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The destruction of undersized haddock on Georges Bank has been of major concern for many years. With the organization of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries in 1951, the Fish and Wildife Service recomnendation for use of a largermesh net to curb the destruction of fish of unmarketable size was given sufficient impetus to ensure adoption.

The haddock year starts in February; therefore, the seasons used in subsequent portions of this paper are as follows: Season A February to April, Season B - May to July, Seas on C - August to October, and Season D - November to January. Subsequent references to the 1952 haddock year will be stated "l952".

To assess the effectiveness of the larger-mesh in actual practice, it was necessary to have accurate information on numbers and sizes of fish discarded at sea before and after regulations were applied. A sea sampling program was therefore initiated in 1951. This report continues our study of the fishery prior to regulations.

During 1952, seventeen trips were made by observers to Georges Bank. These trips were made on the following trawlers: Drift, Wave, and Surge-owned by the Birdseye Division of the General Foods Corporation; Flying Cloud and Winchester - owned by the O'Donnell-Usen Company; and the Michigan and Wisconsin - managed by Fulham Bros., Inc. One of the Boston trawlers on which observations were made at sea is shown in figure 1.

NOTE.--This report on the analysis of haddock discarded at sea on Georges Bank during the 1952 haddock year continues a series of annual reports initiated with the following:

Premetz, E.D., 1953. Destruction of undersized haddock on Georges Bank, 1947-1951. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Special Scientific Report -- Fisheries No. 96.33 pp. 12 figs.

All references pertinent to this study are given in the above report, to which the reader is referred.


The dates and areasfished on these trips are listed in table 1. Most of the fishing was conducted on the Northern Edge (867 sets). The remainder of the fishing was in the South Channel area ( 169 sets), and on the Southeast Part (118 sets) and Southwest Part (113 sets) of Georges. A total of 1,267 sets was made on these seventeen trips; an average of about 74 sets per trip.

The success of this study has been the result of the cooperation of many people. The authors wish to express their thanks to all members of the fishing industry who cooperated in this study. We are especially grateful to the crews of the trawlers on which the Fish and Wildife Service observers shipped, and to the owners of these vessels for their splendid cooperation.

The observers were Robert L. Cory, James W. McKee and Craig Slater. The port interviews were conducted by David F. Hammack and Thomas F. O'Leary at Boston, and George W. Snow at New Bedford. Harriett Murray assisted in the tabulation of the data.

## PART I. PORT SAMPLING

ESTIMATED DESTRUCTION, 1952

Since 1947, the Fish and Wildlife Service port interviewer at Boston has obtained from Captains of vessels landing at that port, estimates of pounds of haddock discarded on each trip and information as to the area in which the destruction occurred. Data collected during 1952 is presented in this report.

Since landings of haddock $a^{+}$, New Bedford had increased, a system for obtaining destruction estimates from fishing masters was inaugu= rated at that port in July 1951. This system is similar to that employed at the Boston Fish Pier.

Quantity of Discard
Skippers' estimates of the destruction of haddock on Georges Bank, as collected by port interviewers at Boston and New Bedford during 1952, are summarized in table 2 . Figure 2 shows the Boston port agent of the Fish and Wildife Service interviewing the mate of one of the Boston trawlers.

The total haddock discard estimated by the skippers of the Boston and New Bedford trawlers during 1952 was approximately 4.9 million pounds ( 4.4 million individual fish). Of this total, about 4.2 million pounds ( 3.8 million individuals), representing 86 percent, was reported by the Boston fleet. This quantity reported in 1952 in Boston approximated

| Trip Number | Season | Date | Number <br> of sets | Areas fished on Georges Eank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52-8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { B } \\ \text { (May to July) } \end{gathered}$ | May 19-26 | $\begin{aligned} & 48 \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ | Southwest Part East Side South Channel |
| 52-9 |  | May 28-June 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 36 \\ & 26 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | Northern Edge <br> Southeast Part <br> East Side South Channel |
| 52-10 |  | June 19-25 | 54 | Southwest Part |
| 52-11 |  | July 9-17 | $\begin{aligned} & 54 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | Northern Edge Southwest Part |
| 52-12 |  | July 12-21 | $\begin{array}{r} 86 \\ 3 \end{array}$ | Northern Edge <br> East Side South Channel |
| 52-13 | (August to Oct | $\begin{aligned} & \text { August } 2-10 \\ & \text { ctober) } \end{aligned}$ | 202 | Northern Edge |
| 52-14 |  | August 4-12 | $\begin{array}{r} 70 \\ 4 \end{array}$ | Northern Edge Southeast Part |
| 52-15 |  | August 6-13 | 70 | Northern Edge |
| 52-16 |  | August 20-28 | 74 | Northern Edge |
| 52-17 |  | August 22-29 | 78 | East Sille South Channal |
| 52-18 |  | September 8-14 |  | Northern Edge |
| 52-19 |  | September 25October 2 | 81 | Northern Edge |
| 52-20 |  | October 1-9 | $\begin{array}{r} 69 \\ 7 \end{array}$ | Northern Edge Southeast Part |
| $52-21$ <br> (N | $\begin{gathered} \text { D } \\ \text { (November to } \\ \text { January) } \end{gathered}$ | October 30November 7 | $\begin{array}{r} 40 \\ 31 \\ 5 \end{array}$ | Northern Fidge <br> Southeast Part <br> East Sice South Channel |
| 52-22 |  | November 5-14 | $\begin{array}{r} 68 \\ 7 \end{array}$ | Northern Edge Southeast Part |
| 52-23 |  | December $4-11$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | Northern Edge Southeast Part |
| 53-1 |  | January 5-15 | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 33 \\ 36 \\ 9 \end{array}$ | Northern Edge <br> Southeast Part <br> East Sice South Channel <br> South Channel |

TABIE 2.--The destruction of haddock (in thousands) on Georges Bank by the Boston and New Bedford fishing fleets, 1952.

| Port | Month | Pounds |  |  | Nunters |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total catch | Discard | Percent discarded | Total catch | Discard | Percent discarded |
| Boston | January | 2,657 | 64 | 2.4 | 1,582 | 54 | 3.4 |
|  | February | 1,416 | 66 | 4.7 | 843 | 56 | 6.6 |
|  | March | 1,811 | 15 | 0.8 | 1,078 | 13 | 1.2 |
|  | April | 796 | 29 | 3.6 | 474 | 24 | 5.1 |
|  | thay | 5,1471 | 230 | 4.5 | 3,060 | 195 | 6.4 |
|  | June | 8,522 | 1,447 | 17.0 | 5,073 | 1,226 | 24.2 |
|  | July | 9,872 | 1,126 | 11.4 | 5,876 | 954 | 16.2 |
|  | August | 9,604 | 619 | 6.4 | 5,649 | 601 | 10.6 |
|  | September | 8,4,2 | 118 | 1.4 | 4,966 | 134 | 2.3 |
|  | October | 7,558 | 180 | 2.4 | 4,446 | 175 | 3.9 |
|  | November | 4,303 | 32 | 0.7 | 2,850 | 42 | 1.5 |
|  | December | 5,544 | 288 | 5.2 | 3,672 | 379 | 10.3 |
| Total |  | 65,666 | 4,214 | 6.4 | 39,569 | 3,833 | 9.7 |
| New Bedford | January | 574 | 2 | 0.3 | 342 | 2 | 0.6 |
|  | February | 359 | 0 | 0.0 | 214 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | Warch | 673 | 0 | 0.0 | 400 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | April | 2,113 | 70 | 3.3 | 1,258 | 59 | 4.7 |
|  | May | 2,052 | 138 | 6.7 | 1,221 | 117 | 9.6 |
|  | June | 1,188 | 48 | 4.0 | 707 | 41 | 5.8 |
|  | July | 889 | 129 | 14.5 | 529 | 109 | 20.6 |
|  | August | 1,383 | 153 | 11.1 | 814 | 148 | 18.2 |
|  | September | 1,224 | 66 | 5.4 | 720 | 64 | 8.9 |
|  | October | 718 | 33 | 4.6 | 422 | 32 | 7.6 |
|  | November | 753 | 20 | 2.6 | 499 | 26 | 5.2 |
|  | December | 667 | 2 | 0.3 | 442 | 3 | 0.7 |
| Total |  | 12,593 | $\overline{661}$ | 5.2 | 7,568 | 601 | 7.9 |


| Both Ports | January | 3,231 | 66 | 2.0 | 1,924 | 56 | 2.9 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | February | 1,775 | 66 | 3.7 | 1,056 | 56 | 5.3 |
|  | March | 2,484 | 15 | 0.6 | 1,478 | 13 | 0.9 |
|  | April | 2,909 | 99 | 3.4 | 1,732 | 83 | 4.8 |
|  | May | 7,193 | 368 | 5.1 | 4,282 | 312 | 7.3 |
|  | June | 9,710 | 1,495 | 15.4 | 5,780 | 1,267 | 21.9 |
|  | July | 10,761 | 1,255 | 11.7 | 6,405 | 1,063 | 16.6 |
|  | August | 10,987 | 772 | 7.0 | 6,463 | 749 | 11.6 |
|  | September | 9,666 | 184 | 1.9 | 5,686 | 178 | 3.1 |
|  | October | 8,276 | 213 | 2.6 | 4,868 | 207 | 4.2 |
|  | November | 5,056 | 52 | 1.0 | 3,349 | 68 | 2.0 |
|  | December | 6,211 | 290 | 4.7 | 4,114 | 382 | 9.3 |
| Total |  | $\underline{78,259}$ | $\underline{4,875}$ | $\underline{6.2}$ | $\underline{47,137}$ | $\underline{4,434}$ | 9.4 |


the average annuai discard of the previous 5－year period，1947－i951．
The Boston fleet discarded over 6 perosnt by weight of the haddock caught by that fleet during－95？This was ecufvalent to discard－ ing about lout of every 10 haddock caughto The New Bedforcl fleet dis－ carded over 5 percent by weight of the totai quantity of haddock caught； or， 1 out of very 12 fish caught。

Season of Discard
The quantity of baby haddcck destroyed on Georges Bank， varied with the season of the year，as caa be seen by a somparison of monthly records in table 2 and figure 3。 The greatest destruction was reported during the summer months，as in previous years，with fune the month of most discard．In this particular montr，discards of more than 15 percent by weight of the fish saught were reported．This was equivalent to mors than 1 out of avery 5 fish caught．

## Area of Discard

Discard by area was summarized by plotting the amounts of discard reported by the Boston and New Bedford fishing fleets by units of 10 ＇latitude by $10^{\prime}$ longitude．The localities where haddock were discarded during the 1952 haddock year are shown in figure 4 。

The areas of greatest destruction were the Northern Edge and Southeast part of Georges。 Quantities of discard were also reported on the Southwest part of Georges．Lesser amounts were discarded in the South Channel area and in the vicinity of Cuitivator Buoy．

As in previous years，areas of greatest discard reflect areas of greatest concentration of fishing effort，and not necessarily the areas of greatest abundance of unmarketable siaes．It is kncm that in shoal water portions of the Southeast pari of Georges small fish pre－ dominate during most of the year．These areas are avoided，whenever possible，by the fleet because of the difficuity encountered in culling out unmarketable fish．

## PART II．SEA SAITFIING

ANALYSIS OF DISCARDS， $295 ?$
The quantities disbarded on each of the comnercial sea sampling trips during i952 are preserted in table ？．



TAPLE 3.--Discards on each of the commercial sea sampling trips to Georges Bank observed during the 1952 haddock year.

|  |  |  |  |  | Pounds |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Trip |  |  |  |  |  |
| Season nunber |  |  |  |  |  | Caught Discarded | Percent |
| :--- |
| discarded |$\quad$ Caught Discarded discarded


| B 52-8 | 100,470 | 9,260 | 9.2 | 57,078 | 9,815 | 17.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (iay to 52-9 | 48,770 | 2,770 | 5.7 | $1 /$ | 3,244 | ---- |
| July) 52-10 | 143,253 | 28,253 | 19.7 | 71,271 | 19,520 | 27.4 |
| 52-11 | 50,159 | 3,659 | 7.3 | 33,468 | 3,339 | 10.0 |
| 52-12 | 79,128 | 4,033 | 5.1 | 64,740 | 4,675 | 7.2 |
| Ave. trip | 84,356 | 9,595 | 11.4 | 55,421 | 8,119 | 14.6 |
| C 52-13 | 157,613 | 8,988 | 5.7 | 89,110 | 8,312 | 10.2 |
| (August 52-14 | 98,665 | 5,315 | 5.0 | 58,421 | 5,330 | 9.0 |
| to 52-15 | 120,651 | 5,615 | $4 \cdot 7$ | 71,797 | 5,274 | 7.3 |
| Oc tobed52-16 | 88,887 | 4,887 | 9.0 | 57,803 | 5,213 | 6.2 |
| 52-17 | 63,403 | 1,403 | 2.1 | 34,424 | 1,305 | 3.8 |
| 52-18 | 49,850 | 850 | 1.7 | 30,509 | 853 | 2.8 |
| 52-19 | 130,135 | 2,135 | 2.7 | 78, 177 | 2,044 | 2.6 |
| 52-20 | 95,337 | 1,037 | 1.1 | 53,308 | 1,113 | 2.1 |
| Ave. trip | 100,568 | 3,779 | 3.8 | 59,106 | 3,681 | 6.2 |
| D 52-21 | 38,871 | 8,371 | 21.5 | 22,134 | 9,850 | 44.5 |
| (November 52-22 | 54,463 | 463 | 0.8 | 27,405 | 688 | 2.5 |
| to 52-23 | 146,975 | 20,975 | 14.3 | 126,659 | 28,941 | 22.8 |
| January) 53-1 | 65,996 | 1,996 | 3.0 | 26,642 | 2,362 | 8.9 |
| Ave. trip | 76,576 | 7,951 | 10.4 | 50,710 | 10,460 | 20.6 |

All

| Seasons Ave.trip 90,154 | 6,471 | 7.2 | 56,016 | 6,581 | 11.7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

1/ No sample of the landed portion of the catch was taken on trip number 52-9.

The average haddock discard per trip (based on eighteen observed trips) during 1952 was about 6,500 pounds. This was slightly less than the average discard of about 6,700 pounds per trip in 1951. During both the 1951 and 1952 haddock years, about 7 percent of the total catch by weight was discarded on the observed trips. Referring to table 2, we note that about $6-1 / 2$ percent of the total Boston catch by weight, based on skippers ${ }^{1}$ reports, was discarded during 1952. Thus there is a good agreement between the estimate of destruction based on skippers' reports and that based on biologists' sampling at sea.

During 1952, it was also possible to derive average trip data for Seasons B, C and D. Since there was very little fishing on Georges Bank during Season A, it was not possible to arrange for an observer to make a trip there at that time. A seasonal variation in the amount of discard is evident (as previously pointed out in the discussion of skippers' estimates), ranging from an average of 3,779 pounds per trip during Season $C$ to an average of 9,595 pounds per trip during Season B. Causes of this variation will be discussed in subsequent sections of this paper.

## Numbers discarded

The average number of haddock discarded per observed trip during 1952 was 6,581 fish, as compared to 8,828 in 1951. During 1952, almos ${ }^{+}$ 12 percent of the total numbers caught were discarded, whereas in 19519 17 percent were discarded. Although almost the same weight was discarded per trip in 1952 as in 1951, the average weight per fish discarded was greater (the number of fish discarded was less). (See p. 17)

The average numbers discarded per trip ranged from 3,681 during Season C to 10,460 during Season D. Although pounds discarded per trip were greatest during Season B, numbers were greatest during Season D, because of the much lower average weight per discarded fish during the latter season.

Estimated total destruction
Using the average discard per trip obtained from the sea sampling data, we arrived at an estimate of destruction of about 4.6 million pounds for the period May 1952 to January 1953 (Seasons B, C and D, 1952). The estimate of destruction by the Boston fleet, as reported by skippers to the port interviewer, during this same period was about 4.3 million pounds. The port interview estimate differed from the sea sampling estimate by about 6-1/2 percent. Ir 1951, this difference was $22-1 / 2$ percent. This close agreement indicates that our observed trips are representative of the entire fleet.

It is believed that this close agreement of estimates of destruction derived by two different methods is not due to chance. Estimates
supplied oy skippers to the port interviewer at Boston for trips on which we hac obseivers wera similar to those reparted by our sea samplers．

## Average weight

The average weights of individual fish taken on the observed trips are show in table L．The average weight of haddock caught on these trips was 1.61 pounds．This compares with 1.80 pounds，the average weight of i̊ish caught in 195土．This difference is due to a difference in year class dominance in the two years：two－year－01ds（ 1950 year class）dominated in 1952 while three－year－oids（1948 year class）dominated in 1951．

The average weight of fish discarded was greater than in 1951 while the average weignt of fish landed was less．This is related to the difference in age composition in the two years and a difference in culling （see p．23）。

Considerable variation in average weight is evident on the individual trips，but seasonal averages are fairly consistant．Very little seasonal variation was roted in the average weight of landed fish，whereas discarded fish ranged from a high of about 1.2 pounds in average weight during Season B to a low of about $3 / 4$ pounds during Season $D$ ．The reason for this lower average weight during the winter is due largely to the recruitment of lojeare old fish which begins at this season．

S．ize composition
The size composition of haddock on the average Georges Bank trip observed during 1952 is presented in table 5 and figure 5.

The size of the haddock caught on the observed trips ranged from 0.2 to 9 pounds（ 8 to 31 inches），with about 90 percent from 0.7 to 2.9 pourds，$(12-1 / 2$ to $20-1 / 2$ inches）．

The sizes of discarded haddock ranged from 0.2 to 1.6 pounds （ 8 To $16 m / 2$ inches），with over 90 percent from 0.6 to 1.1 pounds（ 12 to $\Lambda_{1}-1 / 2$ inches）。

The sizes in the landed portion of the catch ranged frcm 0.6 to 9.0 pounds（ $1101 / 2$ to 32 inches），with over 90 percent from 0.9 to 2.9 pounds（ $13-1 / 2$ to $20-1 / 2$ irches）．

In comparing these data with size compositions obtained in 1951， we note that during 1951 more of the smaller sizes were present in the sample than in 1952．This was due to the presence of a large year class of l－year－old；（ 1950 year $6 l a s s$ ）coming into the fishery in 1951。 During 195，

TABLE 4.-A. Average weight (in pounds) of haddock on the commercial sea sampling trips to Georges Bank observed during the 1952 haddock year

## Average weight Average weight

 Season Trip number per fish caught per fish discardecAverage weight per fish landed


1/ No sample of the landed portion of the catch was taken on trip number 52-9. observed during the 1952 haddock year.

| Length in cms. |  | Average weight (gutted) in pounds | Numbers |  |  | Percent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Inches |  | caught | discarded | landed | discarded | landed |
| 20 | 7.9 | 0.19 | 1 | 1 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 21 | 8.3 | 0.22 | 1 | 1 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 22 | 8.7 | 0.25 | 3 | 3 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 23 | 9.1 | 0.29 | 3 | 3 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 24 | 9.4 | 0.32 | 6 | 6 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 25 | 9.8 | 0.36 | 18 | 18 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 26 | 10.2 | 0.40 | 26 | 26 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 27 | 10.6 | 0.45 | 37 | 37 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 28 | 11.0 | 0.50 | 75 | 75 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 29 | 11.4 | 0.55 | 185 | 182 | 3 | 98.4 | 1.6 |
| 30 | 11.8 | 0.61 | 338 | 319 | 19 | 94.4 | 5.6 |
| 31 | 12.2 | 0.67 | 610 | 531 | 79 | 87.0 | 13.0 |
| 32 | 12.6 | 0.73 | 1,086 | 834 | 252 | 76.8 | 23.2 |
| 33 | 13.0 | 0.79 | 1,887 | 1,309 | 578 | 69.1 | 30.6 |
| 34 | 13.4 | 0.87 | 2,084 | 1,014 | 1,070 | 48.6 | 51.4 |
| 35 | 13.8 | 0.94 | 2,762 | 894 | 1,868 | 32.4 | 67.6 |
| 36 | 14.2 | 1.0 | 3,539 | 694 | 2,845 | 19.6 | 80.4 |
| 37 | 14.6 | 1.1 | 3,896 | 375 | 3,521 | 9.6 | 90.4 |
| 38 | 15.0 | 1.2 | 4,411 | 169 | 4,242 | 3.8 | 96.2 |
| 39 | 15.4 | 1.3 | 4,500 | 62 | 4,438 | 1.4 | 98.6 |
| 40 | 15.8 | 1.4 | 4,481 | 24 | 4,457 | 0.5 | 99.5 |
| 41 | 16.1 | 1.5 | 3,905 | 3 | 3,902 | 0.1 | 99.9 |
| 42 | 16.5 | 1.6 | 3,103 | 1 | 3,102 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 43 | 16.9 | 1.7 | 2,646 |  | 2,646 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 44 | 17.3 | 1.8 | 2,168 |  | 2,168 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 45 | 17.7 | 1.9 | 1,888 |  | 1,888 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 46 | 18.1 | 2.0 | 1,580 |  | 1,580 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 47 | 18.5 | 2.2 | 1,529 |  | 1,529 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 48 | 18.9 | 2.3 | 1,421 |  | 1,421 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 49 | 19.3 | 2.4 | 1,154 |  | 1,154 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50 | 19.7 | 2.6 | 1,157 |  | 1,157 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

TABLE 5.--Size composition and cull on the average Georges Bank trip observed during the 1952 haddock year. (continued)

| Length in cms. | Inches | Average weight (gutted) in pounds | Numbers |  |  | Percent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | caught | discarded | landed | discarded | landed |
| 51 | 20.1 | 2.7 | 814 |  | 814 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 52 | 20.5 | 2.9 | 901 |  | 901 | 0.0 | 100.9 |
| 53 | 20.9 | 3.1 | 740 |  | 740 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 54 | 21.3 | 3.2 | 598 |  | 598 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 55 | 21.7 | 3.4 | 552 |  | 552 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 56 | 22.1 | 3.5 | 353 |  | 353 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 57 | 22.4 | 3.7 | 292 |  | 292 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 58 | 22.8 | 3.9 | 236 |  | 236 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 59 | 23.2 | 4.1 | 170 |  | 170 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 60 | 23.6 | 4.3 | 131 |  | 131 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 61 | 24.0 | 4.5 | 126 |  | 126 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 62 | 24.4 | 4.7 | 96 |  | 96 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 63 | 24.8 | 4.9 | 79 |  | 79 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 64 | 25.2 | 5.2 | 55 |  | 55 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 65 | 25.6 | 5.4 | 60 |  | 60 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 66 | 26.0 | 5.6 | 54 |  | 54 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 67 | 26.4 | 5.9 | 55 |  | 55 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 68 | 26.8 | 6.1 | 59 |  | 59 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 69 | 27.2 | 6.4 | 43 |  | 43 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 70 | 27.6 | 6.7 | 24 |  | 24 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 71 | 28.0 | 6.9 | 31 |  | 31 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 72 | 28.3 | 7.2 | 13 |  | 13 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 73 | 28.7 | 7.5 | 7 |  | 7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 74 | 29.1 | 7.8 | 1 |  | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 75 | 29.5 | 8.1 | 11 |  | 11 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 76 | 29.9 | 8.4 | 12 |  | 12 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 77 | 30.3 | 8.7 | 1 |  | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 78 | 30.7 | 9.0 | 2 |  | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL |  |  | 56,016 | 6,581 | 49,435 | 11.8 | 88.2 |


l-year-olds (1951 year class) were extremely scarce and only a few were captured。

Size ccmpssition surves were also prepared for each of the three seasons, (figures 6 to 8 ).

Cull by fishermen
Of the total catch, about 12 percent by number (? percent by weight) was discarded, while 88 percent by number ( 93 percent by weight) was landed. Cull curves are presented in figures 9 to li. Fjfty percent points for each trip and for average trips are givea in table 6 .

Considerable variation in the 50 -percent, points may be noted on the individual trips, ranging from 0.6 pounds to 1 pourd (1.2 to 15 inches). The size at whish fishermen cull depends in part upon the abundance of fish (Premetz, 1953). If catch is pocr, fishermen cull at a lower level saving many smaller sizes normally discarded when catch is good. This lowers the 50 opercent point. Conversely, if catch is very good, fishermen discard many of the borderline scrod, raising the 50-percent point.

Altnough individual trip variation is great, the 50 percent poirts on the seasonal cull curves are similar, rangirg from about 0.8 to 0.9 pounds ( 13.3 to 13.5 inches).

The 50-percent point for all observed trips in 1952 was $10 w e r$ ( 0.86 pounds) than in 1951 when it was 0.94 pounds. This was due to a dominance of large fish in 1951; three-year-olds as compared with two-yearclds in 1952. Fisnermen cull at a high level when larger fish are more abundant.

Age somposition
The age composition of haddock on the average Georges Bank trip cbserved daring each season of 1952 are presented in table 7. The percent of each age discarded is presented in table 8 .

In 195 2, ths 2950 year class (2-year-olds) dominated the fishery, Orer th percent of the haddock caught were from this particular year class. The 1948 year class (4-year-olds) and 1949 year class ( $3-y e a r=01 \% s$ ) were the next mast important contributing 14 and 19 percent, respectively. The other year class contributed only 5 percent of the catch.
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Fig. 9--Haddock cull curve on the average Georges Bank trip observed during 1952.

 trips observed during the 1952 haddock year.

| Season | Trip number | 50 Percent Point |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Length in cms. | Length in inches | Ave. wt. (gutted) in pounds |
| B | 52-8 | 34.8 | 13.7 | 0.84 |
|  | 52-10 | 36.5 | 14.8 | 0.89 |
|  | 52-11 | 33.8 | 13.3 | 0.78 |
|  | 52-12 | 31.3 | 12.3 | 0.62 |
|  | Ave. trip | 34.3 | 13.5 | 0.81 |
| C | 52-13 | 35.0 | 13.8 | 0.96 |
|  | 52-14 | 35.1 | 13.8 | 0.97 |
|  | 52-15 | 34.2 | 13.5 | 0.90 |
|  | 52-16 | 32.7 | 12.9 | 0.80 |
|  | 52-17 | 33.5 | 13.2 | 0.86 |
|  | 52-18 | 32.8 | 12.9 | 0.81 |
|  | 52-19 | 32.3 | 12.7 | 0.77 |
|  | 52-20 | 30.2 | 11.9 | 0.64 |
|  | Ave. trip | 33.9 | 13.3 | 0.88 |
| D |  |  |  |  |
|  | 52-22 | 30.9 | 12.2 | 0.67 |
|  | 52-23 | 33.6 | 13.2 | 0.85 |
|  | 53-1 | 35.3 | 13.9 | 0.98 |
|  | Ave. trip | 33.7 | 13.3 | 0.86 |
| All Seasons | s Ave. trip | 33.9 | 13.3 | 0.86 |

TABLE 7.--Age composition of haddock on the average Georges Bank trip observed during Seasons E, $C$ and $D$

| Season | Age in years | Year <br> class | Numbers caught | Percent of total catch | Numbers discarced | Percent of total discard | Numbers landed | Percent of total landings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | 1 | 1951 | 80 | 0.1 | 80 | 1.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| (biay to July) | 2 | 1950 | 34,260 | 61.8 | 7,857 | 96.8 | 26,403 | 55.8 |
|  | 3 | 1949 | 6,712 | 12.1 | 182 | 2.2 | 6,530 | 13.8 |
|  | 4 | 1948 | 10,560 | 19.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 10,560 | 22.3 |
|  | 5 | 1947 | $2,994$ | 5.4 | 0 | 0.0 | $2,994$ | 6.3 |
|  | 64 | $1946+$ | $815$ | 1.5 |  |  | $815$ | 1.8 |
| TOTAL |  |  | 55,421 | 100.0 | 8,119 | 100.0 | 47,302 | 100.0 |
| C <br> (August to October) | 1 | 1951 | 166 | 0.3 | 116 | 4.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 2 | 1950 | 33,239 | 56.2 | 3,438 | 93.4 | 29,801 | 53.8 |
|  | 3 | 1949 | 14,137 | 23.9 | 77 | 2.1 | 14,060 | 25.4 |
|  | 4 | 1948 | 9,855 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 9,855 | 17.8 |
|  | 5 | 1947 | 1,184 | 2.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1,18.4 | 2.1 |
|  | $6+$ | $1946+$ | 525 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 525 | 0.9 |
| TOTAL |  |  | 59,106 | 100.0 | 3,681 | 100.0 | 55,425 | 100.0 |

TABLE 7.- ifge composition of haddock on the average Goorges Bank trip observed durirg Seasons B, $C$ and $D$ of the 1952 haddock year. (continued)

| Season y | Age in years | Year class | Numbers caught | Percent of total catch | Numbers discarded | Percent of total discerd | Numbers landed | Percent of total landings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Noveniber to January) | 1 | 1951 | 871 | 1.7 | 871 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | to 2 | 1950 | 36,783 | 72.5 | 9,4,15 | 90.0 | 27,368 | 68.0 |
|  |  | 1949 | 7,276 | 14.4 | 174 | 1.7 | 7,102 | 17.6 |
|  | 4 | 1948 | 3,913 | 7.7 | 0 | 0 | 3,913 | 9.7 |
|  | 5 | 1947 | 1,034 | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 1,034 | 2.6 |
|  | $6+$ | 19L6t | 833 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 833 | 2.1 |
| TOTAL |  |  | 50,710 | 100.0 | 10,460 | 100.0 | 40,250 | 100.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & B-D \\ & \text { (Vay to } \\ & \text { January) } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 1951 | 268 | 0.5 | 268 | 4.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 2 | 1950 | 34,974 | 62.2 | 6,188 | 94.0 | 28,686 | 58.0 |
|  | 3 | 1949 | 10,648 | 19.0 | 125 | 1.9 | 10,523 | 21.3 |
|  | 4 | 1948 | 8,009 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 8,009 | 16.2 |
|  | 5 | 1947 | 1,388 | 2.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1,388 | 2.8 |
|  | 64 | $\begin{aligned} & 1946+ \\ & \text { earlier } \end{aligned}$ | 829 | 1.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 829 | 1.7 |
| TOTAL |  |  | 56,016 | 100.0 | 6,581 | 100.0 | 49,435 | 100.0 |

TABLE 8.--Percent of each age discaried on the average Georges Bank trib observed during Seascns $B_{2} C$ and $D$ of the 1952 hadrock year.

| Season | Age in <br> years | Year class | Number <br> cautht | Number discarded | Percent discarded |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { B } \\ (:=\mathrm{ay} \mathrm{to} \\ \text { July }) \end{gathered}$ | 1 | 1951 | 80 | 80 | 100.0 |
|  | 2 | 1950 | 34,260 | 7,858 | 22.0, |
|  | 3 | 19,49 | 6,712 | 181 | 2.7 |
|  | 4 | 1948 | 10,560 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $5$ |  | 2,994 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 64 | $\begin{aligned} & 1946+ \\ & \text { earlier } \end{aligned}$ | 815 | 0 | 0.0 |
| C (August to October) | 1 | 1951 | 166 | 166 | 100.0 |
|  | 2 | 1950 | 33,239 | 3,438 | 10.3 |
|  | 3 | 1949 | 14,137 | 77 | 0.5 |
|  | 4 | 1948 | 9,855 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $5$ | $1947$ | $1,184$ | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $6+$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1946t } \\ & \text { earlier } \end{aligned}$ | $525$ | 0 | 0.0 |
| D <br> (November to January) | 1 | 1951 | 871 | 871 | 100.0 |
|  | 2 | 1950 | 36,783 | 9,415 | 25.6 |
|  | 3 | 1949 | 7,276 | 174 | 2.4 |
|  | 4 | 1948 | 3,913 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $5$ | $1947$ | $1,034$ | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $6+$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1946+ \\ & \text { earlier } \end{aligned}$ | 833 | 0 | 0.0 |
| ```B - D (Nay to January)``` | 1 | 1951 | 268 | 268 | 100.0 |
|  | 2 | 1950 | 34,874 | 6,188 | 17.7 |
|  | 3 | 1949 | 10, 648 | 125 | 1.2 |
|  | 4 | 1948 | 8,009 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 5 | 1947 | 1,388 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $6+$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1946+ \\ & \text { earlier } \end{aligned}$ | 829 | 0 | 0.0 |

Ninety-four percent of the discarded fish were fron the 1950 year class (2wyearoolds): tre 194? (Z-yearolids) end 295 (1-yea- -In) year

 only about I percert of those fivm the 1949 year clase (joyesmojese) were in the diszard. All of the haddock f50m the 1950 year class (I-rea: oulas) were discarded. During 1951, however, 58 percent of the cojearodds were discarded. Sarcioty of fish duwing 195 ? f゙orced the fleet to save many borderline sizes of serod whish would hate been dsearded in 1951.

Fiftyoeight percent of the haddock landed during 2952 came from the 1950 year class ( $2=y e a r=01 d s)$. The 1940 (Loyeanoans) anc 2949 (3-year=olds) year dasses contributed abour 16 and 21 persens, respeco tively. The remainder of the landec purtion was from otner year alasses.

It is readily eviden from these data nat the yojo year class or 2-yearmold haddock supported the Georges Bank fishery during 2952. All svidenre indicates that this yeax class ie a pery good one and heralds a good catth of 3-yearold scrod during 1953。 In 1951 , the 1948 year class of joyear-olds supported the fishery, and this. year class still exerted considerable influerce on the fishery during 2552. The 1949 year olass of 2-yearoolds was below average in its contribution to the 4951 catch. As 3-jearoolds in 1952, these haddock were still below ayerage in thein contribution to the fishery. The 2948 year class of Loyear-olds controibuted as much to the fishery in 1952 as the 1949 yea. olass of $3-y e a r-31 \mathrm{~d}$.

Size composition of the agre
The size composition of the ages in the discarded and landed portions of the 1952 catch shows more striking ty the effect of cuijing on the different ages cf haddock. These size compositions axe presented in table 9 and foigure î.

Referring to fogure 12 , the dominanse on the 1950 year riass ( $20 y e a r-0$ Icis) in the lancings is immediately erident. Also clearly show is the division of this year 0 -ass between the discards and the Ianded fish, with the smailer of these bejng rejected and the langer included in

 see that the सufluence of the 2948 year wass ia very strong year class, as previousiy noted) is almost as geat in lits fourth year as is that of the 2949 year class in $\dot{\text { its }}$ thind jesr.
i. seasonal breakiows of the sign ommosition of tre ages is presented in tifgures $1 j$ te 35 . The progrescion of the various year zlassea through the foshery is graphially snowzin tnese zessorel rgemene cewn pesitions.

| LengthIn cms | Inchee | Ave, wt. (gutted) in pounde | Total Catch |  |  |  |  |  | Age pnd Yeer cless |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Discerde |  |  | Landings |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1961) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1950) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1949) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1948) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & (1947) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64 \\ & \text { (1946s } \\ & \text { earlier) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1951) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1950) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1949) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1950) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (194 C) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1948) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (1947) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 64 \\ (19464 \\ \text { Barlier) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 20 | 7.9 | 0.19 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | 8.3 | 0.22 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | 8.7 | 0.25 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | 9.1 | 0.29 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | 9.4 | 0.32 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | 9.8 | 0.36 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | 10.2 | 0.40 | 15 | 11 |  |  |  |  | 15 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | 10.6 | 0.45 | 31 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 31 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | 11.0 | 0.50 | 51 | 24 |  |  |  |  | 51 | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | 11.4 | 0.56 | 44 | 143 |  |  |  |  | 44 | 138 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | 11.8 | 0.61 | 41 | 297 |  |  |  |  | 41 | 278 |  | 19 |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | 12.2 | 0.67 | 17 | 693 |  |  |  |  | 17 | 514 |  | 79 |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | 12.6 | 0.73 | 281 | 1,058 |  |  |  |  | 28 | 808 |  | 252 |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | 13.0 | 0.79 | 91 | 1,878 |  |  |  |  | 9 | 1,300 |  | 578 |  |  |  |  |
| 34 | 13.4 | 0.87 |  | 2,076 | 8 |  |  |  |  | 1,006 | 8 | 1,070 |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | 13.8 | 0.94 |  | 2,730 | 32 |  |  |  |  | 862 | 32 | 1,868 |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | 14.2 | 1.0 |  | 3,430 | 109 |  |  |  |  | 673 | 21 | 2.757 | 88 |  |  |  |
| 37 | 14.6 | 1.1 |  | 3,574 | 322 |  |  |  |  | 352 | 23 | 3.222 | 299 |  |  |  |
| 38 | 15.0 | 1.2 |  | 3,957 | 454 |  |  |  |  | 156 | 13 | 3.801 | 441 |  |  |  |
| 39 | 15.4 | 1.3 |  | 3,858 | 642 |  |  |  |  | 41 | 21 | 3,817 | 621 |  |  |  |
| 40 | 15.8 | 1.4 |  | 3,659 | 768 | 64 |  |  |  | 18 | 6 | 3,641 | 762 | 54 |  |  |
| 41 | 16.1 | 1.5 |  | 2,992 | 862 | 51 |  |  |  | 3 |  | 2,989 | 862 | 51 |  |  |
| 42 | 16.5 | 1.6 |  | 2,143 | 866 | 94 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.143 | 865 | 94 |  |  |
| 43 | 16.9 | 1.7 |  | 1,304 | 1,117 | 225 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,304 | 1,117 | 225 |  |  |
| 44 | 17.3 | 1.8 |  | 434 | 1,214 | 520 |  |  |  |  |  | 434 | 1,214 | 520 |  |  |
| 45 | 17.7 | 1.9 |  | 213 | 1,144 | 531 |  |  |  |  |  | 213 | 1,144 | 531 |  |  |
| 46 | 18.1 | 2.0 |  | 148 | 812 | 620 |  |  |  |  |  | 148 | 812 | 620 |  |  |
| 47 | 18.5 | 2.2 |  | 200 | 598 | 731 |  |  |  |  |  | 200 | 598 | 731 |  |  |
| 48 | 18.9 | 2.3 |  | 82 | 612 | 776 | 51 |  |  |  |  | 82 | 512 | 776 | 51 |  |
| 49 | 19.3 | 2.4 |  | 18 | 418 | 685 | 33 |  |  |  |  | 18 | 418 | 685 | 33 |  |
| 50 | 19.7 | 2.6 |  | 20 | 379 | 701 | 57 |  |  |  |  | 20 | 379 | 701 | 57 |  |
| 51 | 20.1 | 2.7 |  | 28 | 140 | 603 | 43 |  |  |  |  | 28 | 140 | 603 | 43 |  |
| 52 | 20.5 | 2.9 |  |  | 100 | 714 | 87 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 714 | 87 |  |
| 53 | 20.9 | 3.1 |  |  | 14 | 525 | 188 | 13 |  |  |  |  | 14 | 526 | 188 | 13 |
| 54 | 21.3 | 3.2 |  |  | 62 | 361 | 162 | 13 |  |  |  |  | 62 | 361 | 162 | 13 |
| 55 | 21.7 | 3.4 |  |  | 40 | 337 | 162 | 13 |  |  |  |  | 40 | 327 | 162 | 13 |
| 56 | 22.1 | 3.5 |  |  | 16 | 163 | 127 | 46 |  |  |  |  | 18 | 163 | 127 | 46 |
| 67 | 22.4 | 3.7 |  |  | 8 | 138 | 130 | 16 |  |  |  |  | 8 | 138 | 130 | 16 |
| 58 | 22.8 | 3.9 |  |  | 9 | 70 | 70 | 87 |  |  |  |  | 9 | 70 | 70 | 87 |
| 59 | 23.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  | 58 | 53 | 59 |  |  |  |  |  | 58 | 53 | 69 |
| 50 | 23.6 | 4.3 |  |  |  | 23 | 77 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  | 23 | 77 | 31 |
| 61 | 24.0 | 4.5 |  |  |  | 7 | 60 | 69 |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 50 | 69 |
| 62 | 24.4 | 4.7 |  |  |  | 8 | 40 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 40 | 48 |
| 63 | 24.8 | 4.9 |  |  |  |  | 24 | 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 | 55 |
| 64 | 25.2 | 5.2 |  |  |  | 4 | 14 | 37 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 14 | 37 |
| 65 | 25.6 | 5.4 |  |  |  | 4 | 8 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 6 | 48 |
| 66 | 26.0 | 8.6 |  |  |  | 6 | 6 | 42. |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 8 | 42 |
| 87 | 26.4 | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65 |
| 68 | 28.8 | 6.1 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 63 |
| 69 | 27.2 | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43 |
| 70 | 27.6 | 8.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |
| 71 | 28.0 | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 |
| 72 | 28.3 | 7.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 |
| 73 | 28.7 | 7,8 |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 74 | 29.1 | 7.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 75 | 29.5 | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| 76 | 29.9 | 8.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |
| 77 | 30.3 | 8.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 78 | 30.7 | 90 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Totaz |  |  | 88 34, | ,074 10 | 10,648 | 8,009 | 1,388 | 829 | 268 | 8,188 | 128 | 26,688 1 | 10,623 | 8,009 | 1,388 | 829 |
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Fig. 12-- Size composition of each age in the catch on the average Georges Bank trip observed during 1952
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FYg. 14--Size composition of each age in the catch on the average Georges Bank trip observed during Season C, 1952
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Fig. 15--Size composition of each age in the catch on the averare Georges Ban!: trip observed during Sesson D, 1952

The size composition curve for the 2949 year class, which exhibited two widely separated peaks in the 195. collection (Fremetr, 1953) shows this phenomenon during Seasors B and D of 1952 , but not in Seassan $C$ o vo explamation of this unusual distribution can be giver.

## SUMMARI

1. During 1952. the destruction of undergized haddook on Gecrges Bank by the Boston and New Bedford fishing flests (based on skippers' estimates as reported to port interviewers) was about 409 million pounds (Lo4. million fish). of this total, akout ho? million pounds ( 3.8 nillifoss fish), or over 86 percent, was reported by the Bnston fleet. The 2952 discard by the Boston fleet approximates the average annudl destrvotion zeported during the period $1947-195 \%$.
2. During the 2952 haddock year, obserfers went to sea on seventioen commercial trips to the Georges Bank area to analyae the catch. Skippers' estimates of pounds discarded were found to be within $6-1 / 2$ percent of estimatesmade by the Service observers at sea. In 1951, skippers' estimates rere within $12-1 / 2$ percent of estimates made by observers at $s e z$.
3. Most of the destruction was reported during the sumes monvis as in past years. At this time of the year tweryazroid fish are attaining a size at which they are caught ir quantity but are still not of maxketable size. In 1952 the fishery was dominated by two-year-clois ( 4950 year cliss). Usually there is a heavy destruction of serod when a cominant year class enters the fishery during its third year of Iffe, (two-pearoelds artsin their third year of life). In 1952, however, the destruction was not exceptionally large in spite of the fact that the two-year-old were vemy abyndant. Older fish were unusuaily scarce in 1952 ; the two myeawrolds coctatetutued over 62 percent of the total catrh. For this reason, fishermen tended to save most of them so that the , 50 percent point on the cull curve wes sexewhat lower than in 1951 when the three-yemoclds dominated the fishery.


[^0]:    Fig. 13--Size composition of each ape in the catch on the averape Georges Bank trip observed during Season B, 1952

