

COMISION INTERAMERICANA DEL ATUN TROPICAL
INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL
MEETING

RESUMEN DE LAS MINUTAS DE LA VIGESIMA
REUNION ANUAL

April 2, 3 and 4, 1968

Panama City, Republic of Panama

Chairman: Eugene D. Bennett

Secretary: Wilson H. Vela

INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

20th REGULAR ANNUAL MEETING

April 2, 3 and 4, 1968

Panama City, Republic of Panama

AGENDA

1. Opening of Meeting by Chairman
2. Consideration and adoption of Agenda
3. Current researches and research results
4. The 1967 fishing year with yellowfin under regulation, Background Paper No.1
5. Condition of yellowfin stocks, B.P. No.2
6. Revision of research programs for 1967/68 and 1968/69 under revised budgets, B.P. No.3
7. Recommended research program for 1969/70, B.P. No.4
8. Proportion of contributions by Member Governments, B.P. No.5
9. Administration: (a) Charge, in some instances, for publications; (b) Definition of unanimous vote - Art. I-8
10. Approval of Annual Report for 1967
11. Election of Officers
12. Place and date of next meeting
13. Other business

The twentieth* regular annual meeting of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission for the year 1968 convened in plenary session in the Washington Salon of the El Panama Hotel at 0930, April 2, 1968. The following persons were in attendance:

Ing. Arturo Díez P., Minister of Agriculture, Commerce and Industry of Panama

Representatives of Member Governments:

CANADA

E. B. Young
E. H. Gennis

COSTA RICA

José Luis Cardona-Cooper
Milton H. López G.

MEXICO

Juan Luis Cifuentes L.
Lic. Alejandro Cervantes (Delegate)

PANAMA

Juan L. de Obarrio
Arquimedes Franqueza (Delegate)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Eugene D. Bennett
John G. Driscoll
William H. Holmstrom
J. L. McHugh

Advisors of Member Countries:

CANADA

P. A. Larkin

COSTA RICA

Fernando Palau Curco

PANAMA

Lic. Roberto Ruiz Stoute, Biologist, Fisheries Dept.

*The first meeting of the Commission was held on July 18, 1950 in Coronado, California. Two regular meetings were held in 1951, and a special meeting on September 14, 1961. Thus the Commission has met 20 times. Regular Annual Meetings began to be numbered in 1965, starting with 17. Thus the present meeting is the 20th Regular Annual Meeting.

UNITED STATES

Donald L. McKernan (Delegate) Department of State
G.C. Broadhead, Ralston Purina
C.R. Carry, Tuna Research Foundation
R.C. Croker, Reg. Fisheries Officer (US Embassy, Mexico)
A. Felando, General Manager, American Tunaboat Assoc.
S.J. Hoinsky, Seine & Line Fishermen's Union
G.V. Howard, Reg. Director, BCF, Terminal Is., Cal.
F.R. Insinger, Western Fishboat Owners
A. Pisano, Fishermen's Cooperative Assoc.
J.J. Royal, Fishermen's Union I.L.W.U.
O.A. Schulz, General Manager, Del Monte de Puerto Rico
W.G. Van Campen, Foreign Affairs Off., Dept. of State
R.C. Wilson, Chief, Branch of International Organizations
and Agreements, BCF, Dept. of the Interior

Staff of Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission

John L. Kask, Director of Investigations
James Joseph, Principal Scientist

Observers from Member Countries:

CANADA

Dean J. Browne, Canadian Embassy, Guatemala

MEXICO

Ricardo Arzamendi Piña

Observers from Other Countries:

CHILE

Ernesto Illanes Edwards, Mgr., Empresa Pesquera Tarapaca,
Santiago
Alfredo Tapia Salazar, Secr., Chilean Embassy, Panama

COLOMBIA

Constantino Tapias Rueda, Co-Director, Project SF/FAO, Bogota

JAPAN

Shintaro Tani, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo
Ryuichi Tanabe, Fisheries Agency, Tokyo
Shojiro Shimura, Asst. Chief, Federation of Japan Tuna Fish-
ing Cooperative Association, Tokyo
Chikara Kuroda, 1st Secr., Japanese Embassy, Panama

NICARAGUA

Ing. Antonio Flores Arana, Chief of Fisheries, Instituto de
Fomento Nacional, Managua

Representatives from International Organizations:

F A O

D.W. Sahrhage, Chief, Marine Biology Section, Rome
L.L. Vasconcelos, Reg. Director for Central America,
El Salvador
F.S. Gneri, Director, Fisheries Project, Colombia
I. Barrett, Chief Biologist, Instituto de Fomento Pesquero,
Santiago
W.H. Bayliff, Marine Fishery Biologist, Panama

UNESCO

L. Howell Rivero, Comisión Oceanogr. Intergubernamental, Panama

GUESTS OF HONOR (Panama)

Ing. Arturo Díez P. Minister of Agriculture	Dário Tovar, Biól. Servicio Forestal, Min. of Agric.
Federico Humbert, Jr. Pres. Asoc. Nal. de la Industria Pesq.	Fehme Halwany, Pres. Pesçadora Pistuni, S.A.
Arnoldo R. Masters, Prof. Biol. University of Panama	Dr. Carlos Raúl Morales A.N.D.A.L.A.I.P.
Robert F. Gillin, 2nd Sec. United States Embassy	Ronaldo M. Gálvez A., Ing. Ministry of Agriculture
Carmen de De Arriba, Asst. Biol. Ministry of Agriculture	Maximo A. Luque Jr., Techn. Adv. C.D.I.P.
Julieta Fábrega, Directora de Ind., Ministry of Agriculture	Elcazar Escala B. Centro de Desarrollo Ind.
Lily P. de Marcos Depto. de Cooperativas Ministry of Agriculture	Ing. Alberto T. Sakata D., Super- int. Adminis., Promarina, S.A, Puerto Caimito

Interpretation Team:

Carlos Díez, Interpreter
Gerardo Lara, Engineer

Agenda Item (1) - Opening of Meeting by Chairman

The Chairman officially opened the meeting by welcoming all distinguished guests and observers. He then introduced the following heads of delegations of member countries:

José Luis Cardona-Cooper, Costa Rica
Juan L. de Obarrio, Panama
Juan Luis Cifuentes L., Mexico
E. Blyth Young, Canada
J. L. McHugh, United States of America

The Chairman noted the absence of Ecuador, who until August 21, 1968 continues as a full member of the Commission.

He next introduced the following official observers from non-member countries and international organizations:

Ernesto Illanes Edwards, Chile
Chikara Kuroda, Japan
Detrich W. Sahrhage, FAO
Luis Howell Rivero, UNESCO

All made suitable responses and commented on the work and aims of the Commission.

The Chairman then asked Mr. Obarrio to introduce a most distinguished representative of the host country:

Ing. Arturo Díez P., Minister of Agriculture, Commerce and Industry
for the Republic of Panama

who spoke on the role of the sea in providing food for the ever-increasing populations of the world. He noted the importance of tuna in this respect and cited the Commission as an example of what can be accomplished through international collaboration and good will for the benefit of mankind.

The Chairman at this point declared a 15-minute recess to allow the Minister to depart. The meeting reconvened at 1040 hours.

Agenda Item (2) - Consideration and adoption of Agenda

The Commission's Chairman pointed out that this year's draft agenda followed the pattern of former agendas and that most agenda items were supported by explanatory background papers. Both the agenda and background papers had been in the hands of the Commissioners for several weeks. He asked if there were any comments or corrections. There being none, it was moved by the U.S.A., seconded by Costa Rica and unanimously agreed to that the agenda be adopted as presented.

Agenda Item (3) - Current researches and research results

The Chairman introduced this subject by stating that during each annual meeting, a review of recent researches was given by the scientific staff of the Commission. He asked Dr. Kask, the Director of Investigations, to proceed with the review.

Dr. Kask indicated that due to budgetary limitations, only very modest researches at sea could be accomplished, therefore virtually all of the report would be confined to work dealing with the current gathering of information and statistics and environmental data collected during earlier years. The Director then called on the Commission's principal scientist, Dr. James Joseph, to carry on with the details of the review.

The following is a very brief summary of the review presented:

1. Statistics of the fishery and population dynamics

A brief summary of the Commission's statistical system, and its importance in the overall conservation program was presented. The use of these data in evaluating the effect of fishing on abundance of tuna was discussed. It was noted that in recent years the tuna fleet had increased its capacity to capture fish more efficiently. The effect of this on the Commission's measure of tuna abundance was discussed and the results of a newly-developed mathematical model designed to compensate for these changes were presented.

A review was given of the scientific staff's studies which were designed to collect and interpret the information which is necessary to employ the mathematical model discussed above.

The logistic model is employed by the staff to describe the population growth of yellowfin tuna in the eastern Pacific Ocean. Since the estimates of the constants for the logistic have a great impact on the fishery through regulations formulated on the basis of the model, it is extremely important to evaluate the schemes used in their estimation. Computer simulation techniques were utilized for evaluating these schemes, and it was concluded that of the variety of schemes examined, the one currently being used is as good an estimator of maximum sustainable yield as any of the others examined.

2. Studies of size composition of the catch

The Commission maintains a continuing series of data on length composition of the catch of tunas. These data are collected at the major ports where tuna captured in the eastern Pacific Ocean are landed. They are used to estimate growth rates, to monitor changes in size composition of the catch, and to compute the numbers of fish available to the fishery which resulted from spawnings during a single season (i.e. the year-class strength).

A discussion of the estimates of year-class strength for yellowfin tuna was given. Attempts were made to relate year-class strength to environmental factors. The use of the size-composition data to estimate the catchability coefficient, one of the constants of the logistic model, was also discussed.

3. Population studies

The Commission's researches in this category were very limited during 1967. Because of lack of funds, it was necessary to curtail electrophoretic studies of serum proteins, which at the time of discontinuance were showing great promise for use in determination of population structure.

4. Tagging

During the year, the Commission was able to conduct three tagging cruises aboard commercial tuna baitboats. These trips were made possible through the cooperation of the vessel owners and captains. There were released during these cruises 1200 yellowfin, 918 skipjack and 474 big-eye. Although these releases are not too useful for estimates of vital

statistics, they are important because they were released in the offshore areas where large numbers of fish have not been released before. This tagging also represents the largest number of bigeye ever released by the Commission.

5. Skipjack

During the past few years, the Commission has been engaged in the analysis of all records which are available in their files relating to the biology, ecology and population dynamics of skipjack tuna in the eastern Pacific Ocean. A review of the first phase of this work, dealing with the biology and population dynamics of skipjack, was given. Estimates of growth rates and mortality rates were presented, as well as a detailed discussion of the methods used to monitor changes in abundance.

6. Other aspects of tuna biology

A review was presented of the Mexican Dirección General de Pesca e Industrias Conexas and IATTC cooperative investigation of the geographical and seasonal variation of tuna spawning and attendant ecological conditions in the area off Mazatlan, Mexico.

7. Oceanography

El Niño

Analysis of the El Niño Project is nearly completed. All of the data reports have been published and distributed and an atlas showing charts of various ocean features is nearing completion and will soon be published.

ACENTO

The first draft of a detailed study of the climatology and oceanography of the Panama Bight where much tuna is caught has been completed. Four cruises of the Colombian R/V Boca de Ceniza provided the data for this analysis.

EASTROPAC

The field work for this interagency-international oceanographic program designed to study the oceanography of the eastern Pacific Ocean is nearly completed. Besides accompanying several cruises of research vessels, Commission personnel have been engaged in the collection and tabulation of data, and will continue to aid in the analysis of data of significance to the Commission and within the limits of its financial resources.

This completed the review of research for the year 1967.

At this point the meeting was recessed for lunch at 1200 hours and reconvened at 1400 hours.

Agenda Item (4) - The 1967 fishing year with yellowfin under regulation

On introducing this item, the Chairman pointed out that the subject had been fully reviewed in Background Paper No.1. He asked the Director

of Investigations to review the highlights of this paper for the benefit of those that had not had an opportunity to read it.

The Director stated that the catch of yellowfin and skipjack, the two principal species of tunas caught in the ETP amounted to approximately 222,000 short tons during 1967. This, he pointed out, is the greatest combined catch of these two species ever made from this area. Demand for tunas during the year was good. Some, but no serious economic slowdowns were reported. Although segments of the international fishing fleet were more successful than others, it can on the whole be said that 1967 was a highly successful tuna fishing year.

Yellowfin

1967 was the second year that yellowfin tuna came under international regulation. Scientific evidence produced by the Commission's staff indicated that there had been some overfishing of yellowfin during past years. The equilibrium yield for 1967, or the size of catch that would not further reduce the stock, was calculated to be about 84,500 short tons, somewhat below the maximum yield the stocks could support on a continuing basis. For reasons given by the Commission in its resolution on the subject, the equilibrium catch of 84,500 short tons was adopted as the quota for 1967. Thus, if the catch of yellowfin could be held to this level, the existing stock size would neither be increased nor decreased, providing average environmental conditions prevailed.

With the effective fleet almost all at sea soon after the season opened, and the availability of tuna favorable, good catches of both species were made from the beginning of the fishing year. In order to limit the catch of yellowfin to the prescribed quota, the Commission was forced to recommend closure to unrestricted yellowfin fishing on June 24. This left more than half of the year for concentrated fishing on the apparently still underfished skipjack.

Skipjack

With yellowfin under regulation, the catch of skipjack increased substantially, amounting by year's end to approximately 132,000 short tons. This marked the greatest catch of this species in the history of the fishery. The previous high was in 1963 when 106,000 short tons were captured and the average for the past five years is about 80,000 tons. Although an appreciable part of the large catch this year was due to particularly favorable availability in the ETP grounds, a substantial part of the catch was almost surely occasioned by a harder look for skipjack after mid-year closure of fishing for yellowfin. The combined catch, as mentioned before, amounted to about 222,000 short tons for this year, the greatest in history in the ETP tuna fishery.

The size and structure of skipjack stocks is not well known. The skipjack appear seasonally off the coast of the Americas and are caught only when they occur in known fishing grounds. It is believed that the fish caught off the Americas are a part of a larger stock that extends to at least the mid-Pacific. It is also believed that these stocks are still underfished. It is with this thought in mind that scientists are encouraging the taking of more skipjack and thus increasing the total catch of tuna from this area. The first step in this direction was apparently accomplished during 1967. But fish, if we do not know their ways and habits, continued the Director, have a way of confounding man's

best laid plans, so that all we can do is hope that the happy start made this year continues. We would be in a better position to assure a happy continuance if we knew more about skipjack, its stock size and stock relationship and its distribution in space and time, or where they are when they do not show up in the known fishing grounds. To find this out takes money for vessel charter and qualified fishermen in addition to scientists. So far these resources, because of their cost, have not been forthcoming, so this development will once again have to be left to chance. Leaving things to chance, however, can prove to be the most costly of all.

Agenda Item (5) - Condition of yellowfin stocks

On introducing this subject, the Chairman called attention to Background Paper No.2 which fully reviewed the subject and which had been in the hands of the delegates for several weeks. He asked the Director of Investigations to point out the highlights of B.P. No.2. The Director discussed some of the problems the staff had encountered in attempting to monitor the changing efficiency of the fleet and the alterations in fishing strategy under regulations. He then called on Dr. James Joseph to review in more detail the contents of B.P. No.2.

At this point, Dr. Joseph introduced this subject by reviewing the theory upon which population dynamics is based. The theoretical models used were explained and the manner in which actual data had been applied to them was described.

The recent history of the fishery was reviewed and it was indicated that the apparent abundance of yellowfin during 1967 increased over 1966. This information was used to compute the levels of catch that the current size of the stock could support.

It was estimated that during 1968 the stock could, under average conditions, support a yield of 93,000 short tons. At this level, it was calculated that the stock was only 5000 tons below the level at which it could support the newly-calculated maximum sustainable yield of 94,500 tons.

The Chairman then called for questions and a general discussion of the presentation followed. After the discussion, the Chairman suggested that a decision on the quota be deferred until the afternoon session. It was agreed by all those present to take this matter up in the afternoon.

Agenda Item (6) - Revision of research programs for 1967/68 and 1968/69 under revised budgets

The Chairman called the attention of the delegates to the agenda item stating that the subject had been covered in Background Paper No.3. He asked the Director of Investigations to comment on the contents of B.P. No.3.

The Director then stated that because of the importance of this subject, he would deal with it at some length. The Commission's budget history, he continued, had never been a happy one. Since 1951, when moneys were first appropriated for the operation of the Commission to the present year, there had been only two years in which the Commission's recommendations for required research and the budget for carrying it out

had been approved by all Member Governments. The accompanying budget records for the past five years and the guide lines received so far on the budget for the next (1968/69) fiscal year serve to illustrate the point. As can be seen, each year the amount finally approved was less by one third to one half (or more) than the amount requested by the Commission, and as salaries and other operating costs have increased by approximately 5% per year, the real amount of money available for 1967/68 and 1968/69 is about 30% less than it was in 1963/64.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount requested</u>	<u>Amount granted</u>	<u>Not yet paid</u>
1963/64	\$624,835	\$412,818	\$ ----
1964/65	617,183	421,110	22,695
1965/66	658,590	458,744	29,002
1966/67	823,403	459,983	36,983
1967/68	859,992	437,702	36,102
1968/69	989,590	431,200*	

*Proposed by U.S. Department of State

The actual size of the recommended budget, continued the Director, is theoretically determined by operational needs under the tuna convention as assessed by the Commission in joint session. The program considered by the Commission is, in turn, arrived at after very careful study and review of research requirements by the Commission's Director of Investigations assisted by members of his staff. All programs and budget proposals are placed in the hands of Commissioners at least two months before action is required at a Commission meeting. Thus each program and budget receives long and careful study.

As is well known, the proportion of contributions made by member governments toward the operation of the Commission is based, by treaty agreement, on a catch-utilization formula, that is, the country that catches and utilizes the most yellowfin and skipjack from the eastern Pacific pays proportionately the highest contribution. As the USA catches and utilizes by far the greatest amount of these species, her contribution is proportionately the greatest. Thus any action taken by the US government on any proposed budget and hence the proposed research program, effectively determines its size.

Another matter of constant concern, in addition to the actual amount of money that is made available, continued the Director, is the timing of the budget. In order to carry out its mandate under the treaty, the Commission recommends a program of research and the amount of money it believes necessary to carry it out two years in advance. In spite of this long lead time, the exact amount of money that is actually being made available is never known until the fiscal year to which the appropriation (and hence the research year) applies is well advanced. During the present fiscal year, for instance, after three budget revisions (all of them downward), the actual amount established (about half that requested) was not known until well past the middle of the fiscal year in which the program was to be executed. As other member governments cannot even be billed for their contribution until the dominant US contribution is known, late billings and late receipts are built into the system. It is not necessary to point out that this does not lend to efficient programming or program execution.

But, added the Director, he wanted to point out that the US contribution was the effective one in another very real sense as well. In spite of the late finalization of budgets, the US government provided

moneys regularly each quarter on the basis of her last year's contribution, until such time as the size of the current contribution was finally established. Without these "advance" payments by the principal contributor, the Commission could not continue to operate.

Thus, the Director continued, because staff salaries and other operational costs continued to increase regularly, the Commission's real income or purchasing power is substantially less now than it was five years ago. For this reason, operations and staff are of necessity becoming progressively smaller, authoritative information progressively scantier, while immediate research and operational responsibilities with yellowfin under regulation continue to expand.

The effects of budget uncertainties on staff recruitment, staff maintenance and staff utilization, he continued, are also important. Normally a director should have adequate staff on hand to carry out the full program of research approved by the Commission. The number and composition of professional staff has been gauged to meet this need. Because the actual program allowed by the amount of money that is finally made available bears little relation to that recommended by the Commission, the staff could rarely be used to best advantage, consequently in some years staff size and costs, under these uncertain arrangements, have been disproportionately high.

In order to partially offset this inexorable march of events, and still be prepared to carry out a nearly full program when and if resources become available, attempts have been made to trim the staff to meet the current actual budget whenever possible. For instance, the Director pointed out, in September 1963 the Commission had 49 employees. By planned reductions, i.e. by not initiating new programs when existing ones were completed, by discontinuing some projects already underway, and by not filling positions that normally fall vacant, the number of employees has been reduced to 36 by September 1966. Through further curtailment in program since that date, i.e. cutting out serological and physiological studies, reducing ecological studies, and through not recruiting to fill either senior or junior positions that had fallen vacant through resignation and through temporary transfer of staff to EASTROPAC, FAO and other agencies, the number of staff members in January 1968 has been reduced to 27.

As can readily be seen, the Commission as a dynamic international research organization is slowly eroding away and its current and growing conservation responsibilities and activities are progressively being based on less and less authoritative information.

The Director added, however, that in spite of these difficulties all was not black. The Commission continues strong in the important field of population dynamics and the Commission's already excellent record in the collection and analysis of catch effort and landings statistics is still going strong, and these can still be improved. For the collection of statistics in the U.S. and abroad, our present resources appear adequate. This activity alone, of course, is not sufficient for the enlightened management of a complex, widely-distributed two species fishery, but this is all we have left that we can do well with existing resources and these studies and activities are fundamental to the program. Conservation measures under these circumstances will of necessity have to be postponed or, if carried out, they would be on a much more trial-and-error basis than was envisioned in the treaty.

It is to this rather routine level of operations that the Commission's once dynamic researches have been reduced. Effective work at sea under present guide lines will not be possible in 1968/69, as has been the case during several recent years. With yellowfin under regulation, every effort we can spare should be placed on evaluating the consequences and effectiveness of the regulations. Without substantial, carefully planned tagging experiments this cannot be done well, but we will do what tagging we can from commercial vessels, if this still proves possible. These reduced programs which are dictated by circumstances hardly need Commission approval, but it is very necessary that Commissioners know our present and expected level of operations.

The Chairman solicited comments. Much sympathy was expressed by all national sections, but no concrete suggestions for improving the Commission's financial situation resulted. The Delegate from Mexico strongly recommended that the new Commission Chairman and Secretary might contact governments to see if some relief in this all important field could be obtained. This suggestion seemed to enjoy general approval.

Agenda Item (7) - Recommended research program for 1969/1970

On opening this subject for discussion, the Chairman mentioned that the program and budget proposal for 1969/70 had been fully covered in Background Paper No.4, which had been in the hands of the Commissioners for about two months. He asked the Director of Investigations if he wished to elaborate on B.P. No.4.

The Director said that the program of research proposed for 1969/70 would cost in the neighborhood of 1 million dollars. The program and budget, he noted, had been discussed with Commissioners from all national sections during his January trip to Latin America and Washington, D.C. Details of proposed researches and attendant costs were fully covered in B.P. No.4.

He further pointed out that most of the increase in this budget over that now expected for 1968/69 was for fishing vessel charter. Although the Commission had recommended budgets which allowed for tuna tagging and other researches at sea since 1963, when the present Commission director took over his duties, in no year have sufficient moneys actually been provided to carry these researches out. As the years succeed one another, and as the Commission's responsibilities under yellowfin regulation increase and become more demanding, substantial work at sea becomes increasingly imperative. To charter a modern purse seiner with a competent crew of fishermen costs about \$2000 per day. Thus if 200 days at sea are required, and we think that about this much is required, it would take \$400,000 to provide it. That is substantially, with necessary attendant costs, what the Commission's staff is requesting.

The Director in continuing his statement, said that it was his opinion, and this was supported by all senior members of the Commission's staff, that the proposed program and budget (\$1,087,074) was the minimum required if the Commission's research and management responsibilities under the treaty were to be competently and effectively carried out.

There followed a great deal of discussion after the Director's

presentation. The U.S. delegate indicated there might be some difficulty in getting the U.S. Congress to approve their share of the budget considering the present economic situation in the U.S. The Chairman then asked if Ambassador Donald McKernan of the U.S. State Department, the department through which all budgets of International Commissions must pass in the USA, could give his opinion on this matter. Ambassador McKernan indicated that all budgets in the U.S. relating to fisheries are being cut back and he could only predict that the current trend would continue. Therefore, the chance of getting an increased Tuna Commission budget through the U.S. Congress, in his view, was not very good.

Further discussion on this agenda item followed until the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 1700 hours to reconvene at 0930 hours the following day.

April 3, 1968

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 0930 hours.

Agenda Item (7) - continued

On resuming the discussion of this item, the U.S. moved that the Commission staff submit two budgets: 1) The desirable budget, incorporating the entire amount (\$1,087,074, see App.I) presented in B.P. No.4 and designed to carry forward research at a level the staff feels necessary to fulfill the dictates of the treaty, and 2) an austerity budget which is the minimum amount necessary to maintain the level of current work and research. The motion was seconded by Panama and carried unanimously.

The Chairman then requested the Director of Investigations to be prepared to present the details of an austerity budget when the Commission reconvened after lunch of the same day. Further action on Agenda Item (7) was deferred by the Chairman until the afternoon session.

Agenda Item (8) - Proportion of contributions by Member Governments

The Chairman referred to Background Paper No.5 which dealt with this subject. He asked the Director of Investigations to discuss the contents of B.P. No.5.

The Director stated that the Tuna Convention provides (Article I-3): that "Each High Contracting Party shall determine and pay the expenses incurred by its section. Joint expenses incurred by the Commission shall be paid by the High Contracting Parties through contributions in the form and proportion recommended by the Commission and approved by the High Contracting Parties. The proportion of joint expenses to be paid by each High Contracting Party shall be related to the proportion of the total catch from the fisheries covered by the Convention utilized by that High Contracting Party." Since the word "utilized" was not defined by the Convention, the Commission for the sake of a modus operandi, defined it in 1952 as "the tuna (yellowfin and skipjack) consumed or substantially processed in a country." The latter is considered to include canning, regardless of the ultimate destination of the canned product.

On this basis, as formerly, we have calculated the proportion of

contributions of each High Contracting Party for fiscal year 1969/70. The calculations are based on utilization of tropical tunas in the year 1967. It is not possible to calculate contributions for a given fiscal year on the basis of tuna utilized in the same year because financial regulations of the Commission require that the Director of Investigations submit at each regular annual meeting of the Commission, budget estimates for the following two years. For example, at this meeting, continued the Director, I am presenting budget estimates for Fiscal Years 1968/69 and 1969/70. The former is simply an updated (and revised, usually downward) version of the budget presented and approved at the 1967 Annual Meeting, but the latter budget (being presented for the first time) will require approval not only of the budget estimates but also the proportion of contributions of member governments for that fiscal year (FY 1969/70). The most recent figures on tuna utilization which are available at this time, are those for the calendar year 1967. These are:

United States of America	402,941,700 pounds
Mexico	16,265,700 "
Costa Rica	2,836,000 "
Panama	none
Canada	none

In accordance with the above, the funds for joint expenses of the Commission should be in the following proportions (expressed as the ratio of the contribution to that of the U.S.A.):

United States of America	100.000
Mexico	4.037
Costa Rica	0.704
Panama - Minimum contribution	\$500
Canada - " "	\$500

With a budget of \$1,087,074 as proposed, the contributions of each government would be:

United States of America	\$1,036,914
Mexico	41,860
Costa Rica	7,300
Panama	500
Canada	500
	<hr/>
	\$1,087,074

With the "austerity" budget of \$517,114, the contribution of each government would be:

United States of America	\$492,753
Mexico	19,892
Costa Rica	3,469
Panama	500
Canada	500
	<hr/>
	\$517,114

After some discussion, moderated by the Chairman, the U.S. moved that the proportion of payments as submitted be adopted. It was seconded by Costa Rica and carried unanimously.

Agenda Item (9) - Administration

After introducing the subject, the Chairman asked Dr. Kask to discuss the proposed administrative changes.

(a) Charge, in some instances, for publications

The Director indicated that because of rising costs for printing and distribution of the Commission staff's findings in the Bulletin series, it might be helpful, in some cases, to charge a modest price per copy to certain groups and individuals to help defray printing and mailing costs. Those parties already on the mailing list would not be charged nor would other public institutions requesting copies of the Bulletins.

After the Director's presentation, the Chairman called for discussion.

The U.S. moved that the staff be authorized to make appropriate charges for documents and mailing at their own discretion. The motion was seconded by Panama and carried unanimously.

(b) Definition of unanimous vote - Art. I-8

The Director introduced the subject by requesting clarification as to whether a unanimous vote implied unanimity of those members present when a vote is taken or unanimity of all High Contracting Parties.

After leading a discussion of this issue, the Chairman stated that it was his opinion that if a member of the Commission voluntarily absented itself from a meeting, and therefore cannot vote, then this implied abstention and could not be considered a negative vote. It therefore follows that the concept of unanimity need only be considered for those members present and voting.

Recess was called at 1045 hours. The meeting was reconvened by the Chairman at 1115 hours.

Mexico suggested, and others agreed, that an ad Hoc committee be appointed to study the question of interpretation of unanimity in Art. I-8 of the Convention, and further suggested that the new Chairman for 1969 correspond with each of the High Contracting Parties and solicit their viewpoints concerning this problem. This should be done prior to the establishment of the ad Hoc committee, so that the Committee could take into consideration these viewpoints.

Agenda Item (10) - Approval of Annual Report for 1967

The Chairman pointed out that the draft Annual Report for 1967 had been in the hands of Commissioners (in both languages) for some two months and thus all had had full opportunity to study it. He asked for comments and after some discussion, the U.S. moved that the Annual Report for 1967 be approved. The motion was seconded by Panama and unanimously carried.

The meeting was adjourned by the Chairman at 1220 hours and reconvened at 1500 hours.

Agenda Item (7) - continued

On reconvening the meeting in the afternoon, the Chairman asked the Director of Investigations for a report on progress made in the development of an alternate or "austerity" budget.

The Director stated that he had worked with the assistance of Dr. Joseph and with the advice of Dr. McHugh during the whole of the noon recess. The three of them had come up with a budget of \$517,114 (see App.II) or about half of the original budget requested. The new austerity budget, the Director continued, would once again effectively cut out all meaningful work at sea during 1969/70, but it would allow the Commission staff to continue doing what they are doing now more effectively.

On the Chairman's request, Dr. Joseph outlined in detail where the cuts in the program would be made. On completion of the review, it was moved by the U.S.A. and seconded by Costa Rica that the austerity budget be accepted as presented, on the understanding that every effort would first be made to obtain the full budget requested. If this failed, the appropriate authorities would retreat to the austerity budget, which, in the view of the U.S. delegates had reasonable hopes of being approved even in the present financial climate. The motion was carried unanimously.

Agenda Item (11) - Election of Officers

The Chairman introduced this item by indicating that when a new member joined the Commission, it was customary to welcome it by nominating its senior Commissioner as Chairman and the next annual meeting, if desired, could be held in the new member country. He then asked for nominations for chairman.

The U.S. nominated Dr. A. W. H. Needler, the senior Commissioner for Canada, as Chairman. This was enthusiastically seconded by Costa Rica and carried unanimously.

The Chairman then indicated that nominations were open for the position of Secretary. Mexico nominated Dr. J.L. McHugh.

At that point the Chairman explained that the secretaryship, like the Chairmanship, is generally rotated among countries, and this office should, under this rotation, go to Costa Rica in 1968/69. The senior delegate from Costa Rica graciously offered to pass up this honor and seconded the nomination of Dr. McHugh as secretary. It was put to a vote and carried unanimously.

Agenda Item (12) - Place and date of next meeting

The Chairman opened the discussion for the place and date of the next annual meeting.

The senior delegate from Canada, on behalf of his government, extended a cordial invitation to the Commission to hold its next annual meeting in Ottawa, Canada.

After being moved and seconded by the U.S. and Costa Rica, it was carried unanimously and the invitation was accepted with thanks.

With respect to the date of the next meeting, the Chairman indicated that Easter Sunday fell on the 6th of April in 1969, and that the dates of 15 and 16 April might be good dates on which to hold the Commission meeting. This would allow Thursday the 17th, and Friday the 18th for the Intergovernmental Meeting.

The U.S. delegation moved that the Commission hold its next annual meeting during the week following Easter, suggesting that the meeting start on Tuesday, April 15, ending on Wednesday 16. This would allow adequate time for the Intergovernmental meeting to take place. The U.S. further moved that, if necessary, the Intergovernmental meeting could take place sometime between the beginning and the end of the Commission meeting, thereby allowing action taken in this meeting, to be considered by the Commission. This motion was seconded by Panama and unanimously carried.

The Chairman then re-opened discussion on Agenda Item (5). He specifically invited the views of delegations on a yellowfin quota for the 1968 fishing year.

In response to the Chairman's request, the senior delegate of Costa Rica recommended a quota of 93,000 short tons. This was seconded by Panama, and after some discussion, and a suggestion by the U.S. that the quota should be somewhat higher, the quota of 93,000 tons was put to a vote by the Chairman. It was carried unanimously.

Canada then moved that the Commission ask its staff to report back at the 1969 annual meeting with specific proposals for a program of experimental fishing designed to ascertain empirically the maximum sustainable yield of yellowfin. Such a program could then be given due consideration by the Commission during the 1969 annual meeting. This was seconded by Mexico and carried unanimously.

The Chairman asked if there were other comments concerning the quota or related matters.

The U.S. responded to this by stating that a season based on the calendar year was not equitable to the various elements of the fishing fleet and moved that the fishing season commence on March 1 of each year. The motion was seconded by Costa Rica. The Chairman then asked for comments from the floor. Both Mexico and Canada indicated that they were not prepared to offer an opinion on this issue at this time.

In order to allow time for the delegates to consider this proposal, further action was deferred until the following day.

At this point, the senior Commission from Panama announced that a social evening was being organized for Thursday night 7-9 P.M. by the Minister of Agriculture of Panama for all those attending the IATTC meeting. This good news was received by an enthusiastic round of applause.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 1725 hours.

April 4, 1968

The Chairman reconvened the meeting at 1630 hours, and the first item of business was a resumption of the discussion concerning the motion presented the previous day by the U.S. delegation relating to a change in the fishing season.

The following resolution, which was discussed earlier in the day at /Intergovernmental meeting was read by Sr. Juan L. de Obarrio, the senior Commissioner from Panama and Chairman of the Intergovernmental meeting.

The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission

Requests a vote by the Contracting Parties to establish 1 March 1969 as the date to open the yellowfin tuna fishery.

Such vote to be submitted to the Chairman of the Commission prior to 1 September 1968, who will communicate the results of such vote to the Contracting Parties and those Governments who have indicated that they will observe the recommendation of the Commission.

If the vote of the Contracting Parties is not unanimously in favor of establishing 1 March 1969 as the date to open the yellowfin tuna fishery, then 1 January 1969 shall be the opening date.

During the open season vessels shall be permitted to enter the regulatory area with permission to fish yellowfin, without restriction on the quantity until the return of the vessel to port. There is no intent to alter the present statistical year.

The resolution was accepted by unanimous vote and the Chairman indicated that the votes should be sent by mail to the newly-elected Chairman, Dr. A.W.H. Needler, Department of Fisheries, Ottawa 8, Canada, prior to 1 September 1968 with a copy to the Director of Investigations.

The Chairman next called for a discussion of the resolution recommending regulations for 1968.

After some modifications of last year's resolution suggested by the Commissioners from the U.S. and Panama, a draft resolution (see App. III) was read to the Commission. Adoption was moved by the U.S., seconded by Panama, and carried unanimously.

The Chairman then asked the Director of Investigations to notify all governments whose nationals fish in the Commission's regulatory area of this action.

At this time the senior U.S. Commissioner announced that a boat trip to transit a portion of the Panama Canal had been arranged for Friday afternoon by the U.S. Embassy for all those present at the meeting.

As this concluded matters of business, the Chairman thanked the host government, and especially the Minister of Agriculture for their many hospitalities and courtesies including the social evening. He also thanked all Commissioners, Advisors and Observers for their splendid cooperation and the Commission's scientific staff for their good work. He also commented favorably on the excellent interpretation service provided by Carlos Diez and his engineering assistant Gerardo Lara.

The senior Commissioner from Panama, the host country, made a suitable response. He thanked the governments of Japan, Chile, Colombia and Nicaragua for their cooperation and interest by sending observers to the

meeting. He also thanked the Chairman for his fine conduct of the meeting.

All participants made suitable responses.

With this, and a round of enthusiastic applause, the Chairman declared the 20th Annual Meeting of the Commission closed.

La Jolla, California
1 May 1968

APPENDIX I. Estimates, by Projects and Budget Objects, FY 1969-1970

APENDICE I. Estimativos por proyectos y objetivos presupuestales, AF 1969-1970

OBJECTS - OBJETIVOS	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL
01-Personal services (net salaries)	62,738		66,351	128,721	57,847	44,323	41,710	\$401,690
Personal (salarios netos)								
02-Travel & Subsistence Viajes y viáticos	5,425		1,800	3,750	1,325	2,075	6,250	20,625
03-Transportation of things Transporte de cosas	100		350	2,075	450	1,450	---	4,425
04-Communications Comunicaciones	2,250		100	425	250	575	550	4,150
05-Rents & Utilities Alquileres y utilidades	---		475	850	---	---	975	2,300
06-Printing & Binding Imprenta y encuadernación	3,600		1,575	5,175	4,600	2,100	125	17,175
07-Contractual Services Servicios por contratos	6,150	750	3,200	3,850	2,700	3,900	2,650	23,200
Vessel charter Flete de barcos	---		---	238,050	---	238,050	---	476,100
08-Supplies & Materials Provisiones y materiales	2,500		500	43,840	3,750	35,840	100	86,530*
09-Equipment Equipo	2,500		900	10,350	2,200	375	2,400	18,725
13-Tag rewards Premios por marcas	---		---	---	---	3,500	---	3,500
15-Contr. to Soc. Sec. Contr. al Seguro Soc.	1,650		1,760	2,860	1,540	1,520	1,100	10,430
17-Contr. to Pension Plan Contr. al Plan de Retiro	2,465		2,630	4,275	2,300	1,200	1,645	14,515
19-Contr. to Medical Plan Contr. al Seguro de Salud	620		662	1,075	579	360	413	3,709
TOTALS	89,998	750	80,303	445,296	77,541	335,268	57,918	\$1,087,074

* Includes \$49,680 for fuel and lube oil for chartered vessels
 Incluye \$49,680 para el combustible y el aceite lubricante de los barcos fletados