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THE DESTRUCTION OF UNDERSIZED HADDOCK ON GEORGES BANK，19L7－1951．
The destrution of undersizad haddock on Georges Bank has been going on sinse the intruduction of the oter traw in 2905．This weste of small fisn has been of great concern to the incustry and to conservationsts for many Jears．The Fish and Wi Idjeire Service has been studying this fishery intensirely since 1931，and has at various times urged the use of a larger－ meshed net in order to curb the destruction of haddock too small to market （Herrington，1932，1935，1936；Sonuck， 1947,$1948 ;$ Royce and Schuck，1950） but，since the banks lie in international waters，no Iegisiation was ever enacted．

With the organization in 1951 of the International Comission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries，亡t became possibie to control the tiosheries of thase banks，and appropriate regulations are now being promulgated by Canacia ard the United States to set the minimum size of mesin allowable fos haddock filshing on Georges Bank and in the Guif of Maine（subarea 5 of the C（mmession）．

In comection with these regulations，it is necessary to have accurate information on the numbers and sizes uifish discarded at sea before and arter the regulations are applied，in order to assess the effectiveness of the larger mesh in actual practics。

Extensive observations（ól sea tinips）were made by Bureau of Fisheries obsemer：（Alexander，Moore，and Kendal1，I915）in 1913－14，and froon data coliected it was possible to estimate the quantities of haddock discarded in these years．Herrington（1932，1935，1936）estimated the quantities of haddock discarded for the years 1930－32 by sampling at sea（20 trips）and by port interviews of vessels．The pressent report extencs these data to include the results of port interriews for the years 1947 to 1951 and the samplings at sea for the year 2951.

The success of this study has been nade possibie by the wholehearted cooperation of the fishing industry．We whsh to express our appreciation to all the fishermen interviewed and especially to the c＝ews of the trawlers on which the observers shipped．An extra man on board may interfere with normal operations，but the observers nave found the fishermen most wijling to afiord them an opportunity to soinect the recessary data．The boat owners have been very cooperative in permitting the observers to sail er these trips．

Howard A．Schuck was in charge of haddock research when these stindies were conducted．Credit is due nim forn supervising the sampingoat－sea program during its initial stages．The following persons collected data at sea：John R．Ciark，Sterling L。 Cogswell，David F。Hammack，George FoKelly， John Fo Shea，and the author．Port Intexvews were conducied by James Jo Miggins and Dawid Fo Hammack。 Betty Bo Murrav ard Sterling I．Cogsweil assisted in the tabulation of the data．

For many years，the Service has stationed a man at the Boston Fish Pier to collect biological information on the haddock landed there．This agent measures the iengths of a sample of each catch，collects scales for age determinations and interviews the captains of the vessels to obtain
Jinformation on the area of captuxe。Since 1947 the interivewer has also obtained from the captains their estimates of the pounds of haddock dis－ sarded or each trip and the area in which the destruction occurred．

In 1951，a system was inaugurated for obtaining more detailed infor－ mation on the fish disrarded．In this program trained observers are sent to sea on commercial trawiers to count and measure the fish discarded and to collect scale samples for age determination．Similar data are collected from the retained portion of the catch．A trawler，typical of those on which observations were made，is shown in figure 1 ．

In rormai fishing operations，the entire catch from a haul is dumped into one or more checkers（fig。2）．From these checkers the marketable fish are selected and separated according to species．The haddock are graded for size，then gutted and tossed into a wash box from which they are pitched below decks for icing．The biologist usually obtains his measurements and scale samples of the marketable fish before the fish are gutted。

The unmarketable fish remaining in the checkers are washed overboard through the scuppers．The biologist takes a sample of these just before they are discarded（see ing．3）．Lengths of fish are measured by the punch－strip method（see fig。 4）．In this method，each fish is laid on an alumium strip and its length recorded by punching the strip with an ice pick．The actual lengths are measured after return to the laboratory． The lengths of several hundred fish can be rapidly recorded in this way on a single strip by a single observer without use of notebook．

During 1951．，seven trips were made by the sea sampling observers． The trips were made on the following trawlers：Barbara C．Angell，Crest， Drift．Michigan．Red Jacket，and Whehester．The dates and areas fished on these trips are listed in table Most of the firhing was conducted on the Northern Edge，where a total of 326 sets were made．One hundred and ten sets were made on the Southeast Part，and 36 sers on the eastern side of South Chanrei．

## ESTIMATED DESTRUCTION，1947－51

The destruction of haddo $k$ or Georges Bank by the Boston flectid for the years 1947 to 1951 is summarized in table 2 ．

If The estimates for the entire New England fleet are almost 50 percent greater than those reported here．



Figure 2.-Cheokers full of haddook, immediately after one set of the net


Fikure 3.--Undersized hadrock. These fish were discarded as soon as the Fish and Wildife Service observer measured them. Note measuring equifment in foreground.



| Year-Month | Pounds |  |  | Numbers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total catch | Discards | Percent discarded | Total catch | Discards | Percent discarded |
| 1947-January | 5,658 | 146 | 2.6 | 1,880 | 182 | 9.7 |
| February | 5,744 | 232 | 4.0 | 2,094 | 290 | 13.8 |
| March | 5,598 | 234 | 4.2 | 2,048 | 292 | 14.2 |
| April | 8,489 | 531 | 6.2 | 3,269 | 664 | 20.3 |
| May | 6,487 | 489 | 7.5 | 2,987 | 611 | 20.4 |
| $J$ une | 6,611 | 711 | 10.8 | 3,226 | 889 | 27.6 |
| July | 6,315 | 1,050 | 16.6 | 3,398 | 1,312 | 38.6 |
| August | 11,317 | 2,074 | 18.3 | 6,931 | 2,592 | 37.4 |
| September | 12,589 | 2,189 | 17.4 | 7,618 | 2,736 | 35.9 |
| October | 12,443 | 1,347 | 10.8 | 6,893 | 1,684 | 24.4 |
| November December | 3,467 | 131 | 3.8 | 1,248 | 164 | 13.1 |
| All menths | 3,563 | 221 | 6.2 | $\underline{3} 2362$ | 276 | 20.3 |
| All months | 88,281 | 9,355 | 10.6 | 42,954 | 11,692 | 27.2 |
| 1948-January | 3,016 | 200 | 6.6 | 1,165 | 250 | 21.4 |
| February | 2,178 | 49 | 2.2 | 800 | 61 | 7.6 |
| March | 5,128 | 81 | 1.6 | 1,852 | 101 | 5.4 |
| April | 7,570 | 105 | 1.4 | 2,721 | 131 | 4.8 |
| May | 2,741 | 160 | 5.8 | 1,459 | 200 | 13.7 |
| June | 6,968 | 265 | 3.8 | 3,601 | 331 | 9.2 |
| July | 7,595 | 519 | 6.8 | 4, 101 | 649 | 15.8 |
| August | 8,998 | 491 | 5.4 | 4,450 | 614 | 13.8 |
| September | 9,184 | 977 | 10.6 | 4,921 | 1,221 | 24.8 |
| October | 8,381 | 548 | 6.5 | 4,217 | 685 | 16.2 |
| November | 5,985 | 679 | 11.3 | 3,251 | 849 | 26.1 |
| December | 3,414 | 180 | 5.3 | 1,689 | 225 | 13.3 |
| All months | 71,158 | 4,254 | 6.0 | 34,227 | 5,317 | 15.5 |
| 1949-January | 4,442 | 104 | 2.3 | 2,094 | 130 | 6.2 |
| February | 6,975 | 142 | 2.0 | 2,886 | 178 | 6.2 |
| March | 6,920 | 149 | 2.2 | 2,526 | 186 | 7.4 |
| April | 3,906 | 90 | 2.3 | 1,431 | 112 | 7.8 |
| May | 5,785 | 419 | 7.2 | 3,066 | 524 | 17.1 |
| June | 7,723 | 412 | 5.3 | 3,978 | 515 | 12.9 |
| July | 5,841 | 113 | 1.9 | 2,854 | 141 | 4.9 |
| August | 9,671 | 553 | 5.7 | 4,584 | 691 | 15.1 |
| September | 9,101 | 329 | 3.6 | 4, 157 | 411 | 9.9 |
| October | 5,791 | 876 | 15.1 | 3,194 | 1,095 | 34.3 |
| November | 1,802 | 90 | 5.0 | 638 | 112 | 17.6 |
| December | 1,757 | 33. | 1.9 | 570 | 47 | 7.2 |
| All months | 69,714 | 3,310 | 4.7 | 31,978 | 4,136 | 12.9 |

TABLE 2.--Destruction of haddock on Georges Bank by the Boston fishing fleet, 1947-51 continued in thousands/

| Year-Month | Pounds |  |  | Numbers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total catch | Discards | Percent discarded | Total catch | Discards | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { discarded } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1950-January | 2,652 | 114 | 4.3 | 921 | 142 | 15.4 |
| February | 3,978 | 2.20 | 3.5 | 1,337 | 175 | 13.1 |
| March | 3,025 | 120 | 4.0 | 1,029 | 150 | 14.6 |
| April | 1,744 | 77 | 4.4 | 600 | 96 | 16.0 |
| May | 5,288 | 290 | 5.5 | 3,061 | 362 | 11.9 |
| June | 5,745 | 836 | 14.6 | 3,695 | 1,045 | 28.3 |
| July | 7,683 | 1,053 | 13.7 | 4,896 | 1,316 | 26.9 |
| August | 10,299 | 810 | 7.9 | 6,837 | 1,012 | 14.8 |
| September | 8,608 | 307 | 3.6 | 5,480 | 384 | 7.0 |
| October | 7,568 | 268 | 3.5 | 4,816 | 335 | 7.0 |
| November | 5,728 | 332 | 5.8 | 3,441 | 415 | 12.1 |
| December | $4,500$ | 74 | 1.6 | 2,574 | 92 | -3.6 |
| All months | 66,818 | 4,422 | 6.6 | 38,687 | 5,523 | -14.3 |
| 1951-January | 4,103 | 44 | 1.1 | 2,332 | 55 | 2.4 |
| February | 8,263 | 139 | 1.7 | 3,065 | 174 | 5.7 |
| March | 4,218 | 26 | 0.6 | 1,524 | 32 | 2.1 |
| April | 2,239 | 27 | 1.2 | 821 | 34 | 4.1 |
| May | 6,397 | 53 | 0.8 | 3,548 | 66 | 1.9 |
| June | 6,216 | 327 | 5.3 | 3,641 | 409 | 11.2 |
| July | 7,217 | 241 | 3.3 | 4,129 | 301 | 7.3 |
| August | 12,189 | 292 | 2.4 | 6,252 | 365 | 5.8 |
| September | 11,056 | 188 | 1.7 | 5,612 | 235 | 4.2 |
| October | 7,732 | 834 | 10.8 | 4,455 | 1,042 | 23.4 |
| November | 4,359 | 293 | 6.7 | 2,048 | 366 | 17.9 |
| December | $3,190$ | 324 | 10.2 | 1.591 | 405 | 25.4 |
| All months | 77,179 | 2,788 | 3.6 | 39,018 | 3,484 | 8.9 |



Figure 6.-Localities where haddook were discarded in the average year, 1947-51.

TABLE 1. - Dates and areas fished on the commercial trips observed in 1951

| Trip <br> Number | Date | Areas fished on Georges Bank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $51-1$ | June 6-14 | Northern Edge <br> Southeast Part <br> East side South Channel |
| 51-2 | July 18-25 | Nortinern Edge |
| $51-3$ | August 3010 | Northern Edge |
| $51-4$ | August 7-14 | Northern Edge Southeast Part |
| $51-5$ | August 13-21 | Southeast Part |
| 51-5 | August 29 . September 5 | Northern Edge |
| $51-7$ | September 22 . Ootober I | Northern Edge East side South Channel |

## Annual

The average quantity discarded annually during the 5 -year period was over $41 / 2$ million pounds, representing over 6 percent of the catch. In terms of numbers this quantity represented over 6 million individual fish or over 16 percent of the catch.

The greatest quantity discarded during this period was reported in 194?, when almost ll percent of the total catch, by weight, was discarded at sea; this was equivalent to discarding 25 percent of the haddock caught. The least discard during this period was in 1951 , when about 4 percent of the catch, by weight, was discarded; this amounted to 10 percent of the fish caught. The years 1948-50 were intermediate.

## Seasonal

The destruction of baby haddock is definitely seasonal, as can be seen by a comparison of the monthly records (table 2 and fig. 5). Discards usually increased rapidiy after June and declined after ontober. November to May were Tsuaing penods of relatively low destruction.

## Areas

Discard by area was sumnarized by plotting the amounts of discard by units of $10^{\prime}$ Iatitude by io' longitude. The localities where haddock were discarded in the average year for the period 1947 to 1951 are shown in figure 6. The aneas of greatest discard were the Northern Edge and

Soutnea* $F$ º. or Geurgea, whth lesser quantities discarded along tise $50-$ fathom contour on the western side and bottom of South Channel, extending northeastrard to Cultivator Shoals.

Iange discards in certain areas on Georges are not due entirely to the presence of large numbers of small fish, but in great part to the fishirg flicit, expended in the area. The distribution of fishing effort in the awerage year is shown in figure 7 (Schuck, 1953). The similarity of the discard and effort concentration charts is immediately evident. Tine areas most hearily fjshed reflect, in most cases, the greatest discard.

## ANALYSIS OF DISCARDS, 1951

## Pounds

On the senen trixps observed in 1951, a total of 46,608 pounds of baby haddock was discarded. This was an average of 6,658 pounds per trip, with individuai trips ranging from 0 to 19,685 pounds (table 3). For all trips, about? percens of the total catch by weight was discarded, while on irdevidual trips, percent discarded ranged from 0 to 17.

## Numbers

These 46,008 pounds represented 61, 802 individual fish, an average of 8,828 per trio. Numbers discarded ranged from 0 to 28,135 on the individuaj. trips (table 4). Of the total numbers caught on these trips, about 17 percent was discarded, while on individual trips, the percentage discarded ranged from 0 to 39.

Estimated total destruction
Using the average discard per trip from the sea sampling data, it was possible to estimate the total destruction by the Boston fishing fleet for the period sampled (June to September). The estimate employing this metiod was 1, 198,000 pounds.

Refering to table 2, we find that the destruction of haddock by the Boston fleet estimated on the basis of skippers' reports, during the $4-$ month geriod which parallels the sea sampling trips, was $1,048,000$ pounds. The estimate by this method was 12.6 percent under that from sea sampling data.

Average woight
I\% is recognized that when haddock are scarce, fishermen tend to save fish of smailer sizes, whereas when plentiful, they discard larger fish. This explains the extreme variability in average weights in table 5. To show this more cieariy, the average weight of discards was plotted against the total pounds landed for each of the trips on which fish were discarded (fig。8)。

Fisure 7.-Distribution of fishing effort of Boston fjshing fleat in the averape year, 1938-49.


Figure 8.--Regression of average weight of discards against total pounds landed.

TABLE 3. --Percent of total haddock catch (in pounds) discarded on the commercial sea sampling trips to Georges Bank observed in 1951

| Trip No. | Pounds caught | Pounds discarded | Percent discarded |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $51-1$ | 58,900 | 4,900 | 8.3 |
| $51-2$ | 79,000 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 5 I-3 | 82,010 | 2,010 | 2.4 |
| $51-4$ | 101,155 | 7,755 | 7.4 |
| 5 I-5 | 114,385 | 19,685 | 17.2 |
| $51-6$ | 134,225 | 9,525 | 7.1 |
| $51-7$ | 86,733 | 2,733 | 7.2 |
| Total | 659,408 | 46,608 | 7.1 |
| Average trip | 94,201 | 6,658 | 7 |

TABIE 4. -- Percent of total haddock catch (in numbers) discarded on the commercial sea sampling trips to Georges Bank observed in 1951

| Trip No. | Number caught | Number discarded | Percent discarded |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $51-1$ | 40,1841 | 10,514 | 26.2 |
| $51-2$ | 33,331 | 0 | 0.0 |
| $51-3$ | 41,744 | 2,463 | 5.9 |
| $51-4$ | 59,639 | 9,073 | 15.2 |
| $51-5$ | 72,186 | 28,135 | 39.0 |
| $51-6$ | 74,055 | 8,404 | 11.3 |
| $51-7$ | 44,728 | 3,213 | 7.2 |
| Total | 365,867 | 52,267 | 8,828 |
| Average trip |  | 16.9 |  |

1/ No samples of the landed portion of the haddock catch were taken at sea on this trip. To derive numbers from the total pounds landed, the average weight per fish was determined from port sampling at Boston (1. 82 pounds per fish).

The average weights of individual fish taken on each of the seven trips are shown in table 5. The average weight of haddock caught on these trips was 1.80 pounds, with individual trips ranging from 1.46 to 2.37 pounds. The average weight of fish discarded for all trips was 0.75 pounds, while on individual trips it varied from 0.47 to 1.13 pounds. The average weight per fish landed was 2.02 pounds, while on individual trips it ranged from 1.82 to 2.37 pounds.

## Size composition

The size composition of haddock on the average Georges Bank trip observed in 1951 is shown in table 6 and figure 9.

The size of haddock caught on these trips ranged from 0.1 to 8.4 pounds ( 6 to 30 inches) with over 90 percent from 0.5 to 3.1 pounds in weight (11 to 21 inches in length).

The size of fish discarded ranged from 0.1 to 2.2 pounds ( 6 to $18 \mathrm{l} / 2$ inches), with about 90 percent from 0.3 to 1.0 pound in weight ( $9 \mathrm{l} / 2$ to 14 inches in length).

The sizes in the landed portion ranged from 0.6 to 8.4 pounds (ll $1 / 2$ to 30 inches), with about 90 percent from 1.1 to 2.7 pounds in weight (14 $1 / 2$ to 20 inches in length).

Cull by fishermen
Of the total catch, about 16 percent by number ( 7 percent by weight) was discarded, while 84 percent by number ( 83 percent by weight) was landed.

A major consideration in selecting a mesh size for regulation of the Georges Bank fishery has been the selection of a mesh which would release most of the sizes of haddock at present discarded at sea. Therefore, it was of considerable importance to determine the numbers of each size discarded, relative to the total numbers of that size caught.

The data pertinent to these determinations are included in table 6 . The numbers caught, as well as the numbers landed and discarded of each size, also are shown in figure 9. From this figure certain percentage discard points can be determined. The 50 percent point, that is, that size at which the same number are discarded as are landed, is 0.94 pounds (about $133 / 4$ inches). This is the point where the line representing dis-cards crosses the line representing landings. From this point downward,


TABLE 6.--Size composition of fish caught, fish landed and fish discarded. Âverage of observed trips in 19.1. A sample of the landed portion of the catch was taken on 6 of the 7 trips. Deriration of numbers landed is based on 6 trips, while numbers discarded is based on 7 trips. 7

| Length in cms. | Inches | Average weight (gat+ed) in pounds | Numbers caught | Numbers discarded | Numbers landed | Percent discarded | Percent landed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 | 6.3 | 0.10 | 5 | 5 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 17 | 6.7 | 0.12 | 8 | 8 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 18 | 7.1 | 0.94 | 40 | 40 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 19 | 7.5 | $0 . \therefore 7$ | 62 | 62 |  | 200.0 | 0.0 |
| 20 | 7.9 | 0.19 | 135 | 135 |  | 3.00 .0 | 0.0 |
| 21 | 8.3 | 0.22 | 219 | 219 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 22 | 8.7 | 0.25 | 282 | 282 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 23 | 9.1 | 0.29 | 348 | 348 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 2.4 | 9.4 | 0.32 | 306 | 306 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 25 | 9.8 | 0.36 | 443 | 443 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 26 | 10.2 | 0.40 | 393 | 393 |  | 700.0 | 0.0 |
| 27 | 10.6 | 0.45 | 382 | 382 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 28 | 11.0 | 0.50 | 583 | 583 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 29 | II. 4 | 0.55 | 801 | 789 | 12 | 98.5 | 1.5 |
| 30 | 11.8 | 0.61 | 962 | 959 | 3 | 99.7 | 0.3 |
| 31. | 2.2.2 | 0.67 | 650 | 650 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 32 | 12.6 | 0.73 | 726 | 650 | 76 | 89.5 | 10.5 |
| 33 | 13.C | 0.79 | 686 | 601 | 85 | 87.6 | 12.4 |
| 34 | 13.4 | 0.87 | 777 | 616 | 161 | ?9.3 | 20.? |
| 35 | 13.8 | 0.94 | 960 | 451 | 509 | 47.0 | 53.0 |
| 36 | 14.2 | $=.0$ | 993 | 351 | 642 | 35.3 | 64.7 |
| 37 | 14.6 | -u. | 1,748 | 221 | 1,527 | 12.6 | 87.4 |
| 38 | 15.0 | 1.2 | 1,700 | 107 | 1,593 | 6.1 | 93.9 |
| 39 | 15.4 | $\cdots 3$ | 1,946 | 66 | 2,880 | 3.4 | 96.6 |
| 40 | 15.8 | $? . L$ | 2,661 | 39 | 2,622 | I. 5 | 98.5 |
| 41 | 16.1 | 2.5 | 3,161 | 33 | 3,128 | 7.0 | 99.0 |
| 42 | 16.5 | $\pm .6$ | 3,899 | 15 | 3,884 | C. 4 | 99.6 |
| 43 | 16.9 | 3.7 | 4,156 | 25 | 4,131 | 0.6 | 99.4 |
| 44 | 17.3 | ?. 8 | 4,235 | 25 | 4,210 | 0.6 | 99.4 |
| 45 | 3.7 .7 | $=.9$ | 4,189 | 11 | 4,178 | 0.3 | 99.7 |


| Length in cms. | Inches | Average weight (gutted) in pounds | Nunbers caught | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Numbers } \\ & \text { discarded } \end{aligned}$ | Numbers landed | Fercent discarded | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { landed } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 46 | 26.1 | 2.0 | 3,389 | 9 | 3,380 | 0.3 | 99.7 |
| 4 ? | 18.5 | 2.2 | 3,31.0 | 4 | 3,306 | 0.1 | 99.9 |
| 48 | 18.9 | 2.3 | 2,403 |  | 2, 403 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 49 | 19.3 | 2.4 | 2,156 |  | 2,156 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50 | 19.7 | 2.6 | 1,544 |  | 1,544 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 51 | 20.1 | 2.7 | 1,192 |  | 1,192 | 0.0 | 200.0 |
| $5 ?$ | 20.5 | 2.9 | 549 |  | 549 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 53 | 20.9 | 3.1 | 588 |  | 588 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 54 | 21.3 | 3.2 | 262 |  | 262 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 55 | $21 . ?$ | 3.4 | 262 |  | 262 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 56 | 22.1 | 3.5 | 230 |  | 230 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5 | 22.4 | 3.7 | 152 |  | 152 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 58 | 22.8 | 3.9 | 62 |  | 62 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 59 | 23.2 | 4.1 | 77 |  | 77 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 60 | 23.6 | 4.3 | 142 |  | 141 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 61 | 24.0 | 4.5 | 112 |  | 112 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 62 | 24.4 | 4.7 | 91 |  | 91 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 63 | 24.8 | 4.9 | 171 |  | 171 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 64 | 25.2 | 5.2 | 126 |  | 126 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 65 | 25.6 | 5.4 | 55 |  | 55 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 66 | 26.0 | 5.6 | 49 |  | 49 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 67 | 26.4 | 5.9 | 20 |  | 20 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 68 | 26.8 | 6.1 | 55 |  | 55 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 69 | 27.2 | 6.4 | 16 |  | 16 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 70 | 27.6 | 6.7 | 28 |  | 28 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 71 | 28.0 | 6.9 | 9 |  | 9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 72 | 28.3 | 7.2 | 24 |  | 24 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 73 | 28.7 | 7.5 | 8 |  | 8 | 0.0 | 200.0 |
| 74 | 29.1 | 78 | 14 |  | 14 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 75 | 29.5 | 8.1 | 7 |  | 7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 76 | 29.9 | 8.4 | 2 |  | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Total |  |  | 54,560 | 8,828 | 45,732 | 16.2 | 83.8 |

TABLE 7.--Cull by fishermen on the individual Georges Bank trips observed in 1951

| Length in centimeters | Average weight (sutted) | Percent of total catch landed Trip number |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | in pounds | 51-3 | 51-4 | 51-5 | 51-6 | $51-7$ |
| Under 28 | 0.50 and under | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 29 | 0.55 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.6 | 0.0 |
| 30 | 0.61 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 31 | 0.67 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 32 | 0.73 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 12.1 | 8.5 |
| 33 | 0.79 | 55.1 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.7 |
| 34 | 0.87 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 19.8 | 36.2 |
| 35 | 0.94 | 62.7 | 23.4 | 31.9 | 34.1 | 66.8 |
| 36 | 1.0 | 74.8 | 59.8 | 51.8 | 29.7 | 89.8 |
| 37 | 1.1 | 93.5 | 73.6 | 82.2 | 72.1 | 96.0 |
| 38 | 1.2 | 96.0 | 89.0 | 97.3 | 87.0 | 96.3 |
| 39 | 1.3 | 98.8 | 94.8 | 99.4 | 88.1 | 97.3 |
| 40 | 1.4 | 99.5 | 97.2 | 100.0 | 95.2 | 98.8 |
| 41 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 97.8 | 100.0 | 96.9 | 99.7 |
| 42 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 99.5 | 100.0 | 98.6 | 100.0 |
| 43 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 99.6 | 100.0 | 97.6 | 100.0 |
| 44 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 97.2 | 100.0 |
| 45 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 99.9 | 100.0 | 98.8 | 100.0 |
| 46 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.9 | 100.0 |
| 47 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.5 | 100.0 |
| 48 and over | 2.3 and over | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

I/ Trip No. 51-1 - No sample of landed portion of catch.
Trip No. 51-2 - No discard reported.
progressively larger percentages were discarded, until at sizes below 0.5 pound (ll inches) all were discarded. Conversely, going from the 50 percent point upward toward larger sizes of fish, the percentage of discard decreased, until at the size of 2.3 pounds (19 inches) none were discarded.

This culling by the fishermen is shown more clearly by the "cull curvel (fig. 10) in which the size of fish is plotted against the percentage of catch landed.

The sizes discarded and landed varied from trip to trip as indicated previously. The cull curves for each applicable trip are presented in figure 1l; the data are given in table.7.

## Age composition

The age composition of haddock on the average Georges Bank tri.p observed in 1951 is presented in table 8 . The percentage of each age discarded is given in table 9.

In 1951, the 1948 year class (3-year-olds) dominated the fishery; over 70 percent of the haddock caught were from this one year class. Next in importance was the 1949 year class (2-year-olds), which contributed about 18 percent to the dotal catch. All other year classes were relatively less important.

Most of the discarded haddock ( 66 percent) were from the 1949 year class (2-year-olds). The 1950 year class (l-year-olds) was next in importance, contributing about 27 percent of the numbers discarded. The rest of the discarded fish (about 7 percent) were from the 1948 year class (3-year-olds).

Of the landed fish, about 83 percent were from the 1948 year class (3-year-olds), 9 percent from the 1949 year class (2-year-olds), and the rest (8 percent) from other year classes.


Figure 10.-mHaddook cull curve on the average Georges Bank trip observed in 1951.

TABIE 8.--Age composition of haddock on the average Georges Bank trip observed in 1951

| Age in years | Year spawned | Numbers caught | Percent of total catch | Numbers discarded | Percent of total <br> djscari | Numbers landed | Percent of total landings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1950 | 2,395 | 4.4 | 2,394 | 27.1 | 1 | ---- |
| 2 | 1949 | 9,991 | 18.3 | 5,803 | 65.7 | 4,188 | 9.2 |
| 3 | 1948 | 38,476 | 70.5 | 631 | 7.2 | 37,845 | 82.7 |
| 4 | 1947 | 2,011 | 3.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2,011 | 4.4 |
| 5 | 1946 | 1,358 | 2.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1,358 | 3.0 |
| $6+$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1945 \text { and } \\ & \text { earlier } \end{aligned}$ | 329 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 329 | 0.7 |
| Total |  | 54,560 | 100.0 | 8,828 | 100.0 | 45,372 | 100.0 |

Size composition of ages
The effect of culling on the different ages of haddock is shown more graphically by the size composition of the ages in the discarded and landed portions of the catch. These size compositions are presented in table 10 and figure 12. Referring to figure 12, the dominance of the 1948 year class in the landings is strikingly evident. Also clearly shown is the division of the 1949 year class between the discards and the landed fish, with the smaller of these being rejected and the larger included in the marketed group.

The size composition curve for the 1949 year class as shown for the total catch is markedly different from that of other year classes in that it exhibits two definite widely separated peaks. At first, it was thought that this might be due to sampling errors, but examination of this same year class a year later (in 1952) showed this same type of size distribution. The reason for this unusual size distribution of the 1949 year class cannot be explained at this time.

TABLE 9.--Percentage of each age discarded on the average Georges Bank trip observed in 1951

| Age in <br> years | Year <br> spawned | Number <br> caught | Number <br> discarded | Percent <br> discarded |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1950 | 2,395 | 2,394 | 99.96 |
| 2 | 1949 | 9,991 | 5,803 | 58.08 |
| 3 | 1948 | 38,476 | 631 | 1.64 |
| 4 | 1946 | 1,358 | 0 | 0.00 |
| $6+$ | 1945 and <br> earlier | 329 | 0 | 0.00 |

## AVERAGE WEIGHT IN POUNDS




Figure 12.--Size oomposition of each age in catoh on the average Georges Bank trip observed in 1951.
TABLE 10.--Size composition of each age in the catch on the average Georges Bank trin observed in 1951

| Length in centimeters | Average weight (gutted) in pounds | Total catch |  |  |  |  |  | Age and year classDiscards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 1950 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1949 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 1948 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 1947 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 1946 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6+ \\ 1945 \& \\ \text { earlier } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 1950 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1949 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 1948 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 1950 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1949 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 1948 \end{gathered}$ | $1947$ | 5 64 <br> 1946 1945 <br> earlier  |
| 16 | 0.10 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | 0.12 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | 0.14 | 40 |  |  |  |  |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | 0.17 | 62 |  |  |  |  |  | 62 |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| 20 | 0.19 | 135 |  |  |  |  |  | 135 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | 0.22 | 219 |  |  |  |  |  | 219 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | 0.25 | 282 |  |  |  |  |  | 282 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | 0.29 | 313 | 35 |  |  |  |  | 313 | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | 0.32 | 266 | 40 |  |  |  |  | 266 | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | 0.36 | 395 | 48 |  |  |  |  | 395 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | 0.40 | 194 | 199 |  |  |  |  | 194 | 199 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | 0.45 | 151 | 231 |  |  |  |  | 151 | 231 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | 0.50 | 158 | 425 |  |  |  |  | 158 | 425 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | 0.55 | 99 | 702 |  |  |  |  | 98 | 691 |  | 1 | 11 |  |  |  |
| 30 | 0.61 | 39 | 923 |  |  |  |  | 39 | 920 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| 31 | 0.67 | 29 | 621 |  |  |  |  | 29 | 621 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | 0.73 |  | 708 | 18 |  |  |  |  | 632 | 18 |  | 76 |  |  |  |
| 33 | 0.79 |  | 654 | 32 |  |  |  |  | 569 | 32 |  | 85 |  |  |  |
| 34 | 0.87 |  | 704 | 73 |  |  |  |  | 562 | 54 |  | 142 | 19 |  |  |
| 35 | 0.94 |  | 751 | 209 |  |  |  |  | 362 | 89 |  | 339 | 120 |  |  |
| 36 | 1.00 |  | 640 | 353 |  |  |  |  | 223 | 128 |  | 417 | 225 |  |  |
| 37 | 1.10 |  | 1,353 | 395 |  |  |  |  | 177 | 44 |  | 1,176 | 351 |  |  |
| 38 | 1.20 |  | 1,023 | 677 |  |  |  |  | 45 | 62 |  | 978 | 615 |  |  |
| 39 | 1.30 |  | 737 | 1,209 |  |  |  |  | 23 | 43 |  | 714 | 1,166 |  |  |
| 40 | 1.40 |  | 197 | 2,464 |  |  |  |  |  | 39 |  | 197 | 2,425 |  |  |


TABIE 10.--Size composition of each age in the catch on the average Georges Bank trip observed in 1951 Continued

| Length in centimeters | Average weight (gutted) in pounds | Total catch |  |  |  |  |  | Age and year class $\qquad$ |  |  | Lendings |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 1950 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1949 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 1948 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 1947 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 1946 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 64 \\ 1945 \& \\ \text { earlier } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 1950 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 2 \\ 1949 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 1948 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 1950 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1949 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 1948 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 4 \\ 1947 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 1946 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6+ \\ 1945 \text { \& } \\ \text { arlier } \end{gathered}$ |
| 66 | 5.60 |  |  |  |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 49 |
| 67 | 5.90 |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |
| 68 | 6.10 |  |  |  |  |  | 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55 |
| 69 | 6.40 |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |
| 70 | 6.70 |  |  |  |  |  | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28 |
| 71 | 6.90 |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |
| 72 | 7.20 |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |
| 73 | 7.50 |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| 74 | 7.80 |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| 75 | 8.10 |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 76 | 8.40 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Total |  | 2,395 | 9,991 | 38,476 | 2,011 | 1,358 | 329 | 2,394 | 5,803 | 631 | 1 | 4,188 | 37,845 | 2,011 | 1,359 | 329 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1．During the period 1947 to 1951，the annual destruction of under－ sized haddock on Georges Bank by the Boston fleet alone averaged over $41 / 2$ milion pounds（based on skippers＇estimates as reported to port interviewers）． This quantityr revrescnted over ó million individual fish．

2．Most of the destruction occurred between the months of June and October during which time most of the 2 －year－old fish，which were caught in great numbers，were under 1 pound in weight and unmarketable．

3．The areas of $\xi^{n} \in a t e s t$ discard were the Northern Edge and Southeast Part．Areas of lesser destruction were the western side and the southern end of South Channel．Areas of most intense discard coincided with areas of most intense fishing．

4．During Igri，observers went to sea on seven commercial trips to analyue the catch．Skippers＇estimates of pounds discarded were found to be within 12 percent of estimates made by the Service observers at sea．

5．The size of fish discarded varies with the size of the catch． Smaller fish are saved when the catches are small．The 50－percent point on the average cull curve was $133 / 4$ inches（ 0.9 pounds）．Practically all fish of this size were 2 years old．The＇smaller fish discarded included many l－year－olds while the largest individuals in the discards included many 3－year－oIds．
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