



The National Anguilla Club

BULLETIN

Volume 5, Number 7.

January, 1969.

CONTENTS

Editorial: More Quotations 53

News Item: Eels & Cheese 54

First Sessions & Holding Places:

 I. by Bob Church 55

 II. by Geoffrey Swailes 56

 III. by Phil Shatford 57

 IV. by Alan Hawkins 58

Correspondence: Songs of Praise. Cheese as Bait 60

 Winter Eels. The Eel Record .. 61

Notable Eels: Middlesex 62

EDITORIAL: MORE QUOTATIONS

'...and your bayte shall be a grete angyltwytch (?) or a menow.'
 - Dame Juliana Berners, 'A Treatyse of Fysshynge wyth an Angle' (1496).

'The Pearch, the Tench, and Eele, doe rather bite
 At great red wormes, in Field or Garden bred,
 That haue beene scowr'd in mosse or Fenell rough,
 To rid their filth, and make them hard and tough.'
 - J.D., Esquire, 'The Secrets of Angling' (1613)

'And this Eel...may be caught with divers kinds of baits: as namely, with powdered beef; with a lob or garden worm; with a minnow; or gut of a hen, chicken, or the guts of any fish; or with almost anything...But the eel may be caught, especially, with a little, a very little Lamprey.'
 - Izaak Walton, 'The Compleat Angler' (1653).

'...the bait is a very large lobworm, or a young bird, or a bleak, for it must be noticed that large eels are fish and flesh eaters; a piece of lampern is also a very good bait on a night line.'
 - J.W.Martin, 'The Nottingham Style' (1882).

'Wasp grubs is a good bait during the early autumn.'
 - J.W.Martin, 'Coarse Fish Angling' (1908).

'They feed chiefly on worms, small fish, cray-fishes, etc., but the larger ones are practically omnivorous, and include frogs, water-fowl, water-voles, etc., in their dietary. It has been asserted that Eels leave the water to feed on slugs, pea-pods, etc...this is very doubtful.'
 - C. Tate Regan, 'The Freshwater Fishes of the British Isles' (1911).

'Most of my eel-fishing has been done with worms, but I am convinced that to catch the very big ones you must use fish, either alive or dead, and live ones for choice. A small gudgeon hooked by the lip on a stout perch-hook is probably as good a bait as any.'
 - H.T.Sheringham, 'Coarse Fishing' (1912).

'While a dead fish is the best bait for big eels...they will take...lobworms, pieces of meat or offal, frogs, skinned mice or birds...even paste and...cheese. They will take a live-bait, but a dead one is just as good and less likely to get hung up...I have met anglers who swear by a really "high" dead fish or mouse, saying that eels hunt by scent (which is quite true)...The point is whether, having smelt it out, they are equally ready to eat it.'
 - Richard Walker, 'Still-Water Angling' (1953).

'The established bait...is a large lobworm. If lobworms are scarce, 3-in. lengths cut from the intestines of any sort of poultry make a good substitute. A dead minnow, gudgeon or other small fish is another good bait. An excellent one is a freshly severed eel's head...The pre-eminent bait for large eels is a dead fish. This should be freshly caught...Bream are a little deep in shape, but almost any other species of freshwater fish will be suitable. I aim at a 6-in. bait, but a trifle over or as much as 2-in. under will serve. An angler of my acquaintance...has had success with small herrings when river baits have been unobtainable...Half a kipper is another proven bait for freshwater eels.'
 - Kenneth Mansfield, 'The Art of Angling' (1957).

'Small eels are omnivorous and may be caught on a wide variety of baits, the best of which is undoubtedly worms, but ...I will concentrate upon the catching of the bigger specimens, from 2 lbs. upwards. Although they have been caught on

every conceivable bait, including bread paste, cheese, hempseed, livebaits, spinners and artificial flies, they are mainly carnivorous, and in my opinion the best bait is a dead fish. It has been said...that unfledged birds, skinned mice, small rats or kittens, and chicken entrails are all excellent baits, but I have never had the opportunity or the inclination to put them to the test. Nor, in the interests of domestic harmony, have I ever tried a putrid and decomposing bait, which some anglers claim to be more attractive than a fresh one... freshly caught baits...work well enough.'

- Maurice Ingham, 'Coarse Fishing with the Experts' (1957).

'...a dead fish takes quite a lot of beating as a bait for big eels. Some anglers believe in a big bait of perhaps 6 inches...My choice would be 4-5 inches, and a roach or rudd for preference...if your fish is too big, cut it in half and make two baits of it.'

- Raymond Perrett, 'Eels: How To Catch Them' (1958).

'...while it is possible to catch eels of three pounds on worms, it is very rarely they are caught under three pounds on dead fish. I am not at all sure that dead fish are the best bait for big eels, though the biggest eels I have landed have been caught in that way. The biggest ones I have hooked, though, have been when using worms...'

- Fred J. Taylor, 'Angling in Earnest' (1962).

'...fish, worms and mussels appear to be the most consistently successful... the use of eel as bait is, to an extent, selective, the average weight of those caught being good. Of all fish baits I would normally choose gudgeon or bleak, with small roach, rudd or dace of similar size as second choice. I have no evidence to suppose that a big eel is more attracted to a large bait than...to a small one. The use of big baits results in a lot of abortive runs. So, on balance, I prefer something between three and five inches. Mussels, worms and liver appear to produce more runs than dead fish, but...are prone to the attentions of small eels.'

- Jim Gibbinson, 'Catch A Big Fish' (1967).

*

"FISH COME WHEN HE OFFERS THEM A BIT OF CHEESE"

(Bob Church has drawn attention to this news item from 'The Weekly News', 19.10.68)

'Every evening, just before darkness falls, naturalist Mr. W.A. Ramsey makes a trip down to a pool on the River Leny, which flows past the bottom of his garden. With him, he carries a long, slender stick and a piece of cheese.

Silently and slowly Mr. Ramsey, of Green Shadows, Kilmahog, near Callander, Perthshire, lowers a piece of cheese on the end of the stick to the surface of the dark water and waits. Within minutes, four or five eels which frequent the pool are nibbling away at the cheese. They are attracted to it by its smell. Their meal over, the eels disappear into the black water.

Mr. Ramsey describes the experience as a most fascinating one. "The eels," he says, "vary in length from eighteen inches to one which is over three feet." He judges their size when the water is low. The large one has become so used to Mr. Ramsey that it will even take a piece of cheese from his hand on occasions. He first discovered the eels three years ago when he was using the cheese to feed the trout in the river. "Any day now," says Mr. Ramsey, "the eels will be leaving the river, which they do around mid-October. But they will be back again in mid-April and I'll be back to the pool to feed them.'

(See also the Correspondence section in this issue - Ed.)

FIRST SESSIONS AND HOLDING PLACES: I

by Bob Church

I can certainly make some comments on the points raised again by Ray Brown and Geoff. Swailes in recent Bulletins. I say 'again' because their view is exactly the same as mine was in the Summer of 1966. I have had no reason to change my mind since then, either. I can remember telling Jim Gibbinson and Fred Wagstaffe almost word for word what Ray and Geoff. have been saying. I agree with them.

The Club's successful close-season eel-fishing weekend of May, 1966 (Bob Rolph had one of 5:5) had a base camp at Weedon on the G.U. Canal. This sparked off a lot of enthusiasm for the spot, and during the following three weeks the area took quite a flogging by various members, myself included. If I remember rightly, there were five or six eels caught in that time, although I personally had seven blanks. It was my conclusion that the area was fished out: one did not have to be particularly clever to work this out.

I decided to continue fishing the canal but in another area, and I motored round the adjacent villages and found several areas similar to Weedon. I told Jim, Fred and Phil Shatford of my new idea, which was to fish a likely spot and move on to the next. I would reckon on two sessions or in some cases three, to be sure.

The results which followed proved that the first or sometimes the second night were the most successful for big eels.

The first night in a new spot I fished with Phil, he caught three eels of 3:7, 3:1 and 2:6. We moved for the next session and I had one of 4:12 but another night in the same spot produced a blank. I then moved another mile to the next village. Result: I hooked an eel all of 6 lbs. plus, only to be broken close to the bank. Unfortunately, I was using an experimental trace material. Returning two nights later, I had one of 5½ lbs. I pointed the spot out to Jim who fished there with his brother, Ricky; result: an eel of 5¼ lbs. to Ricky.

After this, the area appeared to be fished out, as several nights were put in by Jim, Fred and others, all with 'no joy'. I made another move of a mile and first session: bang! - I had an eel of 5¼ lbs. This was followed by many blanks for all of us in this area.

Finally, the three of us fished another new area and on the first night Jim had one of 4:10, followed by blanks all round again.

These figures are very brief, but they seem to me to back up what Ray and Geoff. have said. Most of my eel fishing over the years has been on the River Great Ouse and here, too, I agree with what Geoff. wrote in the Bulletin for November, 1968.

With Terry's knowledge of working things out scientifically and mathematically, I think it would be interesting to run some sort of analyses. First, we could get an accurate back-check on our last two or three years' eel-fishing at particular swims, and then see after how many nights the big one came, etc. I think this could be one of the most important discoveries the Club has made, if we can just prove it a little more, taking in a variety of waters. I am sure that now this question is out in the open, and after Terry has analysed the facts, we shall all be in for a surprise.

Gibbinson
Wagstaff

FIRST SESSIONS AND HOLDING PLACES: II

by Geoffrey Swailes

In the Bulletin for Nov. 1968, Terry Coulson advocated a statistical approach to the question of whether or not big eels tend to be caught in the first session at a swim. This I believe to be the correct approach to obtain a definite answer and I should like to see it resolved in this manner. However, a little theoretical discussion might also be interesting.

It is obvious that the main factor in this question is that of feeding spells. If these occur regularly, with non-feeding intervals between, then first-session successes would not be the rule; if, however, eels feed as and when they can, then such successes would be common. Arguing on from this, my thoughts are as follows.

1. If an eel has definite feeding and non-feeding periods, we should expect to find some eels with undigested food in the stomach i.e. food consumed in the feeding period during which it was caught. In my experience, it is rare to find undigested food - I can recall only one such occurrence in perhaps a hundred guttings; most of my eels stomachs are empty. From this I conclude that the 'feeding spell' type of habit is not common.

2. On previously untried waters, it is common to have good catches at first, then results rapidly peter out. This indicates that the eel density was low in the first place (otherwise, catches would not peter out); thus, I conclude that the eels which were present were relatively easy to catch.

3. Eels usually swim for some distance after taking a bait. This run I believe is back to its home or 'holding place', and occurs whenever it siezes a large chunk of food e.g. a fish. It could be that the eel goes back home simply because it has had its fill in one catch.

With these points in mind, I would put forward these views on the eel's way of life:

- (a) The eel has a permanent place of residence.
- (b) The eel roves regularly in search of food; it does not feed in gorging spells but partakes either leisurely or as and when it can.
- (c) The eel roves in a 'territory' around its 'holding place'.
- (d) The area of this territory extends to about 100 yd. from its base.

I would agree that there is much supposition in these views but they do lead me to believe that a big eel is relatively easy to hook (or at least get a run on) if the bait is in its territory, and that the reason for our low rate of catch of big eels is due to the low density of such creatures in all waters.

Finally, if anyone can modify these ideas or even replace them with something better, then I should be delighted. This question of location is of such importance that I think we should not be afraid to stick our necks out in an effort to find out the facts. Heaven knows, mine's out far enough, now!

*

FIRST SESSIONS AND HOLDING PLACES: III

by Phil Shatford

Although the debate on this topic, promoted by Ray Brown and Geoffrey Swailes, is long overdue, conclusions should not be too hastily drawn.

I think there is little doubt that a given area can be temporarily fished out; or, indeed, it may not hold any eels in the first place. Like Ray and Geoffrey, I have found that the first visit to a certain swim, on some waters, seems to give the best result, although I don't think it's such a good idea to flit about from one swim to another that hasn't produced any eels. I believe that a fair trial should be given to a pitch before it is assumed that no eels are present.

Let me bring up a few points that have already been mentioned in previous Bulletins which convince me that one or two sessions at a pitch are not enough.

Firstly, I believe that a big eel only feeds every three or four days at the least, and that in doing so it travels the shortest path that it can. This in turn means that the bait not only has to be attractive to the eel, it also has to be in the eel's path and in the water for not less than three nights and two days in order to catch the feeding-cycle. Even then, I would not be sure there was enough evidence to convince me that I was wasting my time fishing an eel-less swim.

Another thing that is generally accepted is that when the eel is on the rampage, it will mop up almost any food that is in its path. I agree, this may be so on most occasions; but what if a shoal of small fish is resting up on the eel's beat? I don't really think there is much chance of it picking up a dead fish, then.

A pet theory of mine is that on bright nights, small fish have a habit of resting just under the surface. If the eel is feeding on these surface fish, I think a bait on the bottom is virtually a waste of time. In fact, I tried to get some evidence of this last season, but unfortunately only two eels were caught on the top - and they were both accidental catches whilst carp fishing.

I believe that the eel has a definite territorial beat and that the size of it depends entirely on the water, especially with regard to the availability of the food. Unfortunately, I am not able to detect an eel's tracks, so most of my fishing is done in spots that are pure fancy; the exceptions being when I have pre-baited to try to form the eel's beat. I did this on two occasions last summer. The second one, I spent one week pre-baiting heavily with liver, spleen and strips of lung, planning to fish it on the Friday and Saturday - which I did without a bleep from my buzzer. When I started to pack up, a retired gentleman whom I know well came and asked if he could fish in the spot where I had been. Naturally, I said he could. At 08.30 hrs., I watched him cast a double lobworm into my pre-baited swim and then drove off home. The following week, I found out that only five minutes after I had left the lake, that gentleman had an eel of just over three pounds on the bank.

I do not know whether it was the eel's natural beat or not, but I am convinced that this particular eel had not been foraging around during the previous two nights.

I would like to finish by saying that even if your first session does not produce any eels, do not give up your swim without first giving it a reasonable try-out.

*

FIRST SESSIONS AND HOLDING PLACES: IV

by Alan Hawkins

Having read with great interest the two articles on Holding Places in last month's Bulletin, I should like to add a few comments of my own. I feel sure that Geoff. Swailes was not suggesting that one caught the biggest eels on the first visit to a particular spot, but that the first eels also tended to be the last from these spots. On the waters he mentioned, this appears to be so, but many of us know of other places which yield fish trip after trip.

My own view is that explanations of this type of result can only be sought in terms of the individual characteristics of the water being fished, and with the help of three assumptions about eel behaviour, I propose to give a few examples of what I mean. The assumptions are:

1. That large eels are territorial to the extent that they have particular lairs from which they emerge to feed and to which they return afterwards.
2. That eels are uniform in their behaviour patterns.
3. That eels are capable of selecting the most favourable sites for their lairs in waters of uneven topography.

From this it follows that if a water has great variation in depth, type of bottom, etc., then certain areas will be favoured for living stations and a large population will tend to accumulate in such regions. A case in point is Dringhouses Lake, where Chris Bowyer took fifteen eels of 4 lbs. upwards in one season from one spot. This spot was a channel of some 30 ft. depth between marginal weeds and an elongated island of weed some 30 yds. from the bank. Other spots, or casts which missed the channel, were almost entirely unproductive.

Now, Terry raised the point that living stations may not be important if the fish have definite feeding areas elsewhere. I have reservations over this; surely, if an eel emerges to feed, it is hungry from the moment it pokes its head out until it has eaten its fill. Therefore, the most likely place to catch it is close to its hole; it is (a) more likely to find a bait there, and (b) most hungry on emergence. If one is lucky enough to find an area where there is a large population of resident eels then for my money that is where the bait should go.

The results Chris Bowyer and myself have obtained from a gravel pit near Otley last summer seem to bear this out. At the spot we fished there is a system of ridges, and channels between them, running out into the lake at right angles to the bank. The ridges are covered with weed and the channels are of an almost uniform depth of 7-8 ft. along their length. About 80 yds. from the bank, this system stops abruptly at the edge of very much deeper water - up to 20 ft. Of the 150 rod-hours approx. spent here, almost half were spent fishing less than half way along the channels, and half fishing at maximum distance. This six eels landed and the few lost were all taken from maximum casting distance - some 60 yds. or so. We deduce that the eels lived in the deeper water beyond the channels, unfortunately out of range, and that they normally do not venture far from home in search of food.

Thrapston Gravel Pit, however, is about as featureless a stretch of water as one could find, with no holes in the bottom and a uniform depth of 13-14 ft. With no especially favourable spots, it would appear that the eel population is distributed fairly uniformly across the bottom. Removal of a few eels from a particular spot seems to leave a large gap in the low-density population. The formation of these gaps is interesting in another way, in that it suggests that eels do not forage very widely in search of food; and that therefore once again, the best place to catch your eel is at its home: the problem at Thrapston being that there is no way of telling where home may be.

/contd.

On the Great Ouse, however, it is very easy to locate a resident eel. In the regions we usually fish, there is a marginal band of reeds, lily pads and tree stumps with an area of clear water in mid-stream. Practically every gap in this marginal jungle will yield an eel, but one only. Fishing in mid-stream can, however, produce several eels, of generally smaller size. The inference is that the larger specimens are able to acquire a marginal spot under competition from the floating mid-stream population, and are able to defend it against others, suggesting a modicum of territorial aggression in these highly localised habitats.

In conclusion, then, it seems to me that comparisons of numbers of eels, and sizes, between spots on different waters must be made with great caution, and with due regard to the local geography of the waters. The question of 'holding places' if indeed (as I believe) they do exist, raises the whole problem of how to decide on where to fish in a new or unfamiliar water. As for catching the largest eel first, or on the first trip, this must surely be unlikely unless there is only one eel there. After all, the results of the Anguilla Club suggest the large eels to be comparatively rare beasts, at least in our landing nets. Personally, at a spot which consistently yields fish, I am all for removing every eel, in the hope of improving the chances of a monster eel finding the bait before a smaller one gorges it.

*

** May I add an Editorial word of appreciation for the efforts of our contributors this month, which have started the New Year off with a bumper edition? It is fine support for the Club and most entertaining reading, and I trust we shall continue at this high level both in quality and quantity.

Taking off my Editorial hat, for a moment: on the question of stomach contents mentioned by Geoff. Swailes, let us not forget the great weight of data in Sinha & Jones' work (reviewed in Bulletin 5,3 pp. 22, 23) which it would be folly to ignore. We also ran a successful stomach contents project in 1968 which will be analysed in the forthcoming Projects Report. Sinha & Jones' work and our own project results are both in marked contrast to Geoff's findings. Moreover, one has to take into account the eel's slow rate of digestion when interpreting the occurrence of empty stomachs; indeed, this seems to me to throw quite a different light on the matter, and I hope to write about this in the next issue, when the Project Report will have been published. As I said in the previous issue, the evidence does suggest a gorging/fasting type of habit - rather in line with Phil Shatford's supposition.

I was interested to see a good deal of support for my own analysis of the situation in Alan Hawkins' contribution. In one respect, however, Alan misquotes me, and since he then contests the misquotation, may I note here what I actually wrote? - which was that the question of whether or not eels have definite living stations does not necessarily tell us whether or not they may also have localised feeding areas. This is merely a simple proposition in Logic.

Perhaps the most interesting observation about the exchanges so far is that everyone is saying something different; yet, because the evidence adduced is anecdotal in nature, it is impossible to take an objective view of what it all adds up to. It was for this reason that I invited all members to supply standardised, factual data about their results on multiple sessions at particular 'spots', for statistical analysis; and I acknowledge the support from Bob Church and Geoff. Swailes for this approach. Let me also reassure Alan Hawkins that he need have no fears that the analysis will ignore such obviously relevant factors as Class of water, rate of catch and average weight, once I have enough data to process. Finally, may I appeal once again to members to get down to the job of extracting the needful data from their Angling Diaries.

*

CORRESPONDENCE

SONGS OF PRAISE

From Walter Spencer: "How does anyone express his thanks, when he has been welcomed into a great Club like the NAC the way I have been welcomed? Honestly, I was really knocked flat by the letters received, only hours (it seemed) after being notified of my election. People who were only names on a list of members suddenly became friends, advice flowed in together with offers of help and statements like, 'Looking forward to going eeling with you next season.' All this adds up to a feeling of being wanted, a part of something, not just an isolated individual.

"Never did I think when I wrote to you months ago for advice on how to improve my catch of eels, that all that has happened, would. If you hear of a roach-angler suddenly turning to beach-casting, then you will get some idea of what I have been put through these last few weeks, under the guidance of my new friends and fellow-members Arthur Smith and Alan Hawkins! I was quickly made to realise that my lack of 2 lb.-plus eels was partly because of my tackle. So, out goes my light rod, away goes the seven and eight pound line and number eight hooks; instead, we progressed to a 10 ft. rod of 4½ lb. test curve, number 1 hooks and stainless steel trace wire. Not for me the humble worm, but baits to tempt a 4 lb.-plus eel: baits like 3 and 4 oz. rudd, or king-size bunches of lobs. Such is the knowledge I have been given; who can say I am not fortunate?

"Unfortunately, the active eel season is at an end, so I have to curb my desires to try myself against Anguilla, but with friends like mine I hope to become a useful and successful member of the Club; and in the process, break a few records for the Yorkshire sub-Group which we are forming together with Chris Bowyer. I believe we are going to be active in the Selby area next year; I feel sure this area holds the eel we are looking for, and if it does, I hope we are not found wanting.

"Please let me, through the medium of the NAC Bulletin, say 'thank you' to all of our members and hope that I may have the pleasure of eeling with them some day next year."

CHEESE AS BAIT

From Bob Church: "With regard to the item from 'The Weekly News' (p. 54, this issue) do many of use cheese as bait? Smallish Avon and Stour eels go mad for cheese, I can vouch for that."

** There is mention of eels eating cheese in Bulletin, July 1965, p. 3 in a short note by Arthur Sutton about the R. Great Ouse. I also recall that Bob Church reported the capture of a 1½ lb. eel on cheese at the end of a chub-fishing session on the Gt. Ouse in 1967. We know that scent is particularly important in the foraging of eels - perhaps cheese is worth more serious investigation as bait?

The news item is also interesting as another piece of evidence that eels' feeding is not necessarily confined to the bottom, recalling Phil Shatford's experiments with floating baits, mentioned on p. 57 (this issue).

It is also noteworthy that Mr. Ramsey thinks that the eels leave the river in mid-October and return in mid-April. Possibly, we shall be inclined to think it more likely that they stay put, but become relatively inactive during the Winter months - see the further correspondence on Winter eels, below. In any case, it is interesting to note that Mr. Ramsey's observations tally with the results of our own work and the scientific studies.

WINTER EELS

From Phil Shatford: "Have you any knowledge of any members fishing the warm-outfalls from power stations during Winter? If so, I would like to drop them a line and exchange views."

From Dave Marlborough: "I recently witnessed two eels caught, (a) one of about $1\frac{1}{2}$ lb. taken from the sea at Walton-on-Naze, Essex, on November 1st., 1968. Bait: ragworm; and (b) two eels about 10 ins. long, each taken legering from a floodwater swim on the R. Great Ouse just below Tempsford Sluice (upstream of Great Barford, Beds.) on November 27th., 1968. Bait: paste. On neither occasion did I have my thermometer with me, but I think both are noteworthy to show some activity in Winter."

** There is no doubt that eels do not become totally inactive during the Winter. Sinha & Jones' work (reviewed in Bulletin 5,3 pp. 22, 23) shows that although the feeding of eels falls to very low levels during the Winter as compared with the Summer, yet it does not cease altogether. The amount of food in the eels' stomachs was measured in terms of a 'fullness index' which fell from a peak level around 10 in Summer to around 1 in Winter. It is common experience amongst anglers that an eel is occasionally 'picked up' by accident during Winter - often in rivers during conditions of spate; I have had the odd eel this way myself, and a friend of mine had a highly-prized day's bait-fishing on the R. Test 'ruined' by the attentions of eels during flood conditions in February 1967. There was a fair amount of debate on this subject in the first two Volumes of the Bulletin which interested members may look up through the Indexes; Roger Standen's factual review (May 1966, p. 8) is a particularly useful summary. My own view is that eels are hard enough to catch in Summer, and if they are ten times harder in Winter, I'll stick to other more productive activity!

Eeling in warm-water outfalls from power stations is another matter, of course. Fred Wagstaffe reviewed this subject in Bulletin January 1966, p. 9. Any members with experience of this, please note Phil Shatford's interest.

THE EEL RECORD

From Phil Shatford: "What are your feelings about the dismissal by the Record Fish Committee of the $8\frac{1}{2}$ lb. eel record? I feel they had no excuse for taking this well-authenticated record from the list. Is there anything we can do as a Group to get it re-instated? If I was lucky enough to capture a seven pounder, I would not really feel as if it were a new record. Can you find out how the rest of the Club reacts?"

From Ernie Orme: "There is something troubling me about the Record Fish Committee scrapping the old Eel Record. There is something about Mr. Mitchell's wonderful and authenticated $8\frac{1}{2}$ lb. Anguilla that is inspiring. Could we not do something to persuade them to let it be?"

** Few members will have missed the news in both Angling Times and Angler's Mail (issues dated 12th. and 19th. December) that the British Record (Rod Caught) Fish Committee had decided to "prune" fourteen records from the list, including the eel record. Claims for the vacant records were invited above a minimum weight of 6:8 in the case of the eel. A.T. (Dec. 19th) mentions that Club member Bob Jones is claiming his superb 7:8 specimen from Greystone Lake (18.5.68).

One thing: according to A.T., the Committee was 'embarrassed' when 'an A.T. investigation' revealed that Mr. Mitchell's eel was on show in Veal's, Bristol. Had either shown the sense to consult with this Club, we could have saved them respectively the investigation and the embarrassment. Correspondence, please!

Notable Eels: MIDDLESEX

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>CLASS</u>	<u>WEIGHT</u>	<u>LENGTH</u>	<u>GIRTH</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>BAIT</u>	<u>CAPTOR</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>
R.Thames, Hampton Court	1.2	4:4			Sep 59		Worms	D.A.Kennedy	A.T. 18.9.59, p. 13
Sunbury Weir	1.2	4:0			4 Sep 65	night	Live-bait	M.W.Johnson	M.W.Johnson
Yacht Basin, Penton Hook	2.1	4:8			66	04.00	Bleak db	D.Finch	D.Finch via G.Moss
Little Britain Lake, Cowley	2.	6:8	45 $\frac{1}{2}$	8	? Jul 47	day	Worm	G.Moss	G.Moss
		6:0	42	8 $\frac{1}{2}$? Jul 47	day	Worm	G.Moss	G.Moss
Mayfield Lake, W.Drayton	2.	7:12	48	9	? Jul 58	night	Dead-bait	G.Moss	G.Moss
Diana Pond, Bushey Park	2.2	4:1			Sep 66		Lobworm	A.O'Toole	A.M. 16.9.66, p. 2
Shepperton W. Lake (HAS)	2.	6:0			29 Jun 68	20.45	2 x Lobworms	C.Dakin	(A.T. 11.7.68, p. 9 (A.M. 12.7.68, p. 1
Neta AS Pit, Shepperton	2.	5:0			Jul 67	day	3 x Maggots	T.Dobson	(A.T. 27.7.67, p. 14 (A.M. 28.7.67, p. 2
A lake, Shepperton	2.	5:4			Jul 67	03.00	Small worm	J.Pawley	(A.M. 11.8.67, p. 1 (& photo 18.8.67, p.3
Moor Lane Fishery, Wraysbury	2.	5:8			Aug 60		Lobworm	G.W.Davey	A.T. 9.9.60, p. 1
		4:12			Aug 57			R.Osborn	A.T. 23.8.57, p. 13
A gravel pit, W.Drayton	2.	8:6			63		Found dead by	M.N.Walls	A.T. .63
Small lake, Harrow	2.	7:8	48		63		Found dead		A.T. .63
King George V Res., Ponders End	2.	5:1			19.9.66		Lobworm	T.Askew	T.Askew via A.Sutton
Horton Pool, Staines	2.2	?	52" & 48"		Found dead after	'63	freeze by	C.Glenton	F.G. 20.4.63 p. 559(P)
G.U.Canal, Willesden	2.3	4:7			27.6.64		Dead-bait	M.W.Johnson	M.W.Johnson