

The importance of ICES in the establishment of NEAFC

Sigmund Engesæter

Engesæter, S. 2002. The importance of ICES in the establishment of NEAFC. – ICES Marine Science Symposia, 215: 572–581.

This paper looks at the way management issues were dealt with by ICES prior to the first Overfishing Conference held in London in 1936. That Conference and the subsequent meetings that dealt with fisheries management during the period leading to the establishment, in 1953, of the management organization – the Permanent Commission, subsequently NEAFC – are elaborated in some detail. Finally, the links between key people in ICES and key people in the management organization are described.

Keywords: North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission, Overfishing Conference, Permanent Commission.

Sigmund Engesæter: Department of Fisheries Economics, Directorate of Fisheries, Strandgaten 229, PO Box 185 Sentrum, N-5804 Bergen, Norway; tel: +47 55 23 80 00; fax: +47 55 23 80 90; e-mail: sigmund.engesater@fiskeridir.dep.no.

Introduction

As an organization, the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC) has a history about half as long as that of ICES. The importance of NEAFC as a management organization has fluctuated over the years. The recent development of the Law of the Sea with the 1995 UN Agreement on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks increased the importance of regional fisheries organizations in general. On this basis, in 1998, the Contracting Parties of NEAFC, i.e., Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the European Union (EU), Iceland, Norway, Poland, and Russia, decided to establish NEAFC as an independent international fisheries management organization with its own headquarters in London.

As a consequence of that decision, the offices of NEAFC moved, as of 1 July 1999, from the headquarters of the UK Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF), which had been its home since the beginning, to a new location in London. Old documents pertaining to the establishment of NEAFC were found during that move, providing part of the stimulus and basis for writing this paper.

The intention of this paper is to summarize briefly the establishment and early years of this partner commission to ICES. By doing so, it will be shown how key people in ICES also played a major role in the establishment of NEAFC. In particular, emphasis will focus on the meetings held during the period 1936–1947 that led to the establishment in 1953 of the management organization called the "Permanent Commission" which, 10 years later, changed its name to NEAFC. In addition to the documents found in the NEAFC archives, refer-

ence is made to the writings of two former Presidents of ICES, Arthur Went (1972) and David de G. Griffith (1999), as well as documents provided by the Canadian High Commissioner in London (Anon., 1985).

Management issues dealt with by ICES prior to 1936

The possibility of the overfishing of certain species has received much attention since the foundation of ICES. According to Griffith (1999), "In response to the concerns expressed by ICES Member governments concerning overfishing, the Council's recommendations included – virtually every year from 1902 onwards – warnings about continued landings of immature fish."

In 1909, Friedrich Heincke presented a paper that briefly dealt with the question of protective legislation. That paper considered size limits for plaice, and their effectiveness. According to Went (1972), Heincke's paper may be regarded as a background document to what later resulted in the "Overfishing Conference" in London.

A special ICES meeting, held in London in 1912, arrived at conclusions to be conveyed to Member governments: the advisability of introducing size limits and an international prohibition on the landing of undersized plaice. This was agreed by ICES in 1913.

World War I interrupted work in ICES, but in May 1918, four neutral Member Countries (Denmark, The Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden) met to discuss the effects of reduced fishing intensity, due to the war, on fish stocks in the North Sea. Then, in the early 1920s,

ICES itself discussed these effects. An ICES Council Resolution of 1920 stated that the evidence available indicated benefits from the closure of limited areas to steam trawlers and high powered (>50 HP) vessels. In 1921, a prohibition was recommended along the eastern and southern shores of the North Sea. Following the resumption of intensive fishing, there was evidence of a decline in the stock, and a special conference on North Sea plaice was held in Amsterdam in 1925 to elaborate on this.

In 1930, there was a discussion of the effects of large codend meshes on catches of haddock. In 1933, ICES expressed appreciation for the steps taken by the British government to enforce unilateral minimum trawl mesh sizes. A special ICES meeting was held 4–8 June 1934 on the size limits for fish and the regulation of mesh sizes in fishing nets. Again, according to Went, this was perhaps one of the most important meetings ever held by the Council as it was the "precursor of international conferences which ultimately led to the Fisheries Convention of London in 1937".

Meetings held between 1936 and 1947

The British government played an important role in taking the initiative to establish international management cooperation. As expressed by the British government representative to ICES, the aim was to avoid the same situation in European fisheries as that experienced after World War I. It is, however, fair to say that other European countries regarded the British initiative, to a certain extent, as an attempt to reserve resources for its own fishermen.

Following an invitation by the British government, an international conference on mesh regulations and size limits for fish was arranged in London, 23–28 November 1936; this was the so-called "Overfishing Conference". The Conference was attended by participants from 12 European countries, with observers from Latvia and the USSR and representatives from the British fishing industry¹. Henry G. Maurice, President of ICES, was elected Chair of the Conference.

Formally, the Conference was called the "INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE to discuss the RECOMMENDATIONS made by THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE EXPLORATION OF THE SEA at its Annual Meeting in 1934 regarding the CONTROL OF FISHERIES by REGULATION OF THE MESH AND OF SIZE LIMITS OF FISH". The aim was to discuss and agree upon measures to prevent wasteful fishing or, as expressed by the Belgian Delegate during a luncheon

speech, it was "for the attending countries to follow and imitate the British legislation of 1933".

The agenda for the first Overfishing Conference, as follows, shows the issues being discussed in 1936:

- (1) The Regulation of Mesh of Fishing Nets.
 - a) Trawl Nets; and
 - b) Seines and other bottom-fishing gear.
- (2) Regulation for prohibiting the sale of specified fishes below specified limits of size. It would be desirable to consider whether it would be more practical to prohibit:
 - a) The landing of under-sized fish; or
 - b) Their sale; or
 - c) Both landing and sale.
- (3) The practicability of saving under-sized flat fish after they have been caught.
- (4) Other proposals, if any, for the protection of the stock of fish, either generally or locally.
- (5) The study of the effect of protective measures. It is suggested that the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea might be requested to report from time to time on this subject.
- (6) Methods for the speedy revision of the regulations in the light of experience.
- (7) Heads of an International Convention.

If a similar conference were to be held today, the agenda would likely cover much the same issues. Incidentally, the date of the formal opening of the new NEAFC office in the autumn of 1999 was the same (23 November) as the opening date of the Overfishing Conference in London 63 years earlier.

The outcome of this first Overfishing Conference was that reports from two committees were presented: one from the Committee on Mesh Size Regulations and one from the Committee on Size Limits of Fish. These reports contained many reservations (in particular by France), but the Conference agreed to present its recommendations to ICES and request that ICES study them and further advise the participating governments. It was also agreed to maintain the momentum and call for a meeting early the following year. At the end of the Conference, a committee was given the task of collating the outcome into a single document which was presented as a draft conclusion. This document summarizes the situation and gives an impression of the "bridges" that had to be built and crossed before cooperation could begin. The text of the draft conclusion presented to the Conference is contained in Annex 1 of this paper. The list of participants is given in Annex 2.

A second document entitled "Confidential Report from the INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON MESH REGULATIONS AND SIZE LIMITS FOR FISH FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF THE MESHES OF FISHING NETS AND SIZE LIMITS FOR FISH" is a report from a follow-up conference held in London, 17–23 March 1937. Why this particular report was marked confidential is un-

¹ Participants were Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, and Sweden, with observers from Latvia, the USSR, English Sea Fisheries Committees, and British Trawlers' Federation.

clear. Participants at the 1937 Conference were the same as at the 1936 Conference, with the addition of Iceland and Spain; the USSR did not attend².

The Chair had prepared a draft convention, circulated in advance, entitled "1937 Convention for the Regulation of Meshes of Fishing Nets and Size Limits of Fish". The Convention was meant to apply to fisheries in the North Atlantic and dependent seas, including the Mediterranean and the Baltic Sea. The western limit was proposed as 80°W and the southern limit at the equator. The purpose was to cover all waters that could be reached by vessels from the Contracting Parties. It was signed on 23 March 1937 by ten European states: Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Great Britain, Iceland, Ireland, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, and Sweden. Five states (Finland, France, Latvia, Portugal, and Spain) did not sign.

The aim was for this Convention to be ratified by the governments of the participating delegations. In fact, the elements of the Convention were enforced by several signatory governments up to the outbreak of World War II. However, this international agreement never formally came into operation because it required the ratification of all signatory countries. At the outbreak of World War II, Belgium, Germany, and The Netherlands had not ratified, while France had withdrawn from the Overfishing Conference.

An international fisheries conference was held in London, 12–22 October 1943, with its report bound in black, indicating a time of war, and marked "Confidential Exploratory Conference". Some countries were represented at the Conference by their governments-in-exile in London. It was also of importance that the North American states (United States, Canada, and Newfoundland) were invited³.

The expressed purpose of the 1943 Conference was to update and extend the scope of existing fisheries agreements relating to policing of fishing grounds, rules of navigation for fishing vessels, and the prevention of disputes between fishermen of different countries.

The main agenda included general discussion of a draft convention for the North Atlantic and Arctic in an attempt to replace all the existing conventions with a single up-to-date convention. The conventions already in existence at that time were:

- 1) the Anglo-French Convention (normally known as the English Channel Convention) of 1839 and

connected agreements (Regulations of 1843, amended by the Agreement of 20 December 1928), relating to the fishery in the neighbourhood of the Channel Islands;

- 2) the North Sea Fisheries Convention of 1882 between the United Kingdom, Germany, Belgium, Denmark, France, and The Netherlands relating to the policing of fisheries in the North Sea area;
- 3) the Faroe Islands and Iceland (Anglo-Danish) Fisheries Convention of 1901 for the policing of fisheries in the neighbourhood of those islands; and
- 4) the International Convention of 1937 for the Regulation of Meshes of Fishing Nets and Size Limits of Fish.

The North Sea Convention (1882) and the Anglo-Danish Fisheries Convention (1901) both contained, amongst other things, provisions limiting exclusive fishing rights in coastal waters to three nautical miles.

One of the most sensitive issues at the 1943 Conference was the extension of a possible Convention. Canada supported the view that the boundary should be extended westward to include all North Atlantic high-seas fisheries. The Canadian approach was that if a convention were to be made, it should cover both sides of the Atlantic. This would avoid creating a legal loophole in the western Atlantic and would prevent European interests from depleting fisheries near the North American coast by means of unsound fishing practices. At the same time, Canada proposed rules to make it possible to establish a special regime with different regulations for particular areas. It proposed an annex to the general convention containing provisions for the constitution of a special regime for a Northwestern Atlantic Fisheries Organization.

The United States (US), represented by an observer from the US Embassy in London, argued that inclusion of American waters in a European convention might create an undesirable precedent, and that it might have the effect of tying the hands of the North American states with respect to "possible necessary interim action". The US suggested that the eastern and western Atlantic should be made the subjects of separate arrangements, with a western limit for the eastern Atlantic arrangement at 40°W, which would constitute a logical dividing line (the US had a hidden agenda: the establishment of fisheries conservation zones beyond the three-mile limit)⁴. To support this argument, the US observer pointed out a quotation from the competent fishing authorities, notably ICES, in a report to the Economic Committee of the League of Nations:

The problem of the fisheries vary from sea to sea and from latitude to latitude. The fish population of one

² Participants were Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, and Sweden, with observers from the British Trawlers' Federation and the Association of Sea Fisheries Committees of England and Wales.

³ Participants were Belgium, Canada, France, Great Britain, Iceland, Ireland, The Netherlands, Newfoundland, Norway, Poland, and Portugal, with observers from Denmark, Spain, Sweden, and the United States. The USSR was invited, but did not attend.

⁴ Based on a memorandum taken of a conversation between the highest official in the Canadian Foreign Service and the US Ambassador to Canada. Documents on Canadian External Affairs, Volume 9, p. 809.

sea and of one latitude is different from that of another and even a given species of fish may be found to require protection in one area which it does not require in another. It follows then that fishery problems are so localized as to be of interest only to those nations whose fishermen have access to the localities and fisheries concerned and if and when the necessity for regulation of any of the local fisheries arises it will be a matter for treatment by agreement between the nations interested and between them alone.

The United States was also uneasy about the western boundary since the advice was from ICES, where the US and Canada were not represented.

The result of the 1943 Conference was a "Draft Convention relating to the Policing of Fisheries and Measures for the Protection of Immature Fish" to cover international waters in the North Atlantic. The Final Act was signed by all participating countries except the United States⁵.

After the war, the British government again convened an international conference on overfishing that was held in London, 25 March–5 April 1946⁶. Its aims were to study the problem of overfishing, on the basis of a statement submitted on behalf of the British government, covering only demersal species. Increased fishing activity and improved gear had again led to increased pressure on resources, and the purpose of the conference was to discuss and re-examine proposals such as mesh size and the sizes of undersized fish set out in the 1937 agreement.

At this 1946 conference, the following additional regulatory measures were foreseen:

- 1) quantitative restriction on the amount landed,
- 2) a limit on the number of fishing days in a year,
- 3) area closures, and
- 4) closed seasons.

The conference proposed increased mesh sizes and greater minimum size limits than those recommended in 1937. The conference further recommended that each participating government should endeavour to ensure that the size of its fishing fleet would not be increased beyond its present effective size, or that of 1938, whichever was greater. It was also agreed that this Overfishing Convention, as it was called, should cover the area between 42°W and 32°E. It established agreed land-

ing sizes for demersal fish and minimum mesh sizes, except for trawls catching pelagic fish and shrimp. This Convention, consisting of four parts, was the basis for establishing the management organization that was given the name "Permanent Commission".

In a resolution, it was proposed that signatory governments should appoint a Standing Advisory Committee to study and propose the most suitable form of regulation for the prevention of overfishing. This Committee met twice in early 1947.

The first meeting of the Standing Advisory Committee on Overfishing was held in London, 20–25 January 1947, with 11 European states participating⁷. At this point, only three countries (Great Britain, Poland, and Sweden) had ratified the 1946 Convention. It was agreed to give priority to the protection of haddock, cod, and plaice. The Committee concluded that recommendations on closed seasons and closed areas were deemed impracticable, but governments were advised to adhere to the mesh and fish-size regulations of 1946 and to limit fishing power to 75% of the pre-war level. It was, however, acknowledged that agreement on the limitation of the tonnage of vessels was not likely to be obtained.

As an immediate follow-up, a second meeting was arranged in London, 16–19 April 1947, with the same participation as the January meeting. This meeting developed the following list of useful measures for conservation:

- 1) minimum size of mesh,
- 2) minimum legal size of fish,
- 3) reduction of power of fishing fleet,
- 4) reduction of catch,
- 5) control of building of fleets,
- 6) control of fishing activity,
- 7) temporary closures, and
- 8) closed area.

The Committee agreed to set up an international commission, consisting of the existing Standing Advisory Committee, with the following terms of reference: "to take under annual review the fishing activity in the North Sea from the point of view of the conservation of the stocks, and to report thereon to the Governments concerned".

It took another five years to obtain the required number of signatures to the 1946 Convention for the Permanent Commission to be established and arrange its first meeting in 1953. Ten years later, the responsibilities of the Commission were extended also to cover pelagic fisheries, and the name was changed to the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC).

⁵ As an immediate follow-up, Canada took the initiative and organized a conference on creating a special fishery regime in the Northwest Atlantic. The first meeting was held 24 January 1944, and the eventual result was the establishment of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (ICNAF) at a conference held in Washington, DC in 1949.

⁶ Participants were Belgium, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Iceland, Ireland, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, and Sweden, with observers from the United States and ICES (President Johan Hjort, Dr K. A. Andersson, and Dr H. Blegvad).

⁷ Participants were Belgium, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Iceland, Ireland, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, and Sweden.

Personal links between ICES and NEAFC

One can look at links between ICES and its client organizations in two ways: the issues covered and the people involved. In this final section, I will dwell on the founding fathers of the management organization and their links with ICES.

A list of the presidents and secretaries, a "Roll of Honour", of the Permanent Commission and NEAFC, is contained in Annex 3 of this paper. It is fair to say that the founding fathers of NEAFC were the representatives at the first Overfishing Conference in London in 1936 (Annex 2). These men were influential, with strong personalities and prominent in their field. Four of the names on that list warrant particular attention.

Henry Gascoyne Maurice was Vice-President of ICES from 1912 to 1920 and President from 1920 to 1938. According to Went (1972), the London Overfishing Conference in 1936–1937, which laid the foundation for international cooperation, owed much to Maurice personally. He was a natural leader and was elected Chair of the Conference. By training, he was a lawyer and was employed by the British Board of Agriculture and Fisheries and was in charge of the Fisheries Department until his retirement in 1948.

Johan Hjort was among the pioneers when ICES was founded 100 years ago, being Vice-President of ICES from 1920 to 1938 and President from 1938 to 1948. He was the Norwegian delegate to the Overfishing Conference. Hjort was a leading figure in marine science in northern Europe during the first decades of the 20th century, authoring several major works in fisheries biology and exerting a significant influence on its development during this period. Hjort also was director of fisheries in Norway during the period 1900–1916. He was also a keen internationalist, arguing for international cooperation as a means of enhancing science.

K. A. Andersson was the Swedish delegate to the Overfishing Conference and served as Vice-President of ICES from 1945 to 1948 and President from 1948 to 1952. He was a herring specialist and went on to become a prominent fisheries manager in Sweden.

Å. Vedel Tåning, the expert in the Danish delegation to the Overfishing Conference, was Vice-President of ICES from 1952 to 1955, first Vice-President from 1955 to 1957, and President from 1957 to 1958.

There were other participants at the 1943 and 1946–1947 conferences who later served as president of the management organization (Permanent Commission or NEAFC). One, in particular, was Klaus Sunnanå, a Norwegian fisheries manager, who played a role in meetings during and after the war and became the second president of the Permanent Commission from 1957 to 1960.

There were also three Vice-Presidents of ICES who served as presidents of the management organisation: G. J. Lienesch (The Netherlands), President of the Permanent Commission (1961–1963) and Vice-President of

ICES (1959–1964); A. J. Aglen (Great Britain), President of NEAFC (1964–1967) and Vice-President of ICES (1955–1960); and D. Olafsson (Iceland), President of NEAFC (1967–1969) and Vice-President of ICES (1964–1967).

It is, therefore, clear that key people in ICES also played a major role in the establishment and early years of the management organization.

The importance of NEAFC to ICES

A statement by Arthur Went (1972, p. 240) indicates that ICES found the relationship with the management organization beneficial:

Under the terms of Article 11 of the 1959 Convention, the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission is required to seek, when possible, the advice and cooperation of the Council 'in carrying out any necessary investigations and, for this purpose, may make such joint arrangements as may be agreed with the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea or may make such other arrangements as it may think fit'. Indeed, collaboration with the Permanent Commission and the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission is perhaps one of the most fruitful undertaken by the Council.

ICES and NEAFC had a mutually beneficial influence upon each other from the establishment of the Permanent Commission onwards. While ICES brought its scientific expertise to bear on the work of NEAFC, NEAFC forced a practically oriented agenda on ICES. NEAFC thus contributed to a development where ICES continued to focus its efforts on science intended to serve the fishing industry and the management of resources. The problems encountered in NEAFC also helped to shift the scientific endeavours from the study of natural fluctuations to the overfishing problem. In terms of organizational development, ICES changed its structure to accommodate the needs of NEAFC by establishing a Liaison Committee for providing advice to and maintaining the relationship with NEAFC. The Liaison Committee was "on the basis of evidence available", to provide scientific advice on matters raised by fisheries commissions.

In 1978, the ICES Liaison Committee was replaced by the Advisory Committee on Fishery Management (ACFM). From then until the present time, ACFM has continued providing to NEAFC the full range of scientific advice on the status of all major fish stocks in the NEAFC area.

On 3 December 1998, ICES and NEAFC signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) which outlined terms for the continued provision of scientific information and advice, including financial and general administrative arrangements, and an agreement to consult on ways in which cooperation could be further improved and extended.

References

- Anonymous. 1937a. International Conference to discuss the recommendations made by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea at its Annual Meeting in 1934 regarding the control of fishing by regulation of the mesh and of size limits for fish, held in London, 23–28 November 1936. Report of proceedings, IFC 1937/1.
- Anonymous. 1937b. International Conference on mesh regulations and size limits for fish for the purpose of making an international Convention for the regulation of the meshes of fishing nets and size limits for fish, held in London, 17–23 March 1937. Report of proceedings, S>C, Wt 12732-200-5/37 (5).
- Anonymous. 1943. International Fisheries Conference, London 1943. Report of proceedings.
- Anonymous. 1946. International Conference on Overfishing, London, March 1946. Report of proceedings.
- Anonymous. 1947a. Standing Advisory Committee on Overfishing, London, First Meeting, January 1947. Report of proceedings.
- Anonymous. 1947b. Standing Advisory Committee on Overfishing, London, Second Meeting, April 1947. Report of proceedings.
- Anonymous. 1985. Documents on Canadian External Relations, Department of External Affairs, Ottawa, Volume 9.
- Cushing, D. H. 1971/72. A history of some of the international fisheries commissions. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh (B)* 73, 36: 361–390.
- Cushing, D. H. 1977. The Atlantic commissions. *Marine Policy*, July 1977: 230–238.
- Griffith, David de G. 1999. On the evolution of ICES. Open lecture presented at the 1999 ICES Annual Science Conference, Stockholm, Sweden. International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.
- Went, A. E. J. 1972. Seventy Years Agrowing. *Rapports et Procès-Verbaux des Réunions du Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer*, 165: 252 pp.

Annex 1

Drafting Committee

Draft Conclusions presented to the Conference

1. The recommendations of the Conference refer to the fisheries of the North Atlantic and dependent seas, excluding American waters south of 64° of North latitude, the Mediterranean and the Baltic.
2. The Conference agreed unanimously that the meshes of trawl and seine nets and of other similar nets towed at the bottom of the sea and used for the capture of fish other than pelagic fish, eels, shrimps, prawns and molluscs should be regulated by International Convention.
3. The Conference agreed unanimously that size limits should be imposed by Convention below which fish of the following kinds:

Cod	<i>Gadus callarias</i>
Haddock	<i>Gadus aeglefinus</i>
Whiting	<i>Gadus merlangus</i>
Hake	<i>Merluccius merluccius</i>
Plaice	<i>Pleuronectes platessa</i>
Dabs	<i>Limanda limanda</i>
Witches	<i>Glyptocephalus cynoglossus</i>
Lemon sole	<i>Microstomus kitt</i>
Soles	<i>Solea solea</i>
Halibut	<i>Hippoglossus hippoglossus</i>
Turbot	<i>Scophthalmus maximus</i>
Brill	<i>Scophthalmus rhombus</i>
Megrim	<i>Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis</i>

should be neither landed nor sold.

4. The Conference agreed unanimously that it should be provided that fish below the prescribed limits of size should not be retained on board any fishing vessel except for the purpose of transplantation or for scientific purposes.
5. All the delegations except that of France agreed to a minimum size of mesh such that, taken over an average of a sufficient number of meshes when the net is stretched diagonally lengthwise of the net, a flat gauge 70 millimetres broad and 2 millimetres thick shall pass through it easily when the net is wet. This regulation should apply to all parts of all nets and not to the cod-end only.

This regulation should be deemed to prohibit the use of any device by which in effect the mesh of any part of the net is diminished.

6. It was agreed that the regulation of mesh should not apply to the waters in which the nationals of the contracting parties, or of some of them, enjoy in International Law or by virtue of any Convention the exclusive right of fishing.

The Danish delegation wished that the Skagerrak and Kattegat should also be excluded from the operation of the regulation of the mesh.

7. The Conference further unanimously recommends, for the consideration of the Governments concerned, the enforcement of a mesh of 10.5 centimetres diagonal, measured similarly to the minimum mesh specified in paragraph 5, in the area North of 66° of North latitude and East of the Meridian of Greenwich.

The Conference is also of opinion that the Governments should consider whether it is desirable to enforce a similar mesh, namely a mesh of 10.5 centimetres diagonal, in some other fishing regions outside the waters of the European Continental Shelf.

8. With regard to the fishes named in paragraph 3 the following size limits are recommended by the majority of the delegations as indicated hereunder:

Fish	Size limit	Agree	Reject	Reserve consideration
1. Cod	30 cm	Bel, Den, Fra, Nor, Pol, Swe	—	Fin, Ger, GB, Hol, Irish Free State, Por
2. Haddock	24 cm	All	—	—
3. Whiting	24 cm	Bel, Den, Fin, Ger, GB, Irish Free State, Nor, Pol, Por, Swe	Fra 18 cm Hol 18 cm	
4. Hake	33 cm	Bel, Den, Fin, Ger, GB, Irish Free State, Nor, Pol, Swe	Fra 23cm Hol 23cm, Por	—
5. Plaice	23 cm	Bel, Den, Fin, Ger, GB, Irish Free State, Nor, Pol, Por, Swe	Fra 18cm	Hol
6. Dabs	25 cm	Bel, Den, Fin, GB, Irish Free State, Nor, Pol, Swe	Fra 18cm Ger Hol 18–20cm	Por 21–22 cm
7. Witches	23 cm	Den, Ger, GB, Hol, Irish Free State, Nor, Pol, Swe	—	Bel, Fin, Fra, Por
8. Lemon soles	23 cm	Den, Ger, GB, Hol, Irish Free State, Nor, Pol, Swe	—	Bel, Fin, Fra, Por
9. Soles	23 cm	Bel, Den, Ger, GB, Irish Free State, Nor, Pol, Swe	Fra 18cm Hol 18cm	Fin, Por
10. Halibut	70 cm	Fra	—	All remaining delegations
11. Turbot	25 cm	All	—	—
12. Brill	25 cm	All	—	—
13. Megrims	23 cm	Bel, Den, Ger, GB, Hol, Irish Free State, Nor, Pol, Swe	Fra 18cm	Por

9. It is understood that in the case of shrimp and prawn fisheries a certain destruction of small fish is unavoidable. Measures should, however, be taken to reduce this destruction to the lowest possible limits and to secure the return to the water of all such fish as can be sorted out in a reasonable time.
10. It was agreed that in all cases where size limits were adopted the Governments should make regulations to secure that fish landed with their heads and/or tails off should be so treated that the size limits applicable to the whole fish could not be evaded.
11. Although the Conference has failed to reach unanimity it is of the opinion that the degree of agreement reached is such that the Governments should be able in the near future to frame a Convention acceptable to all. In any such Convention it would be desirable to include provision for the appointment of a Committee of Revision which should meet from time to time to take under consideration the initial minimum measurements both as regards mesh and as regards fish, with a view to their extension in the light of experience, and further to consider the extension of the protection given by the Convention to other fishes.
12. The Conference further recommends that the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea should be requested to study and to report upon the results achieved by any Convention of this character which may be made, and further to advise the participating Governments both as to the extension of the limits laid down by any Convention and as to the inclusion in it of fish for the time being excluded.
13. The proceedings of the Conference and of its Committees are recorded in reports copies of which, after confirmation by the respective Delegations, will be transmitted to the Governments represented.

27 November 1936

Annex 2

International Conference on Mesh Regulations and Size Limits for Fish

List of Delegations

Country	Delegates	Experts and Embassy Representatives
Belgium	M. le Gouverneur H. Bael	M. le Professeur G. Gilson
Denmark	Mr P. F. Erichsen	Dr Å. Vedel Tåning
Finland	M. R. Smedalund	
France	M. Peyrega M. le Dr E. Danois	M. Sarraz-Bournet M. Fourmentin-Avise M. Pouliot
Germany	Herr Gesandter Dr Woermann (represented by Dr T. Bielfeld or Dr T. W. W. Weber) Oberregierungsrat Prof Dr A. Willer	Dr A. Bückmann Dr E. Fischer Konsul Schau
Great Britain	Mr H. G. Maurice, CB Mr G. Hogarth	Dr E. S. Russell, OBE Dr R. S. Clark Mr F. M. Davis Mr M. Graham Mr C. F. Hickling Miss D. E. Thursby-Pelham
Holland	Mr W. J. Janssens	Dr J. J. Tesch
Irish Free State	Mr G. P. Farran	
Latvia		Mr E. Zolmanis (observer)
Norway	Dr Johan Hjort	Captain Thor Iversen Mr J. Sellag
Poland	M. le Professeur M. Siedlecki	
Portugal	Senhor Luis Ferreira de Castro Dr A. S. M. de M. Ramalho	
Sweden	Dr K. A. Andersson	Mr S. Cornelliussun
USSR		Mr A. Ivensky (observer)
Representing English Sea Fisheries Committees		Dr Travis Jenkins
Representing the British Trawlers' Federation		Sir Andrew Lewis Mr J. W. Lown Sir John Marsden, Bart

Annex 3

Presidents and Secretaries of the Permanent Commission and NEAFC

Year	President	Secretary
Permanent Commission		
1953	R. G. R. Wall (UK)	W. S. Armstrong
1954	"	"
1955	"	"
1956	"	"
1957	K. Sunnanå	A. Savage
1958	"	"
1959	"	"
1960	"	"
1961	G. J. Lienesch (Netherlands)	"
1962	"	A. K. H. Atkinson
1963	"	"
NEAFC	"	"
1964	A. J. Aglen (UK)	"
1965	"	J. S. W. Henshaw
1966	"	F. H. Goodwin
1967	D. Olafsson (Iceland)	"
1968	"	"
1969	A. S. Gaidoukov (USSR)	P. Pooley
1970	"	"
1971	"	"
1972	"	"
1973	G. Möcklinghoff (FRG)	T. L. Windle
1974	"	D. H. Griffiths
1975	J. C. E. Cardoso (Portugal)	A. R. Burne
1976	"	P. Elliott
1977	"	"
1978	"	"
1979	"	R. C. Gurd
1980	"	G. Belchamber
1981	"	"
1982	J. L. Arnalds (Iceland)	"
1983	"	"
1984	"	E. A. Blackwell
1985	"	"
1986	W. Ranke (GDR)	"
1987	"	P. J. Ogden
1988	"	"
1989	"	"
1990	"	"
1991	V. J. Olsen (Norway)	"
1992	"	"
1993	"	"
1994	O. Tougaard (EC)	C. J. Bowles
1995	"	"
1996	"	"
1997	"	S. Whitehead
1998	"	"
1999	"	S. Engesæter
2000	E. Lemche (Denmark)	"
2001	"	K. Hoydal