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During the summer of 1959 experiments have been conducted at La Tabatiere Experimental. Fishing. Station, Quebec, to determine the selectivity of a cod trap used by Quebec fishermen.

The experimental trap was installed in the immediate vicinity of the laboratory at La Tabatiere, where productivity for this kind of gear has been low in the past few years.

The trap used was of standard type except for the back, which had a mesh size of 5.2 inches ( 130 mm ) and fitted with an auxiliary back - 3 -inch mesh ( 85 mm ) - to retain escaping fish (Figure 1)。 Both backs were of treated cotton single twine, No. 18 for the 5 -inch back and No. 9 for the auxiliary part.

The meshes were measured in used condition and dry with the standard ICNAF gauge under a pressure of 12 pounds.

Observations of commercial fishermen and a few of our own observations suggest that the back is most important for selection, though more observetions are noeded to give a reliable account of the escapement process. When the trap is left undisturbed, fish can be seen swimming lazily around or standing still in a slight current with their snout pointing and close to meshes which would permit escapement, We could observe that even Capelin does not take advantage of the situation. If fish (Cod and Capelin) are disturbed, they dart in every direction, and not necessarily through the webbing.

However, if the disturbance is caused by the drying up of the net, which takes place from the door towards the back, fish are forced to move towards the back, their escapement through the sides of the gear getting less and less likely to occur as drying up proceeds.

Since catches were not too large, we were able to measure the whole catch each time the trap was visited ( 15 samples), and the fish were sorted by $3-c m$ groups, according to the recommended classification.

Table I is a tally of the numbers in the catches each day; column "A" shows the quantity of fish released by the 5 -inch mesh, column "D" gives the quantity of fish retained by the same mesh, while columns "B" and "C" are subdivisions of column "D", showing respectively the amount of fish gilled and not gilled within the confines of the trap enclosed by the 5-inch back. Column " $D$ " is the population sampled which was retained by the 3 -inch mesh.

As can be seen from this table, 35.8 percent of the total catch by number has been retained by the large mesh, 64.2 percent has been released and 11.3 percent of the fish was gilled. From a practical
point of view, a 5-inch back would not be suitable for commercial practices.

The 50 percent selection point was found to be at about 57 cr
For a 5.2 -inch ( 130 mm ) mesh, this value gives a selection factor of 4.4 , the highest obtained so far for our Cod traps. Previous observations had given, for the same trap, the following factors: 3.9, 4.0, 4.1, 4.2. The average would be 4.1.

Some minor sources of error were gilling of fish which might have escaped, and also escapement of a few big fish over the headine of the 5 -inch back.

It may be noted that in the upper limit of the selection curve the percentage escapement was somewhat irregular. The exact curve of these irregularities is unknown. The irregularities have been traced out in drawing the curve, although a smooth curve might have been fitted.

Data to trace the ogive (Figure 2) are given in Table II.

Table I. Cod Trap Selectivity La Tabatiere 1959

|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | $\text { by } \begin{aligned} & \text { Released } \\ & 5.181^{\prime \prime} \text { mesh } \\ & (130 \mathrm{~mm}) \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{5.188^{\text {Retai }} \text { mesh }}{\text { Not gilled }}$ | $\frac{130 \mathrm{rm})}{\text { Gilled }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { retained } \\ \text { by } \\ \begin{array}{c} 1180 \mathrm{~mm}) \\ (130 \mathrm{~mm}) \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | Population <br> retained <br> by $3^{\prime \prime}$ mesh <br> ( 85 mm ) <br> (see text) |
| June |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | 1092 | 991 | --- | 991 | 2083 |
| Juily |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 963 | 262 | 140 | 402 | . 1365 |
| 3 | 169 | 56 | 13 | 69 | 238 |
| 6 | 1043 | 622 | --- | 622 | 1665. |
| 7 | 285 | 21 | --- | 21 | 306 |
| 9 | 370 | 143 | 134 | 277 | 647 |
| 10 | $\therefore 757$ | 207 | 321 | 528 | 1285. |
| 11 | 809 | 183 | 314 | 497 | 1306 |
| 13 | 687 | 173 | 217 | 390 | 1077 |
| 14 | 470 | 267 | 141 | 408 | 878 |
| 15 | 436 | 77 | 60 | 137 | 573 |
| 16 | 367 | 43 | 65 | 108 | 475 |
| 17 | 312 | 66 | 30 | 96 | 408 |
| 20 | 344 | 30 | 32 | 62 | 406 |
| 21 | 194 | 26 | --- | 26 | 220 |
| TOTAL$\%$ | 8298 | 3167 | 1467 | 4634 | 12932 |
|  | 64.17 | 24.49 | 11.34 | 35.83 | 100.0 |

Table II. Cod Trap La Tabatiere 1959

|  | $A$ | $B$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Length <br> Group <br> $(c m)$ | Actual number | of fish retained |


| 28 | 0 | 25 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 | 0 | 161 | 0.00 |
| 34 | 0 | 293 | 0.00 |
| 37 | 0 | 436 | 0.00 |
| 40 | 2 | 535 | 0.00 |
| 43 | 20 | 619 | 0.03 |
| 46 | 60 | 801 | 0.07 |
| 49 | 250 | 1340 | 0.19 |
| 52 | 540 | 1807 | 0.30 |
| 55 | 800 | 1939 | 0.41 |
| 58 | 789 | 1530 | 0.52 |
| 61 | 730 | 1226 | 0.60 |
| 64 | 580 | 927 | 0.63 |
| 67 | 369 | 608 | 0.61 |
| 70 | 255 | 354 | 0.74 |
| 73 | 105 | 161 | 0.65 |
| 76 | 54 | 73 | 0.74 |
| 79 | 38 | 48 | 0.79 |
| 82 | 17 | 23 | 0.74 |
| 85 | 11 | 12 | 0.92 |
| 88 | 7 | 7 | 1.00 |
| 91 | 3 | 3 | 1.00 |
| 94 | 4 |  | 1.00 |



Fig. 1. Diagram showing the arrangement used in 1959 to study the selectivity of a Cod Trap at La Tabatiere, P. $\Omega$.

- 5 -


Fig. 2.
Selectivity of a $5.18^{\prime \prime}$ ( 130 mm ) Mesh Cod Trap based on the ratio of fish retained by same mesh to total population sampled ( 1959 La Tabatiere).

