mainly on historical performance, but that they should also take account of other factors. It was suggested that such factors might include, without any implication as to the order of priority, provision for states with developing fisheries, coastal states and states with fleets which were incapable of being diverted to other fisheries. It was also agreed that schemes should be flexible, in the sense that the shares initially fixed could not continue in force indefinitely but would be capable of adjustment in the light of experience.

11. The Committee considered that it would be impracticable to lay down hard and fast rules to determine the weight that should be given to the various factors mentioned above. This would have to be settled by negotiation between the member countries participating in any particular scheme. Nevertheless, the Committee agree on the following guidelines which indicate in general terms how the various factors might be taken into account.

Initial Determination of Quotas

12. Historical performance would be measured by average catches of the relevant species over a datum period. A long datum period could tend to favour countries traditionally fishing in an area, whereas a short datum period would tend to favour recent participants in the fishery and countries whose scale of activity was expanding. A possible compromise might be to distribute one half of the historical part of the shares on the basis of catches during a datum period of ten years or longer and the other half on the basis of catches during the last three years. Many countries thought that the portion of the shares to be allocated on a historic basis might be about 80 percent, leaving a balance of about 20 percent to cover both new entrants and non-members, and any special claims by participants on the grounds such as are mentioned in paragraph 10, though these percentages might differ from scheme to scheme. Insofar as provision for development was concerned, several countries suggested that of this balance a proportion should be allocated for general developments and that it should be shared equally by all the participants and not restricted to countries with special claims as had been suggested by other countries.

Adjustment of Initial Quotas

13. The initial quota for each country would be decided by applying the sharing system, agreed in negotiation, to the total catch for the area and stock in question. The permissible total catch would be reviewed annually by the R&S Committee and consequential changes in the quotas for each country would then be made. The Committee considered that the shares would be subject to review periodically, the periods being determined in the original agreement. The Committee hoped that after schemes had been in operation for some time the reviews would be needed less frequently, say at intervals of five years. Provision should then be made for minor adjustments between reviews, these adjustments being automatic so far as possible.

Catches in Excess of Quotas

14. It was generally agreed that if a country exceeded its quota in any year, its share for the subsequent year should be reduced. Some countries thought that it would be sufficient to reduce the quota for subsequent years by the amount of the excess, but others considered that the reduction should be at least twice as great.

Under-Utilization of Quotas

15. The Committee considered whether countries not utilizing their quotas in full should have their shares reduced. In a situation where reduction in fishing mortality is required, under-utilization is beneficial. On the other hand, it was thought by some that if a country deliberately failed to make full use of its quota, this should lead to some re-allocation. If, for this reason, some reduction in a country's share was made, most countries agreed that it should be on a much lower scale than for over-utilization, and that it should perhaps not be invoked unless the under-utilization was persistent over, say, at least three years. There was, however, a general consensus that it would be sufficient to take account of under-utilization in the general review.

Enforcement and Monitoring of the Regulations

16. The Committee attached great importance to proper enforcement. All countries were in a position to check the catches of their vessels on landing, but it was not so clear that the areas in which catches were taken could be checked so effectively, and this would be material if quotas applied to only part of the Convention Area, or if different quotas applied to different parts. It was agreed, therefore, that any help on checks made at landing ports which could be given by inspection at sea would be helpful, and that to facilitate this, vessels should be required to keep a log book in a standard form, indicating the time and place of each catch. It was also suggested that it would be helpful if fishing vessels reported their arrival and departure from a controlled area by radio. The Committee felt that observance of the regulations would be encouraged if the member countries were seen to be cooperating in their enforcement, especially by inspections at sea, and that arrangements to this effect should be made pending the coming into force of any more general joint inspection scheme.

17. The Committee did not feel able to deal with this problem in detail. They considered that when a scheme was negotiated for any area, the countries concerned should inform each other of the specific arrangements they proposed to make for monitoring and enforcement, so that the Commission and the other countries concerned could satisfy themselves that the arrangements would be effective.

Technical details

18. Since catch quotas would be in terms of landed equivalent whole fish, it would be necessary to establish conversion factors where the fish underwent processing at sea, and also the method of treatment of discards. These matters would need to be settled by experts at the time a scheme was formulated in the light of the particular circumstances, and the FAO/ICES/ICNAF Coordinating Working Party on Atlantic Fishery Statistics (CWP) could advise.

Diversion of Fishing Effort

19. The Committee recognized that regulation of catching in one area would lead to diversion of effort from that area to others. If the diversion was to an area where the stocks were already at the maximum yield position, diversion would

be undesirable and should be prevented by quota regulations in that area. On the other hand, diversion to areas in which the stocks were not yet fully exploited, was beneficial.

Statement by the Assessments Subcommittee

20. The Subcommittee turned its attention again to the statement of the Assessments Subcommittee and noted that it stressed

- a) the desirability of introducing regulations controlling fishing mortality rate on the cod stock in Subarea 1 and the haddock stock in Subarea 5, additional to the mesh-size regulations currently in force;
- b) the provisional estimates of the total catch quotas which would have to be such at the present time for Subarea 1 cod and Subarea 5 haddock fisheries respectively to achieve specified reductions in fishing mortality;
- c) the fact that the introduction of any catch restrictions would not make mesh regulations any the less necessary and there would still be a gain in the long-term yield per recruit of cod at West Greenland, and in some other areas, by a further increase in mesh size above that in force at the present time.

Recommendations

21. The Committee recommended that, if the Commission approved their conclusions, they should be drawn to the attention of the Panels for consideration of the possible quota scheme for which areas and species would be desirable.

22. The Committee agreed that an item should be added to the agenda of its June 1969 meeting in Warsaw which would provide for discussion of the Commission's resources in relation to the administrative aspects of controlling fishing.

Adjournment

23. The Committee expressed its gratitude for the facilities and hospitality provided by Her Majesty's Government. There being no other business, the Committee adjourned at 1630 hrs, 29 January.

Mid-Term Meeting of Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures
London, 27-29 January 1969List of Participants

<u>Canada</u>	Dr A.W.H.Needler Mr E.B.Young Dr F.D.McCracken Dr A.W.May Dr G.F.M.Smith Mr L.H.Legault
<u>Denmark</u>	Mr K. Løkkegaard Mr Sv. Aa. Horsted
<u>France</u>	Mr R. Lagarde Mme G. Rossignol
<u>Federal Republic of Germany</u>	Dr U. Schmidt Dr A. Meyer Mr A. Schumacher Mr D. Booss
<u>Iceland</u>	Dr J. Jonsson
<u>Norway</u>	Mr O. Lund Mr E. Kvammen Mr A. Holm Mr S. Remoy Mr A. Høyen
<u>Poland</u>	Dr F. Chrzan Mr M. Fila Mr Z. Pietniewicz
<u>Portugal</u>	Captain Tavares de Almeida
<u>Spain</u>	Mr J. Barcelo Mr V. Bermejo
<u>USSR</u>	Dr A.S.Bogdanov Mr A.A.Volkov Mr L.M.Zhel'tov
<u>UK</u>	Mr J. Graham Mr A.J.Aglen Dr H.A.Cole Mr A. Laing Mr P. Parkhouse Mr B.B.Parrish Mrs S.P.Pollitt
<u>USA</u>	Mr W.M.Terry Mr W.L.Sullivan, Jr. Mr H. Beasley
<u>FAO</u>	Mr R.C.Hennemuth Mr F. Popper Mr J.A.Gulland
<u>ICNAF</u>	Executive Secretary - Mr L.R.Day

Mid-Term Meeting of Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures
London, 27-29 January 1969Agenda

1. Welcome by Chairman, Mr J. Graham (UK)
2. Adoption of Agenda
3. Oral statement by Chairman of ICNAF Assessments Subcommittee (Mr B.B.Parrish)
4. Consideration of USSR Proposals (ICNAF Meeting Proceedings No.16, para.5)
5. Consideration of US Paper ("Note by United States Commissioners on Catch Quota Regulatory Systems" being Contribution No.2 distributed with ICNAF Circular Letter 68/20 dated 17 December 1968)
6. Other Matters
7. Adjournment

NOTE:

The presentations referred to under Agenda Items 4 and 5 above will be examined in accordance with the guidelines set out in paragraph 7 of 1968 ICNAF Meeting Proceedings No.16, which were as follows:

- (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,

and in the light of those points raised in Mr J.A.Gulland's paper "Some Considerations of the Problems of Controlling Effort in the ICNAF Area" (Contribution No.1 distributed with ICNAF Circular Letter 68/20 dated 17 December 1968).



Serial No.2292
(8.b.69)

Proceedings No.12

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of the Second Plenary Session

Wednesday, 4 June, 0930 hrs

1. The Chairman, Mr V.M.Kamentsev (USSR), opened the meeting with representatives from all member governments and Observers present.
2. The Report of the First Plenary Session (Proc.8) was read and adopted without comment.
3. The Chairman reviewed the progress of the various Committees and Panels noting that the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration and the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures had held their first meetings and that Panels A, 1 and 3 had each completed their work. Reports would be presented to the next Plenary Session from the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures (Proc.11), Panel A (Proc.2), Panel 1 (Proc.6) and Panel 3 (Proc.3).
4. At the Chairman's suggestion, the Plenary adjourned so that a Joint Meeting of Panels might be held to consider Plenary Item 20, Conservation Measures for Atlantic Salmon, referred to it by the Plenary at its first session.
5. The meeting adjourned at 1000 hrs.



Serial No.2293
(B.e.69)

Proceedings No.13

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of the Joint Meeting of Panels

Wednesday, 4 June, 1000 hrs

1. The Chairman of the Commission, Mr V. Kamentsev (USSR), opened the meeting which was convened to consider Conservation Measures for Atlantic Salmon under Plenary Agenda Item 20. Representatives of all governments with membership in Panels 1-5 were present. The Chairman drew attention to the resolution from the 1968 Annual Meeting which requested that member countries 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 (1966 Meeting Proceedings No.13 and No.18 with Appendix II). Since then, the ICES/ICNAF Joint Working Party on Atlantic Salmon has held meetings in Copenhagen in October 1968 (Res.Doc.69/5) and May 1969 (Res.Doc.69/33). In addition, the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics has considered these reports and prepared comments of its own which are included in the Provisional Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics. Mr B.B.Parrish (UK), Chairman of the Joint Salmon Working Party and of the Assessments Subcommittee, reviewed briefly the latest results of the research of the salmon scientists.
2. The Chairman then drew attention to the Canadian proposal to prohibit fishing for Atlantic salmon on the high seas in the Convention Area (Comm.Doc.69/19) and asked the Canadian Delegate to review the proposal. In supplementing the Canadian document proposing prohibition of fishing on the high seas, the Canadian Delegate pointed out that one of Canada's reasons for the proposed ban was economic more than scientific, but that this was important to salmon conservation in Canada and other countries of salmon origin who have a great responsibility and spend enormous sums of money on fish culture and pollution abatement to maintain the stocks of salmon. He pointed out that to make best use of the salmon, it was necessary and desirable to regulate the take of various salmon stocks separately. This is evident in the southern part of the Canadian Atlantic salmon producing area where the lowest rainfall on record in 1968 may be responsible for the production of little, if any, salmon run in 1970, 1971 and 1972. It may be necessary to prohibit salmon fishing in the southern areas in 1971 or 1972. In the northern part conditions have been normal and normal runs are expected. In conclusion, the Canadian Delegate expressed the hope that the Joint Meeting of Panels would request the Commission to recommend to Contracting Governments that the fishery for salmon in the waters outside national fishing limits be prohibited in the Convention Area.
3. The Danish Delegate, in speaking against the proposed ban, expressed concern about some of the arguments used in support of it within the Commission. Scientific evidence, not emotion, should be the criterion for making any decisions on high seas fishing. He questioned the need for such a drastic measure when the scientific evidence was so limited and suggested exploration of other less drastic regulatory measures. The complete text of his remarks is in Appendix I.
4. The UK Delegate, in reply to the Danish Delegate's remarks, pointed out that he had meant to say that the scientific questions on which answers are still open to doubt are not critical rather than not relevant. Even if further evidence were to show that the amount of the salmon caught on the high seas exceeded the loss to the home fisheries, this could not remove the UK's objection to the high seas fishery. He asked if each State has a moral duty to maintain stocks in its own rivers without getting any of the benefits and if the high seas catch continues to increase should home water countries have, as a duty, to take measures to maintain it. He pointed out that if other and smaller measures are available, member governments should be proposing them.
5. The USSR Delegate expressed his government's support of the Canadian proposal and agreement with the UK Delegate. Evidence of the good effect of banning fishing on the high seas is well-known for sturgeon in the Caspian Sea.

(over)

6. The Federal Republic of Germany's Delegate expressed his government's objection to the Canadian proposal and agreement with the Danish Delegate's stand. He pointed out that the Convention did not provide for such a measure as banning a fishery, that the law of the freedom of the high seas prohibits such action, that coastal states will have exclusive rights and that there was no scientific evidence that continued high seas fishing will destroy the salmon stocks. The Baltic high seas fishery has not resulted in depletion and has even continued to be successful through regulation by agreed mesh and fish size. The Delegate compared the proposed ban to the principle of abstention which has not been found acceptable. He felt that there was a danger that other States would use a salmon ban as a precedent for a ban on other species. He proposed that the meeting be opened to discussion of other conservation measures since no other measures had been proposed to date except a ban.

7. The Norwegian Delegate reported that his government had expressed serious concern at the increasing development of high seas fishery for salmon at the 1968 Annual Meeting but was unable because of legalities to vote for a ban on the fishery. His government was now prepared to support the Canadian proposal despite the fact that a ban on fishing off West Greenland would raise serious economic problems for Norwegian fishermen engaged in fishing for salmon there.

8. The Icelandic Delegate pointed out that the high seas fisheries are developing faster than the scientific study because salmon fishing is profitable. Iceland has banned sea fishing by its own nationals and wishes to support the ban.

9. The US Delegate reported US support for the Canadian proposal. He pointed out that the 1968 salmon resolution from the Annual Meeting of ICNAF asks member governments to try and prevent an increase in catch in offshore waters. Instead the catch has increased.

10. The Delegates from France, Spain, Italy, Romania and Poland expressed support from their governments for the Canadian proposal. The Delegate from Portugal reported his country had no salmon fishery in the Convention Area and that his government would abstain.

11. Following a suggestion by the Chairman that a vote be taken on the Canadian proposal, the Norwegian Delegate questioned the phrase in the Canadian proposal "to be put into effect immediately". The Canadian Delegate agreed that a date could be added but that the Commission may review any regulation at any time and propose changes. In reply to a suggestion that the Canadian proposal be amended by adding something about more scientific evidence, the Canadian Delegate said that Canada was in favour of more research but it is expensive and although research will continue it may not be enough to give limited assurance in a short time. He agreed that "continued" and even "extensive research" might also be added.

12. The Federal Republic of Germany's Delegate suggested that he was prepared to formulate a compromise proposal based on, for example, quotas, closed areas and closed seasons which would slow down the development of high seas fishing, allow the scientists to continue their studies and placate those who had fears of depletion of the salmon stock. The UK Delegate replied that UK had looked into the use of other measures and concluded that they would not do any good in West Greenland. For example, the fish there are all of the same size range so that mesh size and size limits are useless. Catch limits cannot be effectively enforced and limited closed areas are not effective.

13. With the Canadian proposal for banning high seas salmon fishing and the Federal Republic of Germany's proposal for exploration of other possible measures before the meeting, the Chairman requested a vote which by a two-thirds majority was for consideration of the Canadian proposal.

The Joint Meeting of Panels, by a vote of 11 for, 2 against and 1 abstention, recommends

- 1) that the Commission recommend to the Contracting Governments that the fishery for salmon in the waters outside national fishery limits should be prohibited in the Convention Area;
- 2) that the attention of the Commission be drawn to the discussion in the Joint Meeting of Panels regarding possible amendments to establish an effective date for implementing the ban and to establish that research will continue.

14. The meeting adjourned at 1205 hrs.



Serial No. 2293
(B.e.69)

Proceedings No. 13
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Statement of Danish Delegate on Atlantic Salmon under Plenary Agenda Item 20

"Mr Chairman -

"The salmon fisheries have been the object of discussions in ICNAF for some years and have been debated outside this forum with still growing emotions. I would like to comment upon some of the arguments brought forward. I find it for several reasons difficult - and wrong - to limit myself to what has been advocated in this Commission.

"I have had the pleasure of participating in the meetings of ICNAF for quite a period of years and it has been a satisfaction to me to realize the outstanding qualities of this organization. It has been a forum where matters of common concern were discussed without - in this respect - undue influence of politics and narrow national interests.

"I sincerely hope that this quality of ICNAF will never be destroyed, but I feel that we are running a big risk of losing the sound basis of cooperation if we submit to or let ourselves be lead by a whipped-up public opinion.

"It has been expressed in the debate - even within the international organizations involved - that 'the scientific questions on which answers are still open to doubt are not relevant and that it is to be hoped that delegations of some countries will not continue to shelter behind them.' It was in the speaker's opinion insupportable that such a trifle should uphold action.

"Having the honour and pleasure to be the representative of one of these delegations, I feel compelled to object: the scientific background is where this and similar international bodies should shelter and not behind emotional and panicky public opinion expressed in papers and privately organized meetings by single persons with an understandable interest and an undoubted enthusiasm, but without the substantial scientific basis.

"It has been pointed out also that 'a ban is not incompatible with the biological evidence available'. I am far from objecting to this fact, but I find it necessary to object to this kind of argument being used or having a final influence on the decisions of this Commission. If we yield to such criteria we are losing the sound ground of cooperation hitherto being the fundament of this Commission. If we are going to take action on such a basis there will be no limits and no guarantee for our actions. The fact that a measure is not contrary to scientific experience has no validity if this is only due to the fact that scientific investigations and research have not been made or are not yet sufficient.

"Delegations from countries without specific interest in the fisheries under debate have expressed that nevertheless they support a proposal of a ban on salmon fisheries on the high seas - merely because they are as a matter of principle in favour of conservation measures, or in other words, against a destruction of fish stocks in general. In my opinion the problem these countries are facing is not whether to destroy (what nobody knows so far) the stocks of fish, but the fact that we might destroy the fundamental basis of the cooperation in ICNAF.

"There has been thrown an odium on the delegations maintaining the principles of the convention of scientific evidence as starting-point for action.

"I should like to stress that the Danish delegation is not claiming a 100% evidence, but I'll call to your attention (to quote the terminology used by my distinguished colleague from the Federal Republic in the meeting of NEAFC) that not even a sufficiently 'striking likelihood' is at hand, that the high seas fisheries are a serious threat to salmon fisheries as a whole.

(over)

"I see no reason to go into a discussion of the value of the scientific information available as the countries in favour of a prohibition claim that action should be taken even without such evidence - on the basis of a mere fear of what might happen in the meantime, i.e. until the necessary research has been made.

"In the discussions it has been mentioned that the Danish delegations were advocating the point of view - I quote - ...That it is only right that all countries should be entitled to benefit from the investment of a few...

"I reckon that this has only been said in the heat of discussion - it has at any rate never been a Danish point of view.

"I should like one comment only. The word 'investment' is used - I guess that the Commission would agree this can only partly be true. It goes for all countries that pollution, the building of dams, etc. is detrimental to salmon fisheries. Sweden, who is extremely interested in salmon and has the problems of the so-called 'investments' - has expressed as its point of view - with your permission Mr Chairman - I quote from the minutes of the meeting of NEAFC in London: '...Each state has a moral duty to conserve its natural resources'. If I may interpret this remark it can only be the way, that the money is spent is at least partly to be considered a restitution for damages done to the waters where the spawning takes place.

"It would be hypocritical of me to say that all the money spent had the character of restitution and I have no such intention. It is however a dangerous point of view to claim that money spent, even being pure investment, should mean that the investing country has the right of reserving the fish for its own use and catch. The measures taken in home waters give an understandable interest, but not a prescriptive right.

"Salmon is non-typical because of its specific behaviour, but this fact does not create a justification for the Commission to act merely on the basis of public opinion.

"Where, in general, sufficient scientific research has been made this Commission, and other bodies like it, try to regulate the fisheries with measures spreading from regulations on gear, closed seasons to minimum sizes on the species of fish involved. What is proposed now is the most rigorous measures, far beyond such action - the prohibition of fishing at all - and without the same foundation as normally required.

"As it is, nobody is in a position to forecast the development and the possible consequences of a continued or even increased fishing in the international waters, but - without using this as a justification of my standpoint - I should like to mention, should the fear be justified, that salmon is a species of fish where restitution if necessary can be made by artificial or man-made measures.

"The Danish position expressed at the 1968 Annual Meeting, after study of the report of the Joint Meeting of Panels and meetings with fishermen and industry, was to oppose the ban on high seas fishing for salmon and stressed the need for more scientific evidence as a basis for decision. The Third Report of the Joint Salmon Working Party which has been presented to this meeting still does not convince me that the ban can be supported on the basis of the available scientific evidence. I wonder if Commissioners and Scientists are convinced that such drastic action as a ban on high seas fishing should be taken on such limited scientific evidence and why, from an academic viewpoint, when there is such limited evidence is some less drastic action not recommended. Therefore, my Government cannot support this proposal to ban high seas salmon fishing."



Serial No. 2296
(B.c.69)

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of the Second Meeting of the

Standing Committee on Finance and Administration

Thursday, 5 June, 1450 hrs

F&A Item 13 Application of Canadian Government Employees' Compensation Act. The draft of the amendment to the Financial Regulations agreed at the First Meeting was considered. F&A

recommends

that the following be added to Rule 6 of the Financial Regulations, effective on the date that the Canadian Government Employees' Compensation Act becomes effective with respect to the staff of the Commission:

"6.5 The Canadian Government Employees' Compensation Act shall be applicable to the staff, as provided by the Government of Canada. With respect to amounts charged to the Commission under the Act, the Executive Secretary is authorized to make payments from current appropriations which are otherwise unobligated and which would be surplus at the end of the financial year and credited to the Working Capital Fund in accordance with Rule 4.4.c, to the extent possible. The Executive Secretary shall include in the estimates every other amount charged to the Commission, including any amount which is to be charged annually after the initial payment."

F&A Item 11 Subcommittee on Financial and Administrative Matters. The Report of the Subcommittee on Financial and Administrative Matters (Comm. Doc.69/5) was considered. The Committee agreed that no changes were necessary in the timing of the meetings of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, but held mixed views as to the desirability of recessing on the first day after presentation of the report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics at the First Plenary. F&A

recommends

- 1) that, for the time being, the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics and Commission Annual Meetings continue to be held concurrently;
- 2) that no change be made in the starting time of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics;
- 3) that the Assessments Subcommittee continue to hold mid-year meetings, and
- 4) that the views be ascertained in Plenary of the utility of recessing on the first day after presentation of the Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, and that the Plenary decide whether or not this practice should be continued in the future.

The proposed amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission was carefully examined. F&A

recommends

that the Rules of Procedure set out on pages 2-5 of Comm. Doc.69/5 be adopted with the following changes:

- 1) Rule 2.1 to read: "Observers, experts, and advisers may address Plenary or Committee meetings of the Commission but shall not be entitled to vote";
- 2) Rule 5 to be amended to read: "Except with the unanimous agreement of Commissioners representing all Contracting Governments, no order of business...";
- 3) Rule 6.3 and 6.4 change "by" to "of" in the third line;
- 4) Rule 6.3 add in the next to the last line after "desirable" the following: "(c) keep under review the state of exploited fish stocks and the effects of fishing on these and provide the Commission and Panels with regular assessments";
- 5) Rule 7 insert in the first line after "Commission" the following: "and its subsidiary bodies";
- 6) Rule 8.2 to read: "Summary minutes of the proceedings of all meetings of Panels and Committees shall be furnished to the Commission."

The Committee went on to consider the proposed amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the Panels. After some discussion, F&A

recommends

that the Rules of Procedure for the Panels set out on pages 6-7 of Comm.Doc.69/5 be adopted by the Panels with the following change: Rule 4 be amended to read: "Except with the unanimous agreement of Commissioners representing Contracting Governments which are members of the Panel, no order of business ..."

The Committee reviewed the discussion at its first meeting concerning the carry-over of \$6,000 appropriated from the Working Capital Fund for the Marine Food Chains Symposium. It agreed that in such special circumstances it should be possible to carry over appropriations without regard to the time limitations contained in the Financial Regulations until expended or no longer needed. It examined a proposed amendment of the Subcommittee on Financial and Administrative Matters (Comm.Doc.69/5, p.7). F&A

recommends

that the following sentence be added to Rule 3.2 of the Financial Regulations as adopted by the Commission 1 July 1968:

"However appropriations from the Working Capital Fund for capital and special expenditures shall remain available, as determined by the Commission, until expended or no longer needed for the purpose for which appropriated."

F&A Item 14 Publication Matters. The Committee agreed that its discussion of publication matters under the Administrative Report had been adequate and that no further action was necessary. It took note with appreciation that while the number of publications and especially the number of pages in each publication had been increasing, the cost per page had remained stable in the face of generally rising costs.

F&A Item 15 Date of Billing. F&A

recommends

that the date of billing be 15 August 1969.

F&A Item 16 1971 and 1972 Annual Meetings. Mr W.L.Sullivan (USA) suggested that the Commission consider holding its 1972 meeting in the United States at the customary time. He explained that several sites were still under consideration, and that the United States Government would be

pleased to receive any suggestions from the Commission. His Government would be in a position to name a specific site at least by the time of the 1970 Annual Meeting. No information was available on invitations to hold the 1971 meeting away from Headquarters. It was noted, however, that it would be possible to consider an invitation as late as the 1970 Annual Meeting if the host government was in a position to arrange suitable accommodations for both the meeting and the participants. F&A

recommends

- 1) that the 1971 Annual Meeting tentatively be scheduled at Halifax, Nova Scotia, during the first week of June, and
- 2) that the kind invitation of the United States to hold the 1972 meeting at a site to be selected later, during the first week of June, be accepted with thanks.

F&A Item 8

Budget 1969/70. The Executive Secretary and Mr E.B.Young (Canada) presented information concerning an increase in compensation to Government employees in Canada which has been agreed but not implemented. The increase is expected to be implemented shortly, and will be retroactive to October 1967 due to a change in the method of fixing compensation for Government employees in Canada. Information in general terms is available for certain positions on the staff, while other categories have not yet been decided on. Present information indicates that an amount of \$6,600 will be necessary to cover retroactive increases from October 1967 through June 1969, and that the salaries amount should be increased to \$67,000 to cover the period through June 1970. After some discussion of the impact of these increases on the budget of the Commission, and an examination of other budget items, the Committee decided it had to review all financial resources of the Commission, including the Working Capital Fund, before it could recommend a budget.

F&A Item 10

Working Capital Fund. The Committee noted that the present level of the Fund stands at \$18,137 and that the anticipated surplus of \$6,139 in the 1968/69 budget as of 30 June will increase the Fund to \$24,276 when transferred to the Fund in accordance with Fin.Reg. Rule 4.4.c. Considering that the only special expenditure anticipated is \$5,000 for the Stock Recruitment Symposium in 1970/71, and noting the provisions of Fin.Reg.4.7, F&A

recommends

that \$4,276 be declared in excess of the present and anticipated needs on the Working Capital Fund, and that it be transferred immediately to the Miscellaneous Fund in accordance with Fin. Reg. Rule 4.7.

Returning to the 1969/70 budget, F&A Item 8, the Committee noted that, of the amount appropriated for 1968/69, the sum of \$100,929 had been assessed on member governments. With the salary increases anticipated as discussed above, the 1969/70 budget would be \$116,300. However, the Committee noted that \$9,885 is available in the Miscellaneous Fund from the staff assessment scheme adopted last year, and that the transfer from the Working Capital Fund recommended above would increase this amount to \$14,161. This would be deducted from the \$116,300 to be assessed, leaving \$102,139 to be assessed, an increase of only \$1,210 to be contributed by members collectively (Appendix I). F&A

recommends

- 1) that the ordinary expenditures of the Commission for the fiscal year 1969/70 be \$116,300;
- 2) that, after approximately \$14,161 is utilized from the Miscellaneous Fund, these expenditures be met by appropriating approximately \$102,139 from member governments;

- 3) that the Executive Secretary be authorized to increase staff salaries and to make retroactive payments effective on the date of the anticipated salary increases for the Public Service of Canada, to the extent possible within the Contingency Salary item.

F&A Item 9

Budget Forecast 1970/71. The Executive Secretary estimated that the salary increases discussed above, plus anticipated increases for clerical employees, would result in a forecast estimate substantially increased over the printed one. It was noted that the \$5,000 item for salary contingencies would substantially cover the anticipated retroactive increases for clerical employees, but not the new salary levels likely to be operating for the clerical staff during the year in question. In addition, the present Canadian Government salary arrangements extend only to October 1970 and further increases for the whole staff may be negotiated before the end of the financial year. It was agreed that the Contingency item should cover both of these elements and that \$10,000 would be sufficient. Against this it was estimated that \$10,000 or more would be available in the Miscellaneous Fund to meet this budget in part (Appendix II). F&A, therefore,

recommends

that the Commission give consideration at the 1970 Annual Meeting to authorize appropriations of \$121,700 for the ordinary expenses of the Commission and \$5,000 from the Working Capital Fund for the Stock Recruitment Symposium. This will include \$67,000 for salaries, \$3,000 for salary contingencies and \$7,000 for forecast clerical increases.

It was noted that if the 1971 meeting is, in fact, held in Halifax, it will be possible to reduce the item for the Annual Meeting. The Committee felt it should be left at the present level in the forecast, however, to ensure necessary flexibility for the Commission.

F&A Item 17

Other Business. The Committee requested the Executive Secretary to consider, in preparation for the 1970 Annual Meeting, needs of the Commission in terms of staff and other resources, on a hypothetical basis, bearing in mind the various proposals and suggestions which were being considered in the Committee on Regulatory Measures and the Panels.

F&A Item 18

Election of Chairman. Mr R.W.Green (USA) was unanimously elected Chairman of the Committee for the year 1969/70.

The Committee also considered and approved the Report of the First Meeting (Proc. No.9).



Serial No. 2296
(B. c. 69)

Proceedings No. 14
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

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

	<u>Proposed</u> <u>estimates</u> <u>1969/70</u>	
1. Personal Services		
(a) Salaries	\$67,000 ^{a)}	
(b) Superannuation	2,000	
(c) Additional help	1,200	
(d) Group medical and insurance plans	500	
(e) Contingencies	6,600	
2. Travel	6,500	
3. Transportation	500	
4. Communications	3,500	
5. Publications	15,000	
6. Other Contractual Services	4,000	
7. Materials and Supplies	3,500	
8. Equipment	1,000	
9. Annual Meeting	4,000	
10. Contingencies	<u>1,000</u>	
Total ordinary expenditures		\$116,300
Sources of revenue to meet ordinary expenditures		
a) Miscellaneous Fund		
1) Staff Assessment Scheme	\$9,885	
2) Transfer from Working Capital Fund	<u>4,276</u>	
		\$14,161
b) Appropriations from Member Countries	<u>102,139</u>	\$116,300

a) includes anticipated salary increases

Serial No. 2296
(B. c. 69)Proceedings No. 14
Appendix IIANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 19691970/71 Expenditures to be Covered by Appropriations
from Contracting Governments

	Forecast estimate <u>1970/71</u>	Increase (+) Decrease (-)
1. Personal Services		
a) Salaries	\$67,000 ^{a)}	-
b) Superannuation	2,000	-
c) Additional help	1,200	-
d) Group medical and insurance plans	500	-
e) Contingencies	3,000	-
f) Forecast clerical increase	<u>7,000</u> 80,700	-
2. Travel	6,500	-
3. Transportation	500	-
4. Communications	3,500	-
5. Publications	15,000	-
6. Other Contractual Services	4,000	-
7. Materials and Supplies	3,500	-
8. Equipment	1,000	-
9. Annual Meeting	6,000	+2,000
10. Contingencies	<u>1,000</u>	-
Total ordinary expenditures	\$121,700	
Special appropriation W.C.F. (Stock Recruitment Symposium)	\$5,000	
Sources of revenue to meet ordinary expenditures		
a) Miscellaneous Fund (estimated)	\$10,000	
b) Appropriations from member countries	<u>111,700</u>	\$121,700
Sources of revenue to meet special expenditures		
Working Capital Fund	\$5,000	

a) includes anticipated salary increases



Serial No. 2297
(E.b.69)

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969Report of Third Plenary Session

Thursday, 5 June, 0930 hrs

1. The Chairman, Mr Kamentsev (USSR), opened the meeting. The Plenary agreed, in the interest of expediency, to consider Plenary Items 13-17 assigned to an *ad hoc* Committee on Trawl Regulations at the First Plenary Session (Proc.8).

2. Under Plenary Item 10, Status of Proposals, the Chairman asked Mr Wm. Sullivan, Jr. (USA) to report on the latest status. He pointed out that all proposals for international regulation of the trawl fishery under the Convention were in effect except the 1967 proposals on mesh measurement. The Federal Republic of Germany ratified the Protocols of 7 June 1963 and 6 June 1964, which propose changes in the Convention Articles, on 29 May 1969 (Comm.Doc.69/7, Addendum I). Ratifications were still required from Italy and Portugal. The Portuguese Delegate reported that his country's ratification was now en route to the Depositary Government. The Plenary noted with regret that the two Protocols had not yet entered into force and agreed that Depositary Government be asked to study the problem with a view to achieving the remaining necessary ratification and with a view to preventing similar difficulties occurring in the future. The Depositary Government agreed to consider the matter and to report to the Commission at an early date.

3. Under Plenary Item 11, Protocol Relating to Regulatory Measures, the Chairman drew attention to the draft Protocol to the Convention to provide for greater flexibility in the types of fisheries regulatory measures which may be proposed by the Commission. The draft was agreed to in principle at the 1968 Annual Meeting (1968 Meeting Proceedings 18, App.I, Annex I). The US Delegate proposed that the Commission adopt the Protocol, that the Depositary Government be requested to open it for signature within 3 months and that member countries give high priority to ratification and prompt notification to Depositary Government. The Delegates of Norway, Iceland, USSR, Canada, UK, Italy and Poland accepted the Protocol as drafted. The Delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany preferred the text of the NEAFC Convention but said that his government would probably accept if the majority agreed to the Protocol. The Danish and Romanian Delegates said that their governments agreed with the aim of the Protocol and found it acceptable. They suggested, however, that, if there were other items needing change, the redraft might underline scientific investigations as more important than economic and technical considerations. The French and Spanish Delegates agreed to the Protocol but suspected that difficulties in its interpretation might arise. The Portuguese Delegate suggested retention of sections (a) to (e) in Article VIII but was prepared to accept the Protocol as drafted.

After some discussion, the Plenary adopted the Protocol which was drafted at the 1968 Annual Meeting (1968 Meeting Proceedings 18, Appendix I, Annex I) and which is attached as Appendix I.

4. Under Plenary Item 12, Amendment to Convention Article IV(2) relating to Panel Membership, the Canadian Delegate referred to the need to establish a broader basis for the determination of representation on the Commission's Panels. The Article neglects the fact that other fish species, such as the herring, now support major international fisheries and that the provisions of the Convention are now applicable with respect to molluscs, and harp and hood seals. There was unanimous agreement to broadening the basis for representation. A suggestion that Article IV(2) be deleted altogether was considered difficult to accept by some Delegates. The Plenary agreed that the Canadian Delegate with the representative of the Depositary Government propose the wording for a draft protocol, for adoption at the next Plenary Session, based on the Canadian suggestion that Article IV(2) be changed to include all stocks of those species which support international fisheries in the subareas concerned or on the basis of current substantial exploitation of harp and hood seals in the Convention Area.

5. Under Plenary Item 13, Annual Returns of Infringements, the Executive Secretary reviewed Comm.Doc.69/8. Of the Member Governments which had not submitted

(over)

returns for 1968, the Norwegian Delegate reported that there had been no infringements. The Federal Republic of Germany's Delegate stated that many measurements had been made in ports but that they could not be separated as Northeast and Northwest Atlantic area inspections. The Icelandic Delegate reported that fishing in the Convention Area was limited in 1968 and no inspections were carried out.

6. Under Plenary Item 14, Simplification of Trawl Regulations, the Plenary took note of the simplification based on information provided to 2 May 1969 (Comm. Doc.69/6) and suggested that a simplified guide to the trawl regulations be included in the ICNAF Handbook which is, at present, being revised.

7. Under Plenary Item 15, Topside Chafers, the Plenary noted the increasing use of strong synthetic net twine and looked forward to the eventual elimination of topside chafing gear.

8. Under Plenary Item 16, Mesh Measuring, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, Mr Horsted, reported that the ICES/ICNAF Joint Working Party on Selectivity Analysis was completing work which would be pertinent to this item, in Copenhagen in September 1969.

9. Under Plenary Item 17, Exchange of National Inspection Officers, the Plenary noted that exchanges had been completed between Canada and France (Comm. Doc.69/9), USA and USSR (Comm.Doc.69/25) and Portugal and Spain (Comm.Doc.69/28). The Plenary noted that the exchanges were most useful and successful and hoped that Member Governments would continue to arrange bilateral exchanges.

10. The Plenary adjourned at 1100 hrs.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969Protocol 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 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."

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.

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

Done at Washington this _____ day of _____ 1969, 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:



Serial No.2295
(B.e.69)

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Joint Meeting of Panels 4 and 5

Thursday, 5 June, 1620 hrs

1. The meeting was opened under the joint chairmanship of the Chairman of Panels 4 and 5: Captain T. de Almeida (Portugal) and Mr T.A.Fulham (USA).
2. Dr W. Templeman (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. The USA submitted a proposal (Appendix I) for the regulation of the haddock fishery in Subarea 5, and suggested that in many ways it might also serve as a prototype for many details of the regulation of haddock in Div.4X of Subarea 4.

After considerable discussion, it was agreed that the first paragraph of the US proposal be accepted, with (a) the insertion of 12,000 (metric tons) three lines from the bottom of the first paragraph, (b) the deletion of the last phrase of the first paragraph.

It was agreed to accept in principle the second paragraph of the US proposal, subject to drafting to make the reporting of by-catches simpler for some countries. Member countries which have difficulties in statistical reporting will participate with the USA in the drafting.

It was also agreed to accept the third paragraph of the US proposal with the substitution of the wording of the Canadian proposal to Panel 4 for the first part of the paragraph - namely "That the Contracting Governments take appropriate action to prohibit the fishing of any species of groundfish* with any type of gear during March..." Some small changes and corrections were announced by the USA to the coordinates bounding the two closed areas.

The member countries of Panel 5 then agreed to accept the US proposal, subject to the above changes and considerations. The proposal will be redrafted with such consultation as is necessary, especially for paragraph 2. The new draft of the proposal will be circulated to the members of Panel 5 before being attached to the minutes of the Joint Meeting of Panels 4 and 5 as Appendix II for presentation to the Commission Plenary.

4. The Canadian proposal for regulation of the haddock of Div.4X (Proc.4, Appendix II) was then considered.

It was agreed by the member countries of Panel 4 that the principles of the new haddock regulations agreed to for Subarea 5 be accepted as a basis for regulation of haddock in Div.4X with the substitution of a quota of 18,000 metric tons for the 12,000 metric tons agreed to for Subarea 5, and for the coordinates for the closed area, the substitution of the coordinates in Div.4X between 43°00'N and 42°00'N and between 64°30'W and 67°00'W. A new draft of the Canadian proposal will be prepared and will be circulated to the members of Panel 4, before being attached to the minutes of the Joint Meeting of Panels 4 and 5 as Appendix III for presentation to the Commission Plenary.

5. Poland asked to have the following statement by the Polish Delegate, Mr S. Perkowicz, to the Joint Panels 4 and 5 inserted in the minutes of the Joint Meeting of these Panels:

"The Polish Delegation does not object as regards the establishment of a quota for haddock in Subarea 5 and in Div.4X, as well as a closure period for

(over)

*By "groundfish" is meant the fishes listed in the ICNAF statistics as groundfish, flounders and other groundfish

red hake and silver hake in Subarea 5, because at present Poland has no special interest in these fisheries. However, Poland makes the reservation that any quota limit should not bind Poland, as this country has only recently begun to develop its fisheries in the ICNAF Area."

6. Mr D.L.McKernan (USA) will convene a drafting group to produce the drafts of the new haddock proposals for Subarea 5 (Appendix II) and for Div.4X of Subarea 4 (Appendix III).

7. The meeting adjourned at 1730 hrs.



Serial No. 2295
(B.e.69)

Proceedings No. 16
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Draft US Proposal for Regulation of Haddock in Subarea 5

Panel 5 recommends that the Commission transmit to the Depository Government the following proposal for joint action by the Contracting Governments:

1. That the Contracting Governments take appropriate action to regulate the catch of haddock by persons under their jurisdiction fishing in Subarea 5 so that the aggregate annual landings of haddock by vessels taking haddock in Subarea 5 in each year during 1970, 1971 and 1972 shall not exceed _____ metric tons, except that the Commission is authorized to increase this in any year to take into account changing estimates of recruitment.
2. That each Contracting Government shall report bi-weekly haddock catches taken in Subarea 5 by persons under its jurisdiction to the Executive Secretary of the Commission not later than five days after the end of the reporting week, except that incidental catches may be accumulated and reported in _____ ton increments. The Executive Secretary shall notify each Contracting Government of the date on which cumulative haddock catches in Subarea 5 equal 80 percent of the allowable catch stated in paragraph 1. Within 10 days of receipt of such notification from the Executive Secretary, each Contracting Government shall prohibit landings of haddock caught in Subarea 5 by persons under its jurisdiction, except that each Contracting Government may permit persons under its jurisdiction to land at the end of any subsequent trip haddock caught in Subarea 5 incidental to fishing for other species in amounts not exceeding 10 percent of all other fish caught in Subarea 5 during that trip.
3. That the Contracting Governments take appropriate action to prohibit persons under their jurisdiction from fishing with trawls and trawl lines excepting gear used in fishing for crustacea and molluscs during March and April of 1970, 1971 and 1972 in areas of Subarea 5 bounded by straight lines connecting the following coordinates in the order listed:

(a)	70°00'W, 42°10'N	(b)	67°00'W, 42°20'N
	69°10'W, 41°10'N		67°00'W, 41°15'N
	68°30'W, 41°35'N		65°40'W, 41°15'N
	69°20'W, 42°30'N		65°40'W, 42°00'N
			66°00'W, 42°20'N



Serial No. 2295
(S.e. 69)

Proceedings No. 16
Appendix II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Proposal for Regulation of Haddock in Subarea 5

Panel 5 recommends that the Commission transmit to the Depository Government the following proposal for joint action by the Contracting Governments:

1. That the Contracting Governments take appropriate action to regulate the catch of haddock by persons under their jurisdiction fishing in Subarea 5 so that the aggregate annual landings of haddock by vessels taking haddock in Subarea 5 in each year during 1970, 1971 and 1972 shall not exceed 12,000 metric tons.
2. That Competent Authorities of each Contracting Government shall report bi-weekly haddock landings taken in Subarea 5 by persons under their jurisdiction to the Executive Secretary of the Commission not later than 7 days after the end of a two-week reporting period. Information of haddock by-catch taken by the vessels which do not conduct specialized fishing for haddock shall be reported to the Executive Secretary of the Commission in 700 ton increments.

The Executive Secretary shall notify each Contracting Government of the date on which accumulative landings in Subarea 5 equal 80 percent of the allowable landing stated in paragraph 1. Within 10 days of receipt of such notification from the Executive Secretary each Contracting Government shall prohibit landings of haddock caught in Subarea 5 by persons under its jurisdiction except as provided in paragraph 3.

3. That in order to avoid impairment of fisheries conducted primarily for other species and which take small quantities of haddock incidentally, the Contracting Governments may permit persons under their jurisdiction to have in possession on board a vessel fishing primarily for other species subsequent to the closure referred to in paragraph 2, haddock caught in Subarea 5 in amounts not exceeding 10 percent by weight of all other fish on board caught in Subarea 5.
4. That the Contracting Governments take appropriate action to prohibit persons under their jurisdiction from fishing with gear capable of catching demersal species during March and April of 1970, 1971 and 1972 in areas of Subarea 5 bounded by straight lines connecting the following coordinates in the order listed:

(a) 70°00'W, 42°10'N
69°10'W, 41°10'N
68°30'W, 41°35'N
69°20'W, 42°30'N

(b) 67°00'W, 42°20'N
67°00'W, 41°15'N
65°40'W, 41°15'N
65°40'W, 42°00'N
66°00'W, 42°20'N

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969Proposal for Regulation of Haddock in Division 4X of Subarea 4

Panel 4 recommends that the Commission transmit to the Depository Government the following proposal for joint action by the Contracting Governments:

1. That the Contracting Governments take appropriate action to regulate the catch of haddock by persons under their jurisdiction fishing in Div. 4X of Subarea 4 so that the aggregate annual landings of haddock by vessels taking haddock in Division 4X of Subarea 4 in each year during 1970, 1971 and 1972 shall not exceed 18,000 metric tons.
2. That Competent Authorities of each Contracting Government shall report bi-weekly haddock landings taken in Division 4X of Subarea 4 by persons under their jurisdiction to the Executive Secretary of the Commission not later than 7 days after the end of a two-week reporting period. Information of haddock by-catch taken by the vessels which do not conduct specialized fishing for haddock shall be reported to the Executive Secretary of the Commission in 700 ton increments. The Executive Secretary shall notify each Contracting Government of the date on which accumulative landings in Division 4X of Subarea 4 equal 80 percent of the allowable landing stated in paragraph 1. Within 10 days of receipt of such notification from the Executive Secretary each Contracting Government shall prohibit landings of haddock caught in Division 4X of Subarea 4 by persons under its jurisdiction except as provided in paragraph 3.
3. That in order to avoid impairment of fisheries conducted primarily for other species and which take small quantities of haddock incidentally, the Contracting Governments may permit persons under their jurisdiction to have in possession on board a vessel fishing primarily for other species subsequent to the closure referred to in paragraph 2, haddock caught in Division 4X of Subarea 4 in amounts not exceeding 10 percent by weight of all other fish on board caught in Division 4X of Subarea 4.
4. That the Contracting Governments take appropriate action to prohibit persons under their jurisdiction from fishing with gear capable of catching demersal species during March and April of 1970, 1971 and 1972 in that part of Division 4X of Subarea 4 that lies between 42°00'N Lat and 43°00'N Lat, and between 67°00'W Long and 64°30'W Long.



Serial No. 2298
(3.b.69)

Proceedings No. 17

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Fourth Plenary Session

Friday, 6 June, 0930 hrs

1. The Chairman, Mr V. Kamantsev (USSR), opened the meeting and called for consideration of the Report of the Second Plenary Session (Proc.12). The Report was adopted by the Plenary.
2. The Chairman requested consideration of the Report of the Joint Meeting of Panels (Proc.13) which dealt with Plenary Item 20, Conservation Measures for Atlantic Salmon. The Report was reviewed and minor changes and additions requested by the Canadian, UK and Fed. Rep. Germany Delegates were incorporated. The Plenary examined the recommendations and adopted the Canadian resolution "that the Commission recommend to the Contracting Governments that the fishing for salmon in the waters outside national fishery limits should be prohibited in the Convention Area". It was agreed that there was no need to establish an effective date for implementing the ban since this would be established through the Commission's normal procedures. The Report was adopted.
3. The Report of Panel A (Seals) (Proc.2) which dealt with Plenary Item 21, Conservation Measures for Seals, was presented by the Panel Chairman, Mr H.J. Lassen (Denmark). The Report was adopted with the Plenary instructing that a statement by Mr O. Lund (Norway) regarding the Panel report and the briefs of the representatives of the animal protection societies, be attached as Appendix I.
4. The Report of Panel 3 (Proc.3) was presented by its Chairman, Dr F. Chrzan (Poland). The UK Delegate pointed out that from the scientific advice available, the Panel might have suggested an increase from 4 1/2 inches to 5 inches as in Subarea 1. He wished to focus attention on this matter for possible action by the Panel at the 1970 Annual Meeting. The Report was adopted.
5. The Report of the Third Plenary Session (Proc.15) was read by the Executive Secretary. Minor changes and deletions were made to the Report which was then adopted by the Plenary. Draft Protocol relating to Panel Membership which was prepared by the Canadian and US Delegates in relation to Plenary Item 12, Amendment to Convention Article IV(2), was adopted and is attached as Appendix II.
6. Under Plenary Item 18, Form of International Inspection Scheme, the Chairman drew attention to the resolution from the 1968 Annual Meeting encouraging all member countries to strengthen their national control system (1968 Meeting Proc.19) and the steps taken to modify the NEAFC international inspection scheme for ICNAF (1968 Meeting Proc.19, Appendix I, Annex I). The UK Delegate reported that NEAFC reaffirmed its 1968 decision to bring the Scheme of Joint Enforcement into effect on 1 January 1970. It also approved some practical measures for implementing the Scheme. The Polish Delegate reported that its national control system was now operating on the high seas. He suggested an international inspection which would be a supplement to the national control system and operate according to bilateral agreements. In respect of the control of gear and catch, the Polish Delegate agreed that such control may be exercised only to gear and catch actually on deck of the fishing vessel. The US Delegate was strongly in favour of the proposed international inspection scheme in its present form and suggested that when the Protocol Relating to Measures of Control came into effect a vote on adoption of the scheme should be made by mail. The Norwegian Delegate was prepared to accept the scheme and would agree that all gear on board could be inspected. The Canadian Delegate reported that his government was anxious to see the proposed scheme implemented and regretted that one country had not yet ratified the Protocol. The USSR Delegate agreed that the NEAFC scheme with amendments for ICNAF could provide in the North Atlantic an enforcement system which would be carried out on a reciprocal basis between all the member countries. Difficulties remain regarding international inspection of the catch and gear. The USSR would agree to an international joint inspection scheme when all other member countries agree to do the same.

(over)

The Plenary expressed its great regret that one member country had not yet ratified the Protocol on Measures of Control and strongly recommended that member countries establish and strengthen national inspection schemes.

7. Under Plenary Item 19, Limiting Fishing as a Conservation Measure, Mr J. Graham (UK), reviewed the Report of the Mid-Term Meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures (Comm.Doc.69/2 and Proc.11, App.I) which provided guidelines for the negotiation of catch limitation schemes. He felt that the Committee had taken the problem as far as it could and that the guidelines might now be used by the Panels. There was general agreement with the principles set out as guidelines by the Committee. The USSR Delegate stressed the need for intensified research through joint surveys under a single plan and for the next year or two of limiting the catch of all member countries at the level of the last three years except for those countries just developing fisheries. The Executive Secretary was requested to circulate the statement for further study. The US Delegate felt that the Committee should continue its work and that Panel 5 members should be asked to apply the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures guidelines. For this purpose, a special meeting of Panel 5 might be held sometime before the 1970 Annual Meeting. He felt that the USSR proposal could not be applicable for a particular stock and suggested that the USSR elaborate on its scheme. The Polish Delegate said that his country should not be bound by quotas as it was developing its fishery from a completely destroyed state after the Second World War. The USSR Delegate suggested that allocation of a global quota should be made on the last 5 year basis as a compromise period. He believed that coastal states as such could not have preferred rights on the high seas. The Icelandic Delegate stressed the importance of the coastal state preference to his country which is dependent almost entirely for its livelihood on fisheries. The US Delegate supported the Icelandic case for coastal state preference.

A proposal by the Norwegian Delegate to disband the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures resulted in a recommendation that the Commission consider this possibility further and that the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures be kept till its services were needed.

8. The meeting adjourned at 1140 hrs.



Serial No.2298
(B.b.69)

Proceedings No.17
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Statement of Norwegian Delegate regarding the Seal Panel Report (Proc.2)

The Norwegian Delegate wishes to make a few comments to this report. After having studied the briefs given by the representatives of the animal protection societies more closely, I want to correct some misunderstandings. It is said on page 3 in the brief by Mr Colin Platt, I quote:

"The catch quota imposed on whitecoats in the 'Gulf', for example, however much it is welcomed, is of little real value to the conservation of the seal herd as a whole so long as killing remains unrestricted in the Front."

It is correct that no quota regulation has been introduced on the Front yet. That is a question under consideration. But the killing is not unrestricted. For many years the catch season has been limited to a short period of the year. For instance, this year from 12 March to 25 April. Further, it is prohibited to kill mother seals in the whelping patches and detailed provisions are prescribed for the killing methods.

From the brief you may get the impression that certain areas are exempted from the regulation. That is not the fact. As stated in the Seal Panel Report, that is also the case as far as Canada is concerned.

It should appear from the Report and from the Proceedings of the 1967 Meeting of the Commission in Boston in 1967 that a good cooperation has been established and maintained between the societies for protection of animals and the governments concerned, and that serious attempts have been made both by Norway and Canada to follow the advice of the societies. However, as stated by me in the Panel meeting, some pseudo-scientific and irresponsible articles in the press in several countries have seriously complicated our endeavour. I may, Mr Chairman, request my fellow delegates, if they should be faced with this question of humane killing of seals in their home countries, to study closely the briefs presented by the responsible societies and their attitude to these problems. The delegates are also recommended to study the measures introduced for the purpose of ensuring humane killing methods, and help us to defend a hard-working industry against emotional and exaggerated public opinion which is not based on facts but on sensational articles produced by irresponsible writers.



Serial No. 2298
(B.b.69)

Proceedings No. 17
Appendix II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Draft Protocol to the International Convention for the
Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, relating to Panel Membership

prepared by Canada, and USA

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 establish a more appropriate basis for the determination of representation on the Panels established under the Convention, agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

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

- "2. Panel representation shall be reviewed annually by the Commission, which shall have the power, subject to consultation with the Panel concerned, to determine representation on each Panel on the basis of current substantial exploitation of the stocks of fish in the sub-area concerned or on the basis of current substantial exploitation of harp and hood seals in the Convention area, except that each Contracting Government with coastline adjacent to a sub-area shall have the right of representation on the Panel for the sub-area."

ARTICLE II

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 the 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 III

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.

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

Done at Washington this day of 1969, in the English language.

(over)



Serial No. 2299
(B.b.69)

Proceedings No. 16

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Fifth Plenary Session

Friday, 6 June, 1455 hrs

1. The Report of Panel 1 (Proc.6) was presented by its Chairman, Mr O. Lund (Norway). The Plenary approved the Report and requested that the best wishes of the Commission be passed along to Dr Paul Hansen (Denmark) who was an original participant in ICNAF, on his retirement.
2. The Reports of the First (Proc.9) and Second (Proc.14) Meetings of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration were examined separately. The Report of the First Meeting was approved and the recommendation that Denmark be granted membership in Panel 3 accepted. Following presentation of the Report of the Second Meeting, the Chairman invited Panels 1-5 and A to join the Plenary to consider the revised Commission and Panel Rules of Procedure as prepared by the Subcommittee on Financial and Administrative Matters (Comm.Doc.69/5) and amended by the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration. Following considerable discussion of the proposed Rule 5, Order of Business, the Joint Session requested that the Norwegian Delegate and the Executive Secretary prepare a draft for presentation at the next Plenary Session taking into account the Norwegian Delegate's proposals 1) to change "all Contracting Governments" in Proc.14, p.2, Recommendation 2, to "Contracting Governments present at the meeting" and 2) to ensure that suggested provisional agenda items are circulated 60 days before the meeting with a memorandum covering the subject matter of the items.
3. The Report of the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures (Proc.11) was reviewed briefly by its Chairman, Mr J. Graham (UK), who noted that the subject content had received consideration earlier under Item 19, Limiting Fishing. The US Delegate suggested that the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures might now undertake further analysis of reduction of fishing effort. This would consist of the examination of technical, legal and administrative aspects of problems in establishing effort control at the national level, work to start at a January 1970 meeting. The US Delegate and the Executive Secretary were asked to draft a proposal for study at the next Plenary.
4. Under Plenary Item 24, UN Resolution 2172, the Plenary was informed of the work completed on the Resolution in drawing IOC, WMO and FAO together with IOC the coordinating and focal point and expressed a wish to be kept informed.
5. Under Plenary Item 25, ICES/ICNAF/IOC Cooperative Studies in the North Atlantic, Dr H.W.Graham (USA) reviewed the Report of the First Meeting of the ICES/ICNAF/IOC Coordinating Group for North Atlantic Oceanography, Copenhagen, 3 October 1968 (Comm.Doc.69/4). The Group will not plan any new large-scale programs of investigation but will coordinate hydrographic work being undertaken. The Plenary approved the Report.
6. Under Plenary Item 26, Commission's Observers, Reports were received from NEAFC (Mr G. Mocklinghoff), INPFC (Mr D. McKernan), ICES (Dr H.A.Cole) and IOC and SCOR (Mr A. Lee). Following discussion, the Plenary agreed that the Commission should not send Observers to meetings of other international bodies working in the field of fisheries and oceanography for 2 or 3 years, after which period it should review the situation. It was stated that most meeting participants were already receiving the full reports and documents of all such meetings. It was agreed, however, that the Executive Secretary should continue to attend relevant meetings of fisheries research and management organizations.
7. Under Plenary Item 33, Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the two ensuing years, Dr A.W.H.Needler (Canada) was elected Chairman of the Commission for the 1970 and 1971 Annual Meetings, while Mr K. Lokkegaard (Denmark) was elected Vice-Chairman for the same period.
8. The meeting adjourned at 1715 hrs.



Serial No.2300
(B.b.69)

Proceedings No.15

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Report of Sixth Plenary Session

Saturday, 7 June, 1030 hrs

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 Report of Panel 2 (Proc.7). The Report, which suggested that a joint meeting of Panels 1, 2 and 3 be held during the 20th Annual Meeting to discuss the possible introduction of a uniform mesh size in the respective areas, was adopted.
3. Under Plenary Item 28, Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (Proc.1, being Redbook 1969, Part I), Mr Sv. Aa. Horsted (Denmark), the Committee Chairman, reviewed the Report which was adopted with its recommendations and conclusions by the Plenary. Mr Horsted expressed his best thanks to Mr B.B. Parrish, the outgoing Chairman of the Assessments Subcommittee, for his excellent work during this term of office.
4. The Chairman requested consideration of the Report of Panel 4 (Proc.4). The Report, which referred a Canadian proposal for regulation of the haddock fishery in Div.4X of Subarea 4 to a Joint Meeting of Panels 4 and 5 (Proc.16), was adopted.
5. The Chairman asked for consideration of the Report of the Joint Meeting of Panels 4 and 5 (Proc.16) which dealt with proposals for the regulation of haddock in Subarea 5 (Proc.16, Appendix II) and in Div.4X of Subarea 4 (Proc.16, Appendix III). The Plenary agreed to the suggestion of the Canadian Delegate that "by weight" be added after "10 percent" in paragraph 3 of Appendices II and III of Proc.16. The French Delegate stated that his country would not be able to cope with the proposals by 1970. The Report with the amended proposals for regulation of haddock in Subarea 5 and in Div.4X of Subarea 4 was adopted.
6. The Plenary then considered the Report of Panel 5 (Proc.5) which contained a proposal for regulation of red and silver hakes in Subarea 5 (Proc.5, Appendix III). Following discussion, the proposal for red and silver hake was amended by Plenary to apply for the period 1970, 1971 and 1972 as in the case for regulation of haddock in Subarea 5 and in Div.4X of Subarea 4. It was further agreed that the meetings of Panel 5 should include an agenda item requiring review of the regulation in each of the years 1970, 1971 and 1972. The Report with its proposals as amended was adopted.
7. The Report of the Fourth Plenary Session (Proc.17) was then considered. The Report and the draft Protocol Relating to Panel Membership (Proc.17, App.II) which called for amendment to the Convention Article IV(2) were adopted. The Plenary agreed to a suggestion by the Delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany to request the Depositary Government to consider the possibility of combining the Amendments to Convention Articles IV(2) relating to Panel Membership and VII(2) and VIII(1) relating to Regulatory Measures, into a single Protocol for presentation to Contracting Governments.
8. The Report of the Fifth Plenary Session (Proc.18) was adopted by the Plenary.

The Plenary then returned to consideration of the Report of the Second Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Proc.14) and the proposed amendments to the Commission Rules of Procedure. Attention was directed to Commission Rule 5 "Order of Business". The draft amendment to Rule 5 which was prepared to take into account changes proposed by the Norwegian Delegate at the Fifth Plenary Session (Proc.18), was adopted by the Plenary and is attached as Appendix I.

(over)

The Plenary then directed its attention to the proposed amendments to the Panel Rules of Procedure (Proc.14) and in particular to Panel Rule 4 "Order of Business" and adopted a draft amendment which conformed, *mutatis mutandis*, with Rule 5 of the Commission Rules of Procedure. The draft as adopted is attached as Appendix II.

The Plenary discussed proposals by the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (Proc.1) and the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Proc. 14 and Comm.Doc.69/5) regarding the timing of the R&S and Commission meetings. It was noted that there would be a mid-term meeting of the Assessments Subcommittee before the 1970 Annual Meeting and that the report of this meeting would be made available for study to the Commissioners and Advisers of all member countries well before the Annual Meeting. In view of this, the Plenary adopted the suggestion of the UK Delegate that the timetable for the Annual Meeting be arranged with no recess on the first day and that the need for a recess could be decided at the First Plenary Session.

The Plenary, having concluded its consideration of the items in the Report of the Second Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (Proc.14) adopted the Report.

The Plenary then examined a US proposal for future work by the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures as requested by the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures (Proc.11) and by the Fifth Plenary Session (Proc. 13). The proposal for the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures to examine the various administrative, legal and technical factors involved in instituting controls on fishing effort at the national level at a mid-term meeting in January 1970 was adopted and is attached as Appendix III. The Plenary adopted the Report of the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures (Proc.11).

9. Under Plenary Item 35, Press Release, the Executive Secretary read a draft of the release which was approved by the Plenary.

10. Under Plenary Item 36, Other Business, the US Delegate expressed the gratitude of the participants for the fine meeting facilities and kind hospitality. The Canadian Delegate, Dr Needler, thanked the Commissioners for honouring him with the Chairmanship for two ensuing years. He said that the Governments of Canada and Newfoundland were looking forward to the 1970 Annual Meeting in St. John's. He congratulated Mr Kamentsev, the outgoing Chairman, for the efficient way in which he had conducted the course of the Commission's work over the past two years. The Observer for Ireland and ICES, Dr A.E.J.Went, expressed his pleasure at the continued close working arrangements between ICES and ICNAF and the ensuing good results. The remarks of the Observer from FAO, Mr J. Gulland, are presented in Appendix IV. The Observers from Japan and Cuba expressed their best wishes for future success in the Commission's work and their thanks for the opportunity to attend the meetings. The Polish Delegate, Mr S. Perkowicz, spoke on behalf of the Host Government of the Polish People's Republic, acknowledging the thanks of the Commission and the pleasure of his Government and people at the opportunity to host the 19th Annual Meeting of the Commission. The Norwegian Delegate, Mr Lund, thanked the Secretariat for its fine efforts throughout the year.

11. The Chairman expressed his gratitude to all for their great assistance. All participants had worked hard to obtain solutions to the Commission's problems and progress had been made. He thanked the Secretariat for their assistance over the two years and the Host Government and its people for their hospitality and facilities. He congratulated Dr Needler on his election to the Chairmanship of the Commission for the 1970 and 1971 sessions and wished him every success.

13. The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 1340 hrs.



Serial No. 2300
(A.S.2)

Proceedings No. 19
Appendix I

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Revision of Rule 5 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure

Rule 5

Order of Business

5.1 Except as provided in paragraph 5.2, no order of business which involves amendment of these Rules of Procedure; budget or related financial matters, Panel membership modifications under Article IV(2) of the Convention, or transmittal of proposals or recommendations under Article VIII of the Convention, shall be the subject of a decision by the Commission unless the subject matter has been included in the provisional agenda and in a memorandum which has been circulated with the provisional agenda by the Executive Secretary to all Commissioners at least 60 days in advance of the meeting at which the matter is to be discussed.

5.2 The Commission, with the unanimous agreement of Commissioners representing all Contracting Governments may take decisions on the transmittal of proposals or recommendations under Article VIII of the Convention; and with the unanimous agreement of Commissioners of all Contracting Governments represented at a meeting may take decisions on the other matters mentioned in paragraph 5.1.



Serial No. 2300
(A.a.2)

Proceedings No. 19
Appendix II

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Revision of Rule 4 of the Rules of Procedure for the Panels

Rule 4

Order of Business

4.1 Except as provided in paragraph 4.2, no order of business which involves amendment of these rules of procedure or recommendations or reports under Article VI(2), VII, or VIII(3) of the Convention shall be the subject of a decision by the Panel unless the subject matter has been included in the provisional agenda and in a memorandum which has been circulated with the provisional agenda by the Executive Secretary to all Commissioners at least 60 days in advance of the meeting at which the matter is to be discussed.

4.2 The Panel, with the unanimous agreement of Commissioners representing all Contracting Governments participating in the Panel, may take decisions on recommendations under Article VII(2) or VIII(3) of the Convention; and with the unanimous agreement of Commissioners of all Contracting Governments participating in the Panel and represented at a meeting may take decisions on the other matters mentioned in paragraph 4.1.



Serial No.2300
(A.c.4)

Proceedings No.19
Appendix III

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

US Proposal for Future Work by

the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures

The United States believes that the significant achievement of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures in devising guidelines for the application of quota schemes would be greatly enhanced by further analysis of certain related technical questions, particularly that concerned with reductions of fishing effort. The full economic benefit of quota regulation can be realized only if practical ways can be found to regulate effort at the national level. For many countries, however, limiting fishing effort has proved to be difficult because of administrative problems. Accordingly, the United States believes it would be especially appropriate for the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures to examine the various administrative, legal and technical factors involved in instituting controls on fishing effort at the national level. Such a study could include a review of the principal problems being encountered in countries experimenting with effort controls, and those problems anticipated by countries who plan to institute such controls in the future. It would also be extremely useful for the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures to indicate some of the most promising approaches that have been devised to resolve difficulties encountered in applying limits on fishing, taking into full account differing economic systems in various countries. The United States suggests that work on such a study could be instituted and coordinated at a mid-term meeting of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures in January 1970.



Serial No.2300
(A.c.1)

Proceedings No.19
Appendix IV

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

Statement to the Sixth Plenary Session of ICNAF

by Mr J. Gulland, FAO Observer

Mr Chairman, I would like to express my pleasure for the opportunity to take part, as an Observer, in the deliberations of your Commission and of its various committees. FAO is at this time particularly interested in the activities of ICNAF, because FAO and its subsidiary bodies are becoming closely concerned with problems of conservation and rational exploitation in such areas as the Indian Ocean, and off west and northwest Africa. The experience of ICNAF as the oldest regulatory body concerned with complex multi-nation and multi-species fisheries will undoubtedly be valuable to the new regional fishery bodies. In fact the Fisheries Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CECAF) has specifically requested to be informed, through FAO, of the activities of ICNAF, particularly of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures.

It is therefore disappointing to note how slowly ICNAF is proceeding in managing its fisheries. The reasons for this are well known to those present here. However, as has already been pointed out during this meeting, there is some public dissatisfaction with the achievements of this type of Commission, and pressure for more radical solutions - on the one hand for a wide extension of national jurisdiction, or on the other hand for some stronger form of international control.

I would also like to point out that the slowness in taking action is discouraging to the scientists concerned in preparing the assessments for the Commission. If it appears to them that the results of their studies are not being put to use, it is difficult for the scientists to maintain their interest, and without interest it is impossible to do good scientific work.

Apart from these considerations the state of the stocks underlines the need for ICNAF to take further action. The total catch from the Commission's area has shown a steady increase during the period of the Commission's life, showing a welcome tendency towards fuller uses of the resources in the area. However, the statistics of total catch conceal different trends for some stocks. Thus, of the three species considered of major importance during the early years of the Commission's activities, the haddock catches in 1968 were the lowest for 20 years, red-fish catches the lowest for 12 years, and for cod, the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics has pointed out that the high 1968 catches are unlikely to be maintained. As the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics stated in 1968, there remain several resources in ICNAF which are still under-exploited, but these are generally either small, or of species such as capelin, squid or sand eel, which are not acceptable substitutes for cod and haddock. It is likely that the trawl fleets now operating in the ICNAF Area are more than sufficient to fully exploit all the groundfish stocks in the area, if each stock were fished at the optimum level. Further, and more disturbing in relation to FAO's worldwide responsibilities, it is likely that it will soon also be true for the world as a whole that the capacity of the trawler fleets is in excess of that required for efficient harvesting of the demersal fish resources.

Against this rather sombre background, it is gratifying to note that at this meeting, ICNAF has for the first time made recommendations going beyond minimum mesh sizes and related subjects. The actual steps are small, but they are the important first steps towards adequate control of the amount of fishing. Unfortunately one of these measures - the closure of certain parts of Subareas 4 and 5 during some months early in the year - means that fishing cannot be carried out when catches are best, and potentially most profitable. While these steps are probably necessary as emergency measures in the present low level of stocks, they should only be temporary. The conservation of fish stocks is not the real objective of the Commission, which is concerned with the maintenance of large and healthy fisheries. Measures which restrict the efficiency of the fishery must be used only in the absence of better measures.

(over)

The institution of catch quotas for haddock is therefore a much more significant step for the long-term activities of ICNAF. However, the present quotas are only 1 percent of the total ICNAF catch, and in the present poor state only the local and non-mobile fleets have any interest in haddock fishing. It is hoped that the stocks will soon recover; this recovery will provide both more profitable fishing for local vessels, and some incentive for long-range vessels to return. If the quotas are not to be exhausted progressively earlier each season resulting in less and less efficient fishing, some additional measures will be required, as pointed out by the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics. National quotas, reached either within the Commission, or outside it, will allow each country to arrange its fishing in the most effective and profitable way.

The principles involved are widely applicable and therefore the future activities of ICNAF, and especially of the Standing Committee on Regulatory Measures, in this field will be watched by FAO with great interest, and I hope that FAO will continue to collaborate closely with ICNAF in this and other matters.

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1969

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 A. Meyer (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 T.A.Fulham (USA)
" Scientific Advisers	- Dr G.F.M.Smith (Canada)
Chairman, Panel A	- Mr H.J.Lassen (Denmark)
" Scientific Advisers	- Dr G.F.M.Smith (Canada)

Research and Statistics

Chairman of Standing Committee on Research and Statistics	- Mr Sv. As. 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)
--	---------------------

