

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR



THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

ICNAF Meet. Doc. 52/19

SECOND ANNUAL MEETING

Third Plenary Session - July 5, 1952

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 11:15 a.m. explaining that there was no agenda as it had been called for the special purpose of discussing the research programme for the whole area. Before the main business of the meeting was proceeded with he understood Mr. Knollenberg desired to present a motion.

Mr. Knollenberg moved, seconded by Mr. Bates that

The Commission notes with satisfaction the Report of the Executive Secretary on Co-operation with Other Bodies, - Document I, Second Meeting - and the excellent assistance given to the work of the Commission by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations and the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. The Commission wishes to record its appreciation for this co-operation and endorses the recommendations set forth in the Secretary's report as to future relationships with these bodies.
UNANIMOUSLY AGREED.

On the matter of a general research program the Chairman called for a statement of views from the delegates in order around the table, and these are as follows:

United States - Dr. Kask expressed the view that the Research and Statistics Committee are the planning body. He would like to feel that overall planning, as well as planning on an ad hoc basis is in mind. The Committee should be subject to periodic alteration; should consist of the very best scientific brains; its composition at present includes almost all the top scientific advisers. In addition and until an overall policy got under way, participation of the Commissioners on the Committee was a good move. It was, however, important and essential that the scientists

should be able to speak freely, discuss their various problems and formulate programs without too much guidance or fear of criticism. He felt that younger men should be brought in and encouraged to participate. We should, at this meeting, come to an understanding as to how each new and prospective member can fit into a general large research program.

Canada - Mr. Bates set out the view that the purpose of the countries becoming parties to this Convention was to perpetuate the resources of the seas. The question is how do we take care of this responsibility. The problem seems to be contained in the following questions:

- 1) What should be done in research in the whole area?
- 2) What are we doing now?
- 3) What is the difference between the promise and the ideal?
- 4) How is this residual to be distributed between the countries?

Canada is contiguous to a large part of the area, - Panels 2, 3, 4 and most of 5 - and rightfully has a duty to do a very large share of the research, but it is understood that each country will admit to the need for partaking of some part of this overall. If this was a reasonable way of setting out the matter we should devote ourselves to the first question above, and perhaps before the meetings are through we could have some answers to the final one, i.e. additional work to be done and its distribution. It was further understood that the countries coming into the Convention expected to do more work than they were doing before.

Denmark - Dr. Tanning was pleased to hear the views of the United States and Canada. Experience on the other side of the Atlantic had shown the desirability and, in fact, the necessity of co-operation between nations. An example of this co-operation was evident in the work now being done in Panel 1 and was completely on the other side of the Atlantic.

France - Mr. Barbier agreed entirely with the submissions of the United States and Canada.

Portugal - Commander Almeida said that when the Commission developed a general research program for the whole area Portugal

would be able to say what part it could do through assistance by its research vessel.

Iceland - Mr. Eggerz was unable at the moment to make any statement.

Norway - Dr. Rollefson had listened with interest to the very clear questions put by Mr. Bates and hoped they could be dealt with one by one, and that a proper distribution of the effort could be arrived at.

Spain - Mr. Trelles shared the views expressed by Dr. Kask and Mr. Bates and were willing to co-operate in the research and investigational problem. The work of research stations in Spain was being unified and it was hoped to have scientific representations at the next meeting of the Commission.

United Kingdom - Dr. Lucas said they were all impressed by the way in which Mr. Bates had summed up the problem. The co-operation that had been a fact on the European side of the Atlantic gave us a plan from which to work. This Commission was quite young, - in fact this was but its first birthday - and work was on the way. The first necessity of research was adequate statistical information, and this was being brought together. When the statistical problem was brought up to its highest possible level we could deploy our resources in developing a program of research.

The Chairman, in a brief summary of the preceding remarks asked if he was right in thinking that the first item is "What were we doing now and what additional work could be done and, consequently, what sort of priority should be worked out and how should the effort be distributed". He expressed some puzzlement as to the procedure to be followed.

Mr. Bates, in continuing the discussion, stated that where we place the first question is first, viz. What should be done? The balance is what we should then have to do. In considering the first, one of our greatest assets was the presence of European scientists who could set a real example of collaboration. He was not immediately afraid of the problems on his side. However, what may take place there in the next ten years was likely to be known to a greater extent by our European colleagues than to ourselves. The intensity of fishing on the banks on this side by vessels from the other side of the Atlantic would develop problems

for this Commission. Mr. Bates wished to emphasize that from where he sat at the moment there was no plan. He referred to the problem because of the presence of scientists who had seen similar problems from another perspective. There was great scope for consideration by the scientists and it may be that some sort of Committee could be established which might meet a number of times before the next meeting at a European center or centers. We could not expect our European colleagues to travel to this side unless they so wished. I wonder what our United States colleagues would think of such a proposal.

Dr. Kask asked Dr. Walford to state the United States reaction. He felt the matter could be dealt with by a committee of scientists, and referred to the work that had been done by Panel 5. He proposed referring the problem to an ad hoc committee of scientists, separate from the Committee on Research and Statistics, who after doing background work in the first four to six months could meet a number of times in the subsequent six months and prepare a report for the Commission's next Annual Meeting.

The Chairman asked for a statement of views other than from Canada and the United States, who had brought up the whole matter and who had made this proposal respectively. Denmark supported Dr. Walford's proposal. The other Contracting Governments - France, Portugal, Iceland, Norway, Spain and the United Kingdom agreed.

In expressing agreement Norway, through Dr. Rollefson, stated the aim should be to have a sustained maximum yield and for that purpose statistical data as to the fish taken out of the sea was needed and biological research was necessary to evaluate what could be taken. He stated the statistical problem was relatively easy. Beyond that there are two questions, the first, - was there overfishing, and secondly was it possible to get more out of the sea than we were now obtaining. The first may be answered by a study of statistics and the second by investigating the biology of fish, including their reactions to their surroundings and following their migrations. Simply said, we should ask the fish questions and try to understand their answers.

The Chairman indicated that the point seemed to have been reached where a Committee of Scientists should be appointed to consider the overall investigational requirements and that it might after preliminary work be prepared to meet at Copenhagen in the autumn at the time of the ICES Meeting.

On the question of establishing the committee it was proposed the committee would consist of scientists named by each contracting party and that the committee would report its findings to the Commission through the Committee on Research and Statistics. This was agreed to by all Contracting Governments.

At this point Mr. Bates suggested the ad hoc idea should be dropped. What in fact was being done was putting a special task on the Research Committee and requiring them to meet more than once a year.

The Chairman summarized the action to date as involving establishing a committee of scientists who will meet at Copenhagen to discuss and deal with the question of what should be done for the whole area of this Commission and to report to it at its next annual meeting through the Committee on Research and Statistics.

The matter of an agenda for the Committee developed considerable discussion. Dr. Needler felt the Committee should be a sub-committee of the Committee on Research and Statistics and should be restricted in size to be most effective. His view was that Research and Statistics Committee should discuss and set up a small group here and now to prepare an agenda.

Mr. Wimpenny suggested the experience of ICES might be a good guide, - two or three people prepare a document of a very large program. This was checked by Parties concerned. From this there was picked out the problems regarded as having priority. It would be wise to give special attention to a plan or agenda. He urged consideration of the fact that in this area there are one or two fish of paramount importance.

Mr. Bates said he felt that what was being sought is now beginning to emerge and that the Research and Statistics Committee could consider the matter before we left here and decide on the action to be taken. In this view Dr. Lucas and Dr. Walford agreed.

The Chairman assumed that there was agreement that the matter shall be referred back to the Research and Statistics Committee to produce something before this meeting ended and they, in their own way, should give us some idea of the problem and of the agenda of the meeting to be held in conjunction with the meeting of ICES in October. It was

understood that the result of the meeting in Copenhagen and of any other necessary meetings would be reported to the Commission. If agreed Dr. Needler's Committee would be asked to get busy at once. Agreed.

Mr. Bates added that thought should be given to the matter of budgets in the countries concerned always keeping in mind the need for avoiding delays.

Other Business

The Chairman referred to the small committee appointed to consider necessary and desirable amendments in the Rules of Procedure. He indicated there would be no report at this Meeting since any proposals would be placed on the agenda for the Third Meeting and sixty days notice would have to be given.

Panel Membership

The Secretary pointed out that to comply with Paragraph 2 of Article IV of the Convention the Panel Membership had been reviewed. They now stood as follows:

Panel 1 - Denmark, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, and after ratification France, Italy and Portugal.

Panel 2 - Canada, and after ratification France and Italy.

Panel 3 - Canada, Spain, United Kingdom, and United States, and after ratification France, Italy and Portugal.

Panel 4 - Canada, Spain and the United States, and after ratification France, Italy and Portugal.

Panel 5 - Canada and the United States.

The Chairman asked the Meeting if it was content with the manner in which membership of the panels had been reviewed. The Chairman hearing no dissenting voice declared the matter closed. Mr. Gushue added it should be understood that when ratification came from France, Italy and Portugal it would be necessary for them to provide evidence of the propriety of their being given Panel membership.

Sealing

Mr. Bates explained this matter had been placed on the agenda to facilitate discussion. This has taken place with countries interested and he now asked that the subject be withdrawn. Norway and Denmark were agreeable.

ADJOURNMENT.

