

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

FOURTH MEETING

Tuesday, 3rd June, 1952

In the Chair: H.E. Professor B. Bergersen (Norway)

The CHAIRMAN: I hereby declare the International Whaling Commission's Fourth Meeting open, and I extend to all Commissioners, expert advisers and guests, a very hearty welcome.

I now have the honour of introducing Mr. Nugent, Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Mr. G.R.H. NUGENT: Mr. Chairman, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am very privileged to say a word of welcome to you this afternoon on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, and to welcome you and your Commission to London where you are holding your Fourth Conference this year. I know that most of you know London well and therefore you know, I hope, how to enjoy yourselves when you have an interval from your labours. London, I always feel, has much to offer. I certainly will not try to say it is ahead of any other capital in the world, but I think it can hold up its head with any other capital, and I hope it will provide you with interest and pleasure while you are here.

I feel it is unfortunate you did not come last year. You would have then seen the Festival of Britain, but if you like the frivolous side of it, you can still go to the Battersea Pleasure Gardens; they are not as good as the Tivoli Gardens in Copenhagen. Next year, Mr. Chairman, you might consider starting your Conference a week earlier and then adjourn on the Wednesday so that your Delegates can go to the Derby. You, Gentlemen, I know, are engaged in a hazardous business where you are accustomed to taking risks and gambles, well, you would have a chance on Epsom Downs!

I shall have the pleasure, I think, of meeting you this evening at a more informal occasion when you come to our reception at the Savoy Hotel, and I look forward to that with much pleasure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just a word of tribute to the great work that you have done in forming the International Whaling Commission and carrying it on as you have. I believe that you have now seventeen member countries, and perhaps, indeed, that number might be added to. I feel it is a great achievement that you have secured here. I am quite sure that if this International Commission had not been created, the results would have been disastrous indeed. But what you have done is to determine first of all where whales may be caught, secondly when they may be caught, and thirdly how many may be caught. I feel that I would not be overstating it if I said that had you not formed this Commission under your Convention, then with another five or ten years of uncontrolled, indiscriminate catching of whales, very likely the whale stock in the Southern Hemisphere would have followed the same course as that in the Northern Hemisphere, and the whale would have been virtually exterminated.

Not only would that have been serious in one way, but in several. First of all, it would have meant that the whaling industry would have been at an end. Secondly, the immensely valuable supply of whale oil that comes to many countries, including my own, would have been lost for ever.

We are - and I particularly as a farmer - very familiar with the old story which I think is common to all countries, the story of the peasants who grew hungry one winter and proceeded to eat the seed corn. We are all familiar with that one. I do not believe that people are so generally familiar with the story of the world who nearly proceeded to eat the stock whale, because that is what we, in this world, nearly did.

I recollect the allusion in the book that most of us in this country - and I think most people in America - have read, "Moby Dick", where the whale catcher - that is about a hundred years ago - predicts that there seem to be so many whales in the ocean that never would they all be caught. Well, this prediction, of course, has proved quite wrong, and there is no doubt, as I say, that had we gone on as we were going, we would have exterminated them from the Southern Hemisphere, the same as from the Northern.

I recognise, Mr. Chairman, that in the working of your Organisation it must at times be far from easy. You have difficult problems to deal with. You have from time to time, no doubt, infringements of your regulations, and you have, what is perhaps more difficult, suspected infringements, and then Members feel a doubt as to whether the Commission is really valuable.

I would say this to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your Delegates, that no human organisation is perfect, it cannot be, because there are only human beings working it. But so long as your Commission is in operation, it is of immense value, and even if it is imperfect in its working, it is still something very well worth preserving.

When I knew that I was going to say a word to you this afternoon, I thought of a book written by a very well known American - he is dead now - Wendell Wilkie, about eight or ten years ago. The title of the book was "One World", and the theme of the book was that despite all the differences of our different countries, our different nationalities, we nevertheless were one world. We have common interests and when we hurt each other we hurt ourselves. You, in your Organisation, are living this theme; and you are conscious as few other people are, of the limitation, in this particular respect, of the whale population, the limitation in the world of how few there are, how easy it would be to exterminate them altogether. What you have set out to do is to put into practice that ideal that Wendell Wilkie expressed in his book, "One World".

I feel that apart from the practical effect of your regulations and your procedure, your experts have contrived to define just what the position is; how many whales exist, what is their rate of reproduction, and generally what the whole picture is. So that now everyone who takes part in the business of the whaling industry does know what can be done safely, and what will be an injury to the future. To put that at its lowest level of ordinary human gain, which after all moves us all, up to a point, you know that if you overstep that mark that you will be injuring the business of the whaling industry; and, put at a higher level, you know that if you do overstep the mark, that if you do catch and kill more whales than should be killed, you are damaging the

whale stocks for posterity. Even today, Mr. Chairman, with all the uncertainties there are in the world, I believe that at the heart of everybody is the same wish, the same inspiration, that when we leave this world, as we all shall in due course, we shall leave the world a slightly better place than when we came into it, and not a slightly worse one. Even if we are not always conscious of that thought, I think that the work of your Commission which can focus the attention of the public opinion on those who do overstep the mark, may have some braking effect on those who might infringe. So I do feel, Mr. Chairman, that you have here an Organisation of tremendous value.

It may be that as the intense shortage of oils and fats has eased somewhat this year, over what it had last year, the price is a good deal lower, the price today is under half what the peak price was last year, the intense pressure to produce more whale oil will perhaps, to some extent, ease the problems of the working of your Commission. I saw, Mr. Chairman, that last year you had a record yield of oil of 2.3 million barrels. I am not sure whether I ought to congratulate you on that, or to commiserate, whether it was too much or too little; but be that as it may, we have all been very glad to use it.

Just one practical point that I hope you will consider: we, in this country, and I believe many others, are extremely short of animal protein meal for our livestock. I hope it may be possible that, in your deliberations, or the deliberations of your experts, you may devise some means of converting the very valuable whale meat into meal. I know it is a direct competitor with the oil, but it may be that now that the disparity of price between the value of the meal and the value of the oil is not so great, it may be perhaps a possible economic proposition. In any event the need is there, Mr. Chairman, and I hope you may perhaps give it a thought.

May I finally pay my tribute to you, Mr. Chairman, for the work you have done in leading the Commission this year, and to those of you who have taken part in leading it and in forming it. May I say that I am very proud that we, in this country, have had some part in this and, if I may say so, I am particularly proud that you have appointed an Englishman as your Secretary, Mr. Dobson. I am sure that the work is far from easy at times and requires great patience and great faith; I feel that in Mr. Dobson you have those qualities.

Well, Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by giving you my best wishes for a very successful Conference, for success in your deliberations, and for your future strength, and my best wishes for the future great contribution that you are making not only to your own industry and to your own countries, but to the whole community, so long as you keep this Commission working for the benefit of all.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to offer to Mr. Nugent our heartiest thanks for his kind words and for his interesting and inspiring speech. May I also, Mr. Nugent, ask you to convey the thanks of all those present to the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries for the friendly co-operation which they have always extended to the Commission from the very beginning of our existence. The Commission takes the opportunity of welcoming the observers and guests from the F.A.O. the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea and the International Whaling Association.

The Commission can now proceed with the Agenda as set out in the document which you have received. Before doing so, however, it is my duty to tell the Press that it is not possible for them to be present during the remainder of the Commission's Agenda. I am very sorry to say so, but according to our Rules of Procedure only the Commissioners, their advisers and a few guests may be present. (The Press withdrew).

Although you have received the Agenda of this fourth Meeting of the Commission, may I now ask if there are any delegates who have objections or suggestions or additions? I take it then that the Agenda is approved.

Mr. Dobson has a few words to say.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two quite simple things that it may be better for me to deal with now. First of all, a rather important matter, I want to be quite satisfied that you can all hear what is said from the dais here, because when we had a trial run, we had to move some people off the flanks to a table in front. Are you all quite comfortably situated? Because if not we shall try to make alterations.

The second point is, you have, I hope all registered in the Delegates' lounge. If you have not done so, I would ask you to do so at the conclusion of the Meeting when we adjourn for tea. There are a number of papers of which, I hope, you have all got a complete set. There is first of all a paper provided by the Foreign Office with regard to administrative arrangements; then there are the purely whaling papers, numbered from I to XI, and I would ask you to see that you have all those and if you have not got them, they will be provided to you from the room on the next floor opposite the Delegates' lounge, entitled the Documents room.

The final point I want to call attention to is that you have been, or you should all have been invited to the Government cocktail party this evening at half past six at the Savoy Hotel, and if there is anyone who has not received an invitation, would he let Mrs. Tait or Mr. Durrant at the end of this table know and that will be put right. Then there is a party at the Natural History Museum on Friday, and again, if you have not received invitations to that, we will put it right if you will let us know. Then you have had notices of a lecture on the 9th June in this building about THE VOYAGE OF "DISCOVERY II" 1950 - 51 by Dr. H.F.P. HERDMAN. And finally I was asked to give a warning that the U.S.S.R. are very kindly going to give a little cocktail party on Thursday, the 5th June, and we shall have some further information about that later.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that is practically everything. But one point I want to get on to the records. We have received an invitation, that we always get, for this Commission to be represented at the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, meeting at the end of September, and I took it upon myself, consulting the Chairman afterwards, that the Chairman

should represent it at that meeting; so that has been disposed of. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now consider item 4 on the Agenda. We have to elect a chairman for the next three years' period. May I move the election of Dr. Remington Kellogg as chairman. I am sure it is quite unnecessary to give this Meeting any special reasons for that proposal. Everyone who has an interest in the preservation of the whale stocks owes a real debt to Dr. Kellogg. Through all the years he has been a steadfast and inspiring central figure in the great work of conservation. I move the election of Dr. Remington Kellogg as Chairman for the next three years.

Any other proposals?

The SECRETARY: May I ask each country to say, 'yes'.

For: Australia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, South Africa, Sweden, U.S.S.R., U.K.

Abstention: U.S.A.

That is carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN: As I leave this platform, I think it is my duty to offer my warmest thanks to all the participants in the meetings which have been held during my period of Chairmanship. I have always had the greatest possible measure of help and co-operation from each and every one of them. Furthermore, I feel I owe a very special debt of gratitude to our Secretary, my old and very valued friend, Mr. Dobson.

(The Vice-Chairman, Dr. Remington Kellogg now takes the Chair)

The CHAIRMAN: We now come to the election of the Vice-Chairman for three years. Nominations from the floor are now in order.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I should like to move the motion for Vice-Chairman for the next three years of Mr. Lienesch of the Netherlands.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lienesch of the Netherlands, nominated for Vice-Chairman: are there any other nominations? Is there a seconder? Seconded by South Africa. We will now poll the delegations if there are no further nominations.

For: Australia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, South Africa, Sweden, U.S.S.R., U.K., U.S.A.

Abstention: Netherlands.

The voting is unanimous.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 5, Appointments to our Standing Committees. The Commission will be polled in pursuance of Rules of Procedure as to whether any additional countries desire representation.

First, on the Scientific Committee. As it now stands, Australia has on the Scientific Committee Mr. J.E. Cummins. Is that O.K?

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Does Brazil desire representation on the Scientific Committee?

(Brazil): Just as an observer.

The CHAIRMAN: Canada, Mr. G.R. Clark.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Denmark: Mr. Erichsen, do you desire representation on the Scientific Committee?

Mr. P.F. ERICHSEN (Denmark): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: France has Dr. P. Budker on the Scientific Committee. Do you want any additional ones?

(France). No.

The CHAIRMAN: Iceland?

His Ex. A. Kl. Jonsson (Iceland): None.

The CHAIRMAN: Japan?

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): I should like to have Mr. N. Nishikawa nominated in addition to Mr. Omura.

The CHAIRMAN: We have Dr. Takeda, Dr. Omura and Mr. Nishikawa.

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Then it is all right; no further additions.

The CHAIRMAN: For the Netherlands we have Dr. Lienesch and Dr. Slijper on the Scientific Committee.

Dr. G. J. LIEBESCH (Netherlands): We should like to do it in this way, that our representative will be Dr. Slijper in the first place.

The CHAIRMAN: You will reverse it then.

New Zealand?

Mr. F.H. CORNER (New Zealand): We do not require membership.

The CHAIRMAN: Norway?

His Ex. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): We would like Mr. Knudtzon in addition.

The CHAIRMAN: At present you have Professor Bergersen, Mr. Vangstein and Mr. Melsom. The same next year?

Panama, do you wish representation?

Mr. R.R. ALEMAN (Panama): No thank you, we will take the advice of gentlemen more experienced in these matters.

The CHAIRMAN: South Africa, Mr. E. Larsen.

Mr. C. Von BONDE (South Africa): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Sweden?

Mr. M. de WACHENFELT (Sweden): We have had no instructions to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN: U.S.S.R. We have Mr. Tverianovich and Mr. Ogorodnev.

(U.S.S.R.): Just Mr. Tverianovich.

The CHAIRMAN: The United Kingdom? At present it is Dr. Mackintosh.

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (United Kingdom): No change, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: U.S.A. I think I will still stay on, if you have no objections.

We now come to the Technical Committee.

Australia, F.F. Anderson.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I will continue.

The CHAIRMAN: Brazil? I presume they have not indicated representation.

Canada? G. R. Clark.

Mr. C. R. CLARK (Canada): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Denmark? Mr. Erichsen, do you wish to be on it?

Mr. P. F. ERICHSEN (Denmark): No.

The CHAIRMAN: France, M. Martin? M. Anziani do you want to be on the Technical Committee?

M. ANZIANI (France): No, thank you. Merci, je n'ai pas de qualite.

The CHAIRMAN: Iceland?

His Ex. A.K. JONSSON (Iceland): I have no wish to be represented on that Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Japan?

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Maeda, Mr. Nara and Mr. Takeda, are these names already in?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know, I have not the papers.

The SECRETARY: They have not been on before. In the past we have only had one man on the Committee, and he brings any advisers he likes. Mr. Maeda has been on the Committee at your request.

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Is it necessary to restrict it to one person?

The SECRETARY: They may bring any experts they like.

Mr. A. KODAI (Japan): In that case it is all right to appoint Mr. Maeda.

The CHAIRMAN: Mexico do not seem to be represented on the Technical Committee. Netherlands?

Mr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): No change.

The CHAIRMAN: New Zealand?

Mr. F.H. CORNER (New Zealand): Representation is not required.

The CHAIRMAN: Norway? Mr. Knudtson, yes.

Panama?

(Panama): The same position.

The CHAIRMAN: South Africa, Dr. Von Bonde.

Sweden?

M. de WACHENFELT (Sweden): Nobody, thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: U.S.S.R. M. Solyanik?

M. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: United Kingdom?

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (United Kingdom): Add the name of Mr. Leach.

The CHAIRMAN: U.S.A. Mr. Kling.

I believe that now completes the composition of the Scientific Committee and the Technical until the next meeting, the Fifth Meeting of the Commission.

The SECRETARY: Before you pass on from the Appointments to Committees in Item 5, I am a little bit puzzled. You will remember that the Committees were set up under an amendment to the Rules of Procedure which was read by Dr. Deason from manuscript. It was rather concocted as we went along, and I just want to ask a simple question which may be of pure formality: how long do these committees last as regards chairmen? There is nothing in the Rules of Procedure about electing a chairman. I assume, therefore, (it is probably only a formality, and you will continue with the present chairmen) that at the last meeting of the Committees the chairmen should be either appointed or re-elected for the ensuing year. If that is your wish, I will see that that is done at each final meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: It was my understanding that each of these two Committees would elect their own chairman, but there was no time set for such an election. If we are going to function advantageously, it will be necessary for the chairmen of each of these committees to continue in the Chair until the following meeting at least, because there are matters that come up that are referred to the different Committees; and unless there is a chairman who continues in office there is no-one to handle those details.

Now, what is your wish? Shall we have the new chairmen elected following the first plenary session of the next meeting of the Commission, or do you wish the chairmen to be elected during the present session of the Commission? And to hold it over until the next meeting? It is entirely up to you. Are there any recommendations from the floor?

Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): I would prefer to have the chairmen elected at the last meeting every year. I think that would be the right way to do it.

The CHAIRMAN: Then he would continue through the next meeting.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): I propose the opposite to that because the actual membership of the Committees varies from year to year. You may be nominating a man as Chairman who may not actually be a delegate or representative of his country. I think they should be elected, in order to have the confidence of the members of the committee, at the first meeting of the committee in the new year.

The CHAIRMAN: I have not correctly followed parliamentary procedure. First, we should have a seconder to Professor Bergersen's proposal. Does anyone wish to second Professor Bergersen's proposal? Dr. Von Bonde seconds it. Is there a seconder for Mr. Anderson? Mr. Clark seconds it.

We must deal with the amendment first, that is that the Chairman of each of these committees is to be elected at the first meeting of those committees after the first plenary session.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Anderson's proposal which was seconded by Mr. Clark is that the Chairman of each committee, that is the committees we are talking about, shall be appointed at the first meeting of those committees after the plenary.

For: Australia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Japan, U.S.S.R., U.K., U.S.A.

Against: Norway, South Africa.

Abstentions: Iceland, Netherlands, Panama, Sweden.

Ten in favour, two against and four abstentions. That is carried.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no need to go back to the original proposal.

The SECRETARY: May I raise one final point, that is on the Finance Committee. Mr. Chairman, the question of the Finance Committee is a little bit different because under the Rules of Procedure it quite clearly says that the Finance Committee is appointed by the Chairman and appoints its own Chairman. The members of that Finance Committee as appointed by Professor Bergersen last year were Dr. Lienesch, Mr. Clark and Professor Bergersen. Dr. Lienesch was appointed by the Committee as Chairman.

The point I put to you is: "Are you content as new Chairman to appoint that Committee again".

The CHAIRMAN: They did a swell job last year, and I suggest we continue with it for the present year as the Finance and Administration Committee. I do not think that calls for a vote under the Rules of Procedure.

Item 6 - Now that this Finance and Administration Committee has been appointed, the documents relevant to item 6 will be referred to that Committee for report back at the appropriate Plenary session.

Item 7 - the draft of the Third Annual Report is now up for your approval.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, this Report follows the usual form, and I should be delighted if anybody would suggest some amendments; but I only wanted to say that the only difference between this Report and its predecessors is that among the appendices the late Chairman thought it would be desirable to print the Chairman's Report. It would, of course, be a year late as it were, but there is no record of the Chairman's Report except in the actual document which is circulated and is very easy to lose, whereas if you had the Chairman's Report always as an appendix to the Annual Report it is in print and handy to refer to. Therefore, the Chairman's Report is included as one of the appendices. Now, strictly speaking, Mr. Chairman, I do not think you can get any further than approving this Report provisionally, because I happen to know that owing to the meeting of certain committees they are going to recommend the inclusion among the appendices of certain other documents. I suggest they should rather provisionally approve the lay-out of this Report subject to what may come into the Report of the two Committees.

The CHAIRMAN: We now have before the Commission the adoption provisionally of the Third Annual Report. To expedite things, I think the quickest way is to poll the Delegates.

The SECRETARY: The provisional approval of the Third Report without prejudice to certain further recommendations with regard to the contents of the appendices. Australia?

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Yes, but I see there are a few blanks in clause 2. Is there any chance of filling those in beforehand?

The SECRETARY: Well, I will endeavour to. They were not available; you always have to come forward with a lot of gaps.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): We are always interested in the number of Governments which have ratified since the previous meeting.

The SECRETARY:

For: Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, South Africa, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, U.S.A.

Against: None.

Abstentions: Brazil.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, may I ask if that Annual Report will be finalised before the Conference adjourns with these blanks filled in that Mr. Anderson referred to?

The SECRETARY: I shall certainly do my best to, and re-circulate it. It may be difficult if everybody rushes off on Saturday. There are a number of points, there are some I want to discuss with Mr. Clark, there may be quite a lot of finalisation. If the Commission says it has got to be done before they leave on Saturday, it shall be done before they leave, but I am not sure if it is going to be quite so easy.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): What I am wondering is, otherwise how it is going to be taken care of, if it is only approved provisionally.

The SECRETARY: It is to be taken as provisionally approved, subject to verbal amendments to be agreed between the Secretary and the Chairman. But I do not want to take sole responsibility and I will do my utmost to fill in any gaps.

The CHAIRMAN: Under Item 8 - The Commission will await the submission of the Research Report by the Scientific Committee. There is no action to be taken until the Report is actually submitted for your consideration at the Plenary Session.

Under Item 9 - The adoption of the Report by the Special Committee on Model Log Book sheets. That, of course, will come in with the recommendation from the Technical Committee when it is submitted.

I think everyone understands clearly now that no action will be taken on either the Scientific Committee Report or the Technical

Committee Report until they actually submit those Reports to the Commission for consideration.

Now we come to Item 10 - Review of the 1951/52 Season's catch. It has been suggested that we defer Item 10 until the Plenary Session tomorrow afternoon. That will give us adequate time to review and have the full details of the season's catch. I would like to suggest at this time that the Finance and Administration Committee meet tomorrow morning at 10 a.m., and that the other two Committees - the Scientific and Technical Committees - meet tomorrow morning, either at 10.45 or 11 a.m. Is there a recommendation from the Committee Chairmen as to what time would be most convenient?

Dr. C. VON BONDE (South Africa): Ten o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: The Technical Committee at 10 a.m.

The SECRETARY: It collides with the Finance Committee.

Dr. C. VON BONDE (South Africa): Make it 10.30 a.m., then, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: It is agreed that the Scientific Committee and the Technical Committee will meet tomorrow in their respective rooms at 10.30 a.m.

Looking over the remainder of the Agenda, Items 12, 13, 14 and 15 will be delayed until a later Plenary Session. The Finance and Administration Committee are asked to consider the date and place of the next meeting, and report their recommendation to the appropriate Plenary Session. Unless there is any further business

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Am I right in understanding that the date and place of the next meeting will be considered primarily by the Finance and Administration Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: That is right.

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): In that event I should like to express my opinion to the Committee which would consider this question.

The CHAIRMAN: That will be the Committee that will ordinarily consider the question of the next meeting.

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Can I attend as an Observer at that meeting?

The CHAIRMAN: Ordinarily, no.

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): All right, I understand, I will send my notes to the Committee. That is perfectly proper. I am sure Mr. Clark will look after me.

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (United Kingdom): Under Item 10, I am not quite sure what was decided. That is the review of the 1951/52 Season's catch. Is that to be discussed at a special Plenary meeting?

The CHAIRMAN: That will be given at the Plenary Session tomorrow afternoon, commencing at 2.30 p.m.

In view of the fact that three Committees must act on matters on the Agenda, this Plenary Session is now closed.

(The meeting rose at 3.45 p.m.)

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Delegation takes pleasure in inviting all Commissioners, advisers, secretariat, observers and their wives to the Soviet Embassy on Thursday, June 5th, at 8 o'clock p.m. for a film show.

A Soviet documentary film in technicolour will be given. The film is called "Soviet Whaling". It is dedicated to the work of the expedition "SLAVA" for 1950/51 and that of our Pacific whaling expedition "ALEUT" and the land station on the Kuril Islands.

After this show, which will take one hour, there will be a cocktail party. Mr. Dobson will be kind enough to give the address to you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Solyanik, I am sure we all appreciate this invitation. It is at 8 o'clock on Thursday, at the Soviet Embassy, 18 Kensington Palace Gardens, W.8. Mr. Solyanik has kindly given me a number of slips to give round so as to remind you of the address.

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Before we disperse, I would like to request the Secretariat to distribute the publications I have brought with me.

The SECRETARY: They are in the Document Room opposite the lounge.

The CHAIRMAN: If the various countries will remain in their seats, Mr. Dobson will bring Mr. Kodaki's publications in and distribute them.

The Finance and Administrative Committee meets at 9.30, the Scientific Committee and the Technical Committee will meet at 10.30, the Second Plenary Session will be held at 2.30 tomorrow afternoon, and this Plenary Session is closed.

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

FOURTH MEETING

Wednesday, 4th June, 1952

In the Chair: Dr. Remington Kellogg (U.S.A.)

The CHAIRMAN: The Second Plenary Session is now open, and the first item, the main item for this afternoon, is No. 10, a review of the 1951/52 Season's Catch. I am going to warn all of you that as soon as Mr. Vangstein completes his statement we are going to take up the three reports that the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics has prepared. I am sure all of you appreciate the immense amount of work required to prepare these reports, and I am sure most of you have some interest in them. For that reason, when we take up each report, I personally will appreciate it if each one of you, or severally anyway, have questions to ask about the contents of the reports, and we will see if we can get some answers from Mr. Vangstein or others that may have the information you may have in mind. I think it is not more than a matter of courtesy that we indicate by our questions that we have read the reports that have been furnished to us for our guidance.

I call upon Mr. Vangstein to present his report.

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): Gentlemen, the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics has, as in previous years, prepared certain statistic material for the use of the International Whaling Commission. In the folder which has been distributed you will find:

International Whaling Statistics Nos. XXVII and XXVIII. No. XXVII comprises the operations in fields outside the Antarctic in the year 1950. No. XXVIII comprises the operations in the Antarctic in 1950/51.

At the meeting in Cape Town we were requested to include in the statistical publications tables showing the production of by-products. In this connection I draw attention to the table on page 34 in No. XXVII. It shows the production of by-products in the Antarctic since 1945/46. We are now engaged in collecting statements of the production of by-products in fields outside the Antarctic, and we hope to get a fairly complete table in our next issue of the statistics.

The folder contains, further, a provisional copy of International Whaling Statistics No. XXIX. This comprises the catch outside the Antarctic in 1951. The statistics for 1951 are, as far as we know, complete as regards the number of whales and production of oil. We have, however, not received measurement statements from some of the companies, and the tables giving the average size etc., are, therefore, incomplete.

In connection with the statistics relating to the catch outside the Antarctic a chart has been prepared showing where the operations have taken place and which companies have operated in 1951. On the same chart we have shaded the areas where the hunting of baleen whales is prohibited.

Finally, the folder contains some statistical statements and calculations relating to the operations in the Antarctic in the season 1951/52. With respect to the statements concerning the catch in number of whales and production of oil, the material is complete. The tables showing the distribution of the catch between the various fields in the Antarctic and the average size, etc., of the animals caught comprise whales taken by all the expeditions excepting factory ship "Slava". Two days ago I had the whaling statistics from "Slava", and all the statistics will have to be worked out again.

The Committee of International Whaling Statistics is very grateful for the courtesy shown by the whaling companies. Most of

the whaling companies, and especially those who operate in the Antarctic, answer by return to our enquiries, and the statistical statements are sent to us immediately after the return of the expeditions home. Without this compliance on the part of the whaling companies it would not have been possible for us this year to obtain such a complete survey of the operations in the Antarctic this last season.

In the earlier editions of the International Whaling Statistics the whaling field in the Antarctic was for statistical purposes treated as a whole. Some years ago we went over to the practice of dividing the whaling field in the Antarctic into four areas of about 60 - 70° longitude. Such classification was then carried back to the season 1933/1934.

The desire has been expressed, however, that the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics should group the operations in the Antarctic in smaller areas. We have complied with this wish to some extent. When it relates to the catch in number of whales last season, this has been grouped in areas of 10° square. I draw attention here to tables 12-22 in the material distributed, comprising the Antarctic season 1951/52. From these tables, it will be seen how large the catch has been in number of whales in each single square and the average size of the whales caught. At the same time, we have retained the earlier division into areas.

When we look at the catch in number of whales in the various areas of 10° square, we cannot of course from this draw any conclusion concerning the occurrences of whales in the different areas, for the tables tell us nothing about what whaling material was used and for how long whaling was carried on in each area.

The tables showing the distribution of the catch in the smaller areas, such as I have mentioned, do not comprise "Slava's" catch, as this expedition has not sent in its measurement lists.

I shall now give a short review of the operations in fields outside the Antarctic in 1951 and in the Antarctic in 1951/52.

In fields outside the Antarctic, whaling was carried on by 42 land stations and 7 factory ships, employing a total of 221 catching boats. In actual fact, only 6 factory ships have operated outside the Antarctic in 1951. One floating factory was whaling off Peru twice - the first time at the end of the Antarctic season 1950/51, and the second time prior to the Antarctic season 1951/52. In the statistics we have therefore reckoned this as two factory ships.

In fields outside the Antarctic there were produced altogether about 280,000 barrels whale oil and about 376,000 barrels sperm oil, total about 656,000 barrels oil. In 1950 the total production amounted to about 382,000 barrels. The large increase in production is due principally to the sperm oil production of the factory ships off Peru. In 1951, the production in that area was about 196,000 barrels sperm oil. In 1950, no factory ships hunted sperm whales in the Peruvian field. I draw attention to the material distributed, where you will find a provisional copy of the publication of the International Whaling Statistics which gives particulars of the catch in 1951.

In the Antarctic 1951/52, 20 factory ships with a total of 270 catching boats were engaged in pelagic whaling. One of the factory ships hunted only sperm whales, namely, the Japanese vessel "Baikal Maru". The material engaged in baleen whaling operations consisted therefore of 19 factory ships and 265 catching boats. It is the same number of factory ships as operated in the previous season.

The pelagic baleen whale operations began on January 2nd and ended on March 5th. The total catch was 16,006.3 units. It took therefore the 19 pelagic expeditions 64 days to capture the permitted number of blue whale units. In the three preceeding seasons the hunting period was 102 days, 84 days and 78 days respectively. The much shorter whaling period this last season must be ascribed in part to the larger number of catching boats employed, but one of the causes is probably also that in certain areas of the Antarctic this year the weather conditions were particularly good.

Reports on the catch of blue whale units reached the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics from the great majority of the expeditions within two days after the end of each week. We forwarded the particulars of the total catch of blue whale units to the Chairman and Secretary of the International Whaling Commission, to the Contracting Governments which had pelagic expeditions in the Antarctic, and to the individual whaling companies. The whaling companies were informed of the total catch, so that they got a view of the course of the whaling and could themselves form an idea of the probable length of the season.

Notification of termination of the operations was sent to the Contracting Governments; also to those which had no pelagic expeditions in the Antarctic; and to the individual whaling companies.

The hunting of humpback whales proceeded for five days. 1,545 whales were captured, which represents an overstepping of the limit by 295. Five expeditions captured together 1,308 humpbacks, while the other expeditions accounted for 237. With the present regulations for termination of the humpback whaling operations, the Committee of International Whaling Statistics thinks it is very difficult to fix a perfectly correct closing date.

The pelagic expeditions captured:

5,124 blue whales
20,518 fin whales
1,545 humpbacks
32 sei whales
<u>5,342 sperm whales</u>

Total 32,561 whales

The production was about 2,048,000 barrels whale oil and about 281,000 barrels sperm oil, total about 2,329,000 barrels oil. The whale oil production in 1951/52 rose by about 138,000 barrels in comparison with the season 1950/51, despite the fact that this last season 411.4 blue whale units fewer were processed. This is due to the fact that the average yield per blue whale unit rose by 11.7 barrels, to 129 barrels. There must be several causes of the high yield last season compared with earlier seasons. The later opening date for the taking of baleen whales has in some degree led to a higher oil output. The operations commenced last season 11 days later than in season 1950/51, but on the other hand they terminated on March 5th this year instead of March 9th as in the previous season. The active whaling men on some of the expeditions have stated that the whales last season were very fat, and it is probable that this is another cause of the high yield. The raising of the minimum size for the taking of fin whales from 55 feet to 60 feet has also contributed to a higher oil yield.

The proportion between the number of blue whales and fin whales caught last season was 20 per cent and 80 per cent, as compared with 28.5 per cent and 71.5 per cent in the previous season. According to

our statements the pelagic expeditions, excluding "Slava", captured altogether 714 whales below the fixed minimum dimensions. This represents about 2.4 per cent of the total catch. The average size for all blue whales declined by 0.19 feet compared with last season..

The average size of the fin whales rose by 1.25 feet compared with last season. When it relates to fin whales, however, it must be remembered that the minimum size for capture was raised 5 feet last season.

The average production per catching boat per day was last season 121 barrels compared with 102 barrels in the previous season. The average catch of blue whale units per catching boat per day was 0.94, compared with 0.88 in the season 1950/51. The large increase in the average production is due therefore in part to the fact that the average production per blue whale unit rose by 11.7 barrels.

On South Georgia three land stations were in activity and 21 catching boats. A total of 2,630 whales were captured, from which were produced about 138,000 barrels whale oil and about 6,500 barrels sperm oil, total about 144,500 barrels oil. The average yield per calculated blue was 127.9 barrels. Those of you who wish to have further particulars of the catch last season in comparison with earlier seasons, will find these in the material distributed.

Thank you for your attention, Gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure the Commission owes a debt of gratitude to Mr. Vangstein for his excellent report, and before we go on to the tables, has anyone any enquiry to make regarding his report?

Mr. J.L. KASK (U.S.A.): I would like to ask Mr. Vangstein a question, but before I present that, I would like to commend the International Bureau of Whaling Statistics which have always done a superbly good job, especially this year, because I believe these tables, as I have seen them, are just a little better than usual. I would like to formally have it read into the record how pleased we are to have this fine set of data presented so quickly after the end of the season. It certainly will give a lot of room for statisticians and biologists to subject this material now (which I hope will be done by this Commission sometime) to a critical analysis, so that we will be able to tell a little better than we have up to now just what condition the various species of our whale populations are in.

Now for the question. On page 10 of your Report on Antarctic Whaling, I notice where you are reporting on the catch of immature whales, that the immature blue whales - the percentage captured of immature blue whales - is the highest on record, especially for the females, and for the fin whales there has been a constant decline in the number of immature males and females. I was wondering if Mr. Vangstein could give me some sort of an interpretation of this. What is the significance of these figures?

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): With regard to fin whales, of course, the percentage of immature whales went down from about 24 per cent to about 16 per cent. This is, of course, due to the fact that the minimum length has gone up from 55 feet to 60 feet. With regard to blue whales, the average size last season went down by 0.19 feet and that is why it is that more small whales were blue whales last season than the previous season.

Mr. J.L. KASK (U.S.A.): Could that be an index of an increase in intensity of fishing on that species?

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask a question in connection with that?

Catching equipment is more costly today, therefore, the expeditions are not so keen on taking chances on going near to the ice and your catch, therefore, might not include as many of the old larger whales as it would if you were closer to the ice. Mr. Trouton might have something to say on this. Can we hear it?

Mr. R. TROUTON (South Africa): The difference really is the nearer the ice you go the less fin whales you get.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you not get more blue whales nearer the ice? The previous season they reported the largest blue whales were nearest the ice.

Mr. R. TROUTON (South Africa): We found in the Ross Sea, where we were way down near the ice, the weather was very bad, and all the whales seemed small, and the manager had to move further north into the fin whale area to get away from infringing regulations. Long-experienced gunners brought in under-sized whales as they have never done before, because there was no choice. They were all small whales in the Ross Sea. We moved north because all of them were small. Then you get these infringements. We are responsible for the statistical alteration this year.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the sort of information the Commission is interested in - as to what happens on the grounds.

Mr. R. TROUTON (South Africa): We did not get the oil yield from the small whales we would have from the bigger ones. We moved the expedition into fin whales. We have always been the highest producer year by year of blue whales. We have always fished nearer the ice, but this year we met this astonishing position in the Ross Sea. We moved north and this year we have got the highest percentage of fin whales.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it true, Mr. Trouton, the blue whales were frequently found near the ice? That was my understanding; but this season there was a reversal.

Mr. R. TROUTON (South Africa): We were in terribly bad weather, of course, and going deep into the ice did not improve the weather conditions. The light, the fog and the weather was bad in the Ross Sea, whales were small and we moved out; and that is why you find a much higher percentage of fin whales this year than has ever been recorded before.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure some of the rest of you have comments on these tables 1 to 32 - Antarctic Whaling.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): It is only a small point. As a matter of interest, I think that one sometimes finds in one year there are a number of small whales. I was just wondering whether there were any peculiarities in the ice conditions. Could one link up the catch of small blue whales with the ice conditions or any other conditions?

Mr. R. TROUTON (South Africa): I do not think so. We were down round about the seventies, seventy-one, and we found as usual, as we have always found, that by going north we got into fin whales and left the blue. We did that deliberately.

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (United Kingdom): May I put a question of a rather different character? I think we shall all be very much obliged to the Committee and Mr. Vangstein for the figures of by-products that appear in Volume XXVIII for the first time now. And I see the Committee have been good enough there to set out figures by countries for each

of the last six seasons. It will probably not be necessary to do that again, to get out the past seasons, and I wondered whether it might be possible in the forthcoming years, instead of that, to give separate figures of each of the expeditions. I feel, if that were done, it might do a little more towards limelighting and encouraging the manufacturer of the by-products - one of the matters, as the Commission will remember, that Mr. Nugent dealt with yesterday when he addressed us.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vangstein, do you have any reply to that?

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): If that is the wish of the Commission. We can state the production of each year from each of the factories; but when it refers to whale oil and the catch of whales in the statistics published, we do not give details of each expedition, only the total for the region. We have got the figures for this season, but we have not had time to get them up to date for the last season. Of course, if the Commission wants, we can take the results for the various expeditions from 1945/46.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): If they can compile such figures for each expedition, that would be very useful.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments?

Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): You will remember that we are very much dependent on the goodwill of the expeditions. They have been extremely kind; they have helped us in every way, and in future, of course, we depend on their goodwill. We cannot go any further than they wish us to go.

The CHAIRMAN: You are quite right. I was going to raise the question of whether or not whaling companies would wish to provide this additional information. I am quite sure it would be valuable information, as Mr. Vangstein and Mr. Johns have stated, but I think although the Convention states we can acquire such statistical information as the Commission may require, we also want to know whether the companies wish to provide this information. It would seem to me advisable to ascertain the views of the whaling companies themselves as to whether this would be an onerous burden to furnish that additional information in detail.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (United Kingdom): The first point is that we do already supply the information. I think I am right in saying the Commission decided last year that it should be reported to the Bureau and all that is being suggested now is that the Secretary, Mr. Vangstein, should be asked to do what we were asked to do last year. There were a lot of complicated figures and I am sure he will do so if the Commission asks him. I should like to call the attention of the Commission to the immense amount of trouble that has been taken, particularly in dividing the areas into ten degrees longitude all round, and the tremendous amount of work that has been done in trying to work out the statistics in those areas. I should like to warn the statisticians and biologists that these figures are to be dealt with with very great care; as they stand, they are figures all lumped together in various degrees of latitude. Therefore, one might think that whaling starts in the far north and works southwards, and one might assume the figures as they stand indicate the progress of the season. That, in many cases, is not the case, and in some cases - particularly in an area which I personally was in last year - where we started just about fifty, we finished up about fifty-two. To one's surprise one discovered a large number of blue whales in the area where we had not expected them. I am not going to ask Mr. Vangstein to divide them into further squares, to make any further distinction between the 50-60 and the 70-80; but I do think it is most important

for statisticians and biologists not to come to conclusions without careful reference to actual facts. They must go much further than merely looking at statistics to get facts.

As far as I am concerned, I shall give very great study to the figures as they have been turned out; and in my own investigations as to the most fitting places to send expeditions they will certainly give me a lead, and I am most grateful for them.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Salvesen. I am quite sure most biologists were at least partially aware that the tables as prepared by Mr. Vangstein did not mean that whalers started at the top and went to the bottom. It does give me a clue as to the take over the year. We have suggested to Mr. Vangstein that he prepared similar tables for the period since the war and if possible some years before the war, to give a comparative picture of what the take is in those areas.

I agree with him that it is somewhat of a burden to break it down to smaller squares. As a biologist I do believe that a certain amount of information can be gained from these tables, but I also recognise, and I am sure Dr. Kask will agree with me, that it is going to require more study than just the furnishing of data for those squares. That is the beginning, but if we are to assume our responsibilities as a Commission then we must evaluate all available data and not just the catch and output or seasonal production and so on. It is not something we can do in one or two years, but it is something everyone, biologists, statisticians and fisheries experts, can give some consideration to.

Are there any other comments?

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): This year we introduced a new system of statistics, and it is in fact very easy to split it into smaller areas if you want to: for instance, a catch between sixty to sixty-five and sixty-five to seventy, you understand?

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): I am very sorry, I went astray. I started talking about different periods and finished up in different squares. What I intended was different months. They are already divided into areas.

The CHAIRMAN: That is quite true, but this is a basis - the preliminary steps. As you study it you will have to have further details as to seasons and so forth.

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): We can draw up figures of the average length per month, the average length in January and February. That is quite easy if the Committee wants us to do it.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): If we could have the months as well as the position shown when the statistics are actually published, Mr. Chairman. There is one point we noticed, that the blue whale catch was very low this year, but we ought not to compare the whole year with the previous whole year because the season opened late, and we know that more blue whales are normally caught earlier in the season. The proper comparison is between January and February in one year and January and February last year, so if we can have those figures it would give far more meaning.

The CHAIRMAN: Would that be possible, Mr. Vangstein?

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): Yes.

Dr. E.J. SLIJPER (Netherlands): I think it would be better if it were not split up by months but by weeks. The season is very short.

You can say more about the fluctuations in the catch if you split them up by weeks.

The CHAIRMAN: There are only nine weeks altogether.

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): I think we must have one hundred tables per season! I am afraid no one will study that lot of tables.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, it is certain we cannot overload the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics. They have furnished this information very generously but I think we ought to reach some reasonable modus operandi so that Mr. Vangstein can furnish the information that will guide the Commission in its deliberations. Dr. Mackintosh, what do you think is the minimum information we need?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): That is a difficult question to answer straight away, but before this question of the catch I think we could do quite a lot with what has appeared in the statistics so far, that is to say, the catch of each species in each month. What one really wants for comparing the catch in one year with another is the catch, say, in January and February, because, whatever the starting and finishing date, it always pretty well covers those two months. Where you get inaccuracies coming in is when you compare one season that started in January and goes on till April, with another that began in December and stopped in March. That is, at least, one inaccuracy that can be eliminated. I should think it would be too much work to try and give the weekly, or perhaps even monthly, position of a catch in every square, but it really depends on Mr. VANGSTEIN - how much time and work he can afford.

The CHAIRMAN: I quite agree and that is why I think we should be guided by what time Mr. Vangstein thinks he could devote to this.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): It is hardly possible really to get all the facts one would like to know from the statistical point of view. We must make the best of what Mr. Vangstein can do.

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): I would draw your attention to table 30, Dr. Kellogg. Do you mean that we should work such tables for each square of ten degrees. This is a catch per day.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, I should prefer to take this matter this way. The tables 1 to 22 are for the previous year from 1946 on and then they stop for a moment. It takes some study to get all the possibilities out of these figures. Then you also get an impression - if you are overloaded with figures, with data, you cannot make anything out at all, and I should prefer to get the data of the previous years in the same way as we have got it for this year, 1951.

The CHAIRMAN: It is quite true that just the preparation of data without any evaluation is a waste of time. If we can have this data and then have an ad hoc committee to study the thing we can see what the recommendations are for additional data. In other words, before we go into these details, let us see what we get out of the data that is furnished for the present year. That gives you your basis now. Both the statisticians and biologists can review the information that is provided, to decide whether or not that data is adequate for the purposes of the Commission, and if not, in what respects; in other words, what additional data the Commission needs for its guidance.

Are there any further comments on Tables 1 to 32, Antarctic Whaling? If not, we will go on to Tables 1 to 9, Whaling outside the Antarctic in 1951.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): If it is a question of expense, don't you think we can make some contribution to the Bureau out of the funds available for the Commission? If it is a matter of personal supervision by Mr. Vangstein, it may not help a great deal. But if it is possible we should very much like to have such data, say, from next year. Then we can continue several years and we can compare them. I think we would find such tables very useful.

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): Could Mr. Kodaki repeat his remarks? I did not hear.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): If you are making statistics, it involves great expense. This Commission should consider some contribution out of the funds available here. They have already financed an Administrative Committee; they should consider this question. If it is a question of your personal supervision of these statistics, money would not help your work a great deal. So I want to know first how things are carried out, and if it is possible to make such weekly statistics, getting some contribution from the Commission. I should like to recommend the Finance Committee to consider this question.

Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): This Committee has been working more or less, I think, 23 years. It was the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea that asked the Norwegian Government to appoint this Committee. It is an official body, and the Government pays everything. I reckon they can do it in the future. I hope so.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Professor Bergersen. I think all of us are deeply appreciative of the services of the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics. The amount of information they have furnished over the years is almost unbelievable when you realise the amount of time it takes to assemble that data. Certainly some of the rest of you must have some comments on the statistical information, the way it is recorded and its implications.

Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): One thing more. It has been in previous years rather difficult to get in contact with companies who are operating outside the Antarctic. It would, of course, help Mr. Vangstein and the Committee very much if those companies could help us. We would be very grateful if they would do so.

The CHAIRMAN: Each Commissioner should do what he can to see that the companies in his own respective bailiwick furnish the required information.

Are there any comments now you have had a chance to look at the tables on Whaling outside the Antarctic area? If there are no further comments on whaling statistics for the area outside the Antarctic, we will take the last Report, that is Whaling Statistics for the Antarctic Season 1951/52. Have any of you any comments you wish to make on the total catch, duration of operation, break-down of the catch, average size of the whales, maturity, average yield, and so forth?

What is your impression of the past season, Mr. Salvesen? I am sure you have something to say on it.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (UNITED KINGDOM): You want an impression of our season. I think the point that is the most interesting to make is that most of the figures on the basis of reasoning that have been put forward here would suggest a decrease in the number of blue whales and a decrease in the number of fin whales and a decrease in the numbers of anything else. The thing the Commission has stressed most strongly

has been the number of whales. This year there has been an increase in the number of whales per catching day. But I would implore you not to pay attention to that. I do not think blue whales or fin whales are increasing. Mr. Vangstein and his colleagues from Norway gave figures about the yield very similar to those I have got - that the catch is better than last year. In South Georgia there is a very marked increase in the average of oil per whale although they are not all the same whales because in general the catchers go very much further. As far as next year is concerned, there will be 18 expeditions rather than 19, but the odds are that the 16,000 will be taken in more or less the same time.

I think the general view is that in this last season, on the average, we were favoured by good weather, whereas in the season before, on the average, we were favoured by bad weather; so that if one was thinking in terms of, say, 78 days in one and 64 days in the other season, the figure to start from would be more or less in between these. If there is one expedition less going out than was expected, you would have to add on a few days for that. I should like to warn you once again, as I have often done before, that it is very unwise to generalise on the figures of any one particular season, and it is very much wiser to take a look at the figures that have been suggested over a period of five or six years before attempting to come to any figure. It appears we are finding no difficulty in getting our 16,000. I think personally the warning sign will come when we begin to find it difficult to get 16,000 within the time, and that, rather than any figures of whales per catching day or anything else, will be the sign of decline of stock, if that comes. So long as we find it easy to catch the 16,000 it may be assumed there are very large numbers of whales available. When we cease to find it easy, there will be quite a reasonable ground for the assumption that the stock has dropped.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to ask Captain Salvesen one question. You have been engaged in whaling down there quite a number of years; all I can say is from my conversations with captains of other whaling ships, and they have invariably told me that when they first went on the ground they would get more whales within the area of a factory ship - you could see them - than you can now. There may be enough whales but you have to go farther to get them. They are not, let us say, bunched up; they are not as numerous.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): Personally, I have been down since 1928 and I would confirm that entirely. I think it is particularly true of the humpbacks which have more or less disappeared from South Georgia where they used to be discovered a mile or two from the station. They have almost completely disappeared, I do not remember the exact date - since approximately 1916.

As far as blue whales are concerned we found great congregations on the edge of the ice, but they are less seldom found there now. It is very difficult to compare but, the first year I was there, we started the season at the end of September. It was assumed it was impossible for the floating factories to continue after the middle of February. Now, practically speaking, we start where we previously stopped and it is very hard for that reason.

As regards fin whales the position is much more difficult; as far as South Georgia is concerned, we do not find fin whales close to South Georgia. The catchers are moving 200 to 240 miles out before they catch them, and they are obviously catching from quite different stock than they were previously. On floating factories, opinions vary; my personal opinion is there are fewer than previously, but it is difficult to tell because when you do get amongst them you get into very large schools of them and you may be over impressed by the number in the particular school. There are frequently periods when you do

not see any schools whatever, although when you do find a school, there may be very large numbers in it.

I would confirm the general feeling that the stock is very much smaller than it was in 1928, and it is my own personal view that it is not larger than it was in 1945.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask you one other question? It has appeared in print several times by more or less irresponsible people that the results of the Atlantic whaling have been to scatter the stocks. I have always been a little sceptical of that.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): That is a difficult one. I think if any particular expedition gets in amongst whales, it will certainly scatter those particular whales. When we run short of whales in any particular place where we have been, I do not think it proves we have killed them all. It is clear they have scattered. We get reports coming in that whales have been scared; possibly they have been hunted before by another expedition.

The CHAIRMAN: I can readily see when you get in any sort of wild life, when you start hunting them, they will spread about. The general trend of some of these articles has been that when they start whaling in one area they have gone over somewhere else to some unknown place, and that is where they congregate.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): I think they tend to move not necessarily up and down, but more or less on the same sort of lines as they ordinarily do. On the land stations I think you kill out the particular sets that move close to land, and therefore you have got to move further out. The floating factories are so spread out nowadays. I cannot tell you at all whether they have been scattered to a particular sanctuary or not. I do not like to think of the number of aged whales dying there without our people being able to have a shot at them!

The CHAIRMAN: I can state from our own experience from the Washington Shore Station when it was first started, they got all the whales necessary to operate the station. It finally got to the point when they were out three days before they got back. It confirms your general opinion of the shore stations, that they do at times make serious inroads on the stocks.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): The land stations are confined to their particular stocks, even though they get smaller. To please Dr. Mackintosh, they concentrate on the biggest concentrations of whales, so they ought to be specially encouraged by this Commission instead of being frowned upon to the advantage of the land stations.

The CHAIRMAN: Has anyone else any comments?

May we adopt a resolution that we send a message of condolence to Mrs. Paulsen on the passing of her husband, expressing our deepest regret and conveying our acknowledgment of his services in all the years he was associated with this Commission?

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

(The meeting rose at 4 p.m.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

FOURTH MEETING

Thursday, 5th June, 1952.

In the Chair: Dr. Remington Kellogg (U.S.A.)

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the Third Plenary Session is now open. The first item on our programme for today will be the Report of the Scientific Committee, which is Document XV. Inasmuch as certain items in this Report involve amendments to the Schedule of the 1946 Convention, it will be necessary to poll each Delegation individually on such amendments, but in the meantime may I assume that the Commission accepts the Report. We do not approve it - we just accept it for consideration. Any objections?

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): Not so long as we have time to read it.

The CHAIRMAN: This is just the receipt of the Report. Have you any objection to that?

Mr. G. R. CLARK: I have no objection to just receiving it.

The CHAIRMAN: I assume the Commission accepts the Report for consideration.

The SECRETARY: Is there anyone present who has not got Document XV? The Chairman wants us to read it now.

(After an interval)

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, may we go on now? I assume you have now had time to read this. There is nothing under items 1 or 2 that seems to require further consideration.

Item 3, Whale marking. I will just read the essential parts now. "The Committee confirmed their view that the continuation of marking of whales on a large scale was to be strongly recommended." "A further approach should be made to Whaling Companies and Whaling Inspectors to enlist their help in recovering marks, together with all useful data and specimens."

Finally, "It was agreed that research into new methods should be pursued, but, if funds allowed, marking by the existing methods should continue in the meantime."

Are there any comments, or can we accept that? Is the statement acceptable to the Commission?

Mr. H. S. DROST (Netherlands): "They hope that the means would be found to organise whale marking expeditions." That sounds not very hopeful. Is that the end of the affair, or is there something more to be expected?

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Mackintosh, could you comment further on that?

Dr. N. A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, "expeditions" is used there in the sense of hoping that funds could be found for sending a ship for the purpose of whale marking. It does not mean to say it is the only possible method of marking, because we can of course get whale marking done if the different countries are prepared to mark their whales ^{during} ~~after~~ the catching season. But by that method I think we should only get a limited number of whales marked.

The CHAIRMAN: This would be a further extension of the present co-operative arrangements with a number of Contracting Governments.

Dr. N. A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Since this involves no change in the Schedule, it will not be necessary to poll the Delegations. I assume unless there are further objections that this item is acceptable.

Item 4 involves a change in the Schedule, and it will therefore go over until we come to the amendments.

Item 5, "Blue and Humpback whales in the Northern Hemisphere.

The Committee recommend that the countries concerned should be asked to study the general question of blue and humpback whales in the Northern Hemisphere with a view to the inclusion of this subject in the Agenda of a future meeting". In other words, the Committee request that all the Contracting Governments concerned with the Northern Hemisphere give the matter further study. I assume 5 is acceptable.

Item 6. Antarctic Season 1952/53

"(i) Opening and Closing Dates. The Committee see no reason for varying the opening and closing dates now in force under paragraph 7(a) of the Schedule to the Convention." Any comments? In other words, the opening and closing dates now in force will continue for another year. I hear no objection, so I assume it is acceptable.

Now we come to (ii) "Limit of 16,000 blue whale units. The Committee recommend that tables should be prepared on the lines of Tables 12 to 22 in the new statistics to cover the Seasons 1945/46, to 1950/51, and if possible for a few years prior to 1939/40." We had some discussion on that yesterday afternoon, if you recall. In other words, we anticipate that the Commission will have additional data to study when they attend the next meeting of the Commission. Any further comments by anyone?

If not we will proceed with (b) under 6. We recommend that "these tables should be circulated to Commissioners and Scientific Advisers". Was that in advance of the meeting or what was the intent of this?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): The intention was to circulate it quite a long time in advance of the next meeting, so that perhaps we could have an ad hoc meeting to consider it. The point was to give us time to consider the thing properly.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further comment under (b) 6?

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (U.K.): Is the word 'scientific' necessary there?

The CHAIRMAN: We will just say "advisers" then.

Now we come to 6(c), "The Committee make no recommendation as to the limit of 16,000 blue whale units, but in the light of the data, the question of modifying the limit should be raised at the Fifth Meeting." We have no recommendation before us for alteration of the existing limit, which is 16,000 units.

Dr. J.L. KASK (U.S.A.): Does this mean that the Committee make no recommendation as to limit?

The CHAIRMAN: No, as to alteration. It will remain the same unless changed in the Plenary Session. Do I hear a motion to accept or otherwise? Mr. Salyanik has made a motion to accept. It has been seconded. Any further comment? Unless there is further comment the Chair will assume that this is acceptable to all delegations.

Item 7 - the matter of sanctuaries. "The Committee recommended that this matter should be given further study between now and the Fifth Meeting of the Commission, when the further tables referred to above are available. If further restriction of the Antarctic catch is required, consideration should be given to the closure of Area II in whole or in part, the reduction of the total limit and the reopening of the present sanctuary in the Pacific sector of the Antarctic." Any comment?

Dr. C. VON BONDE (South Africa): This matter is not quite clear to me. At the foot of page 2, if I may just go back to paragraph 6 for a moment, it states "The output per blue whale unit showed that the fattest whales were caught in Area II."

Then, in the first paragraph on page 3, under 7, Sanctuaries, it mentions again, "...the most abundant whale food is available in Area II and that if any part of the existing whaling grounds were to be closed as a sanctuary this area is the most appropriate." It seems that that is the best area for catching whales if they are feeding there.

Dr. N. A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): The intention there was this. I think the statistics do give some evidence that rather fatter whales are in Area II, but the real point of this was that if an area is closed as a sanctuary, if that area is one where there is abundant food, there is a better chance of the stock of whales building itself up if it were given a period of years during which it was not molested. One might set against that the value of the whales because they are likely to be fatter there, but I do not know that the difference in fatness is of very great importance, and purely from the point of view of closing an area as a sanctuary, I think there is something to be said for choosing an area where there is a great deal of food and a chance for the population to increase. That was the consideration we had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that acceptable to Dr. von Bonde?

Dr. C. von BONDE (South Africa): The explanation is, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments? If not the Chair assumes that the recommendation as read is acceptable. 8 will be dealt with when we deal with the amendments to the Schedule.

9, General Research. I hope you have read these two paragraphs, because the Committee states that no special recommendation was made, but the Committee hope that more of such reports will be received.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): May I rise to a point of order here. I think that Canada has sent in some report. We are not mentioned there.

The SECRETARY: I am sorry if I have omitted to put in something that should be here. I want the Commission to understand that when we communicate with various Contracting Governments as regards scientific research, we are after two things: one is we want them to send us all the printed or other reports on scientific research generally for the building up of our library. We have had a number of those from different countries, and Japan have circulated some yesterday.

Then there are the progress reports for the given year which we like to circulate at the Annual Meeting.

Mr. Clark, I am sorry, I think I regarded yours as a general research report on the research and not as a progress report for a given year. We have got it recorded of course in our library.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): It was a progress report.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further comments? If not, I assume that the Commission accept the recommendation or the statement under 9.

We now come to 10. "Joint Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Committees". We have already covered Whale Marking, and the amendments to the Schedule under (ii) will go over until such time as we deal with amendments to the Schedule.

(iii) "Meetings of Committees prior to the Plenary Session. The opinion was strongly expressed that the practice of holding meetings of Committees before the Commission had met in Plenary Session was undesirable, apart from any question of procedure".

It is my understanding that both Committees have made this recommendation, and that we agreed to that procedure at the first Plenary Session, so I think that matter is disposed of. It will also come in I understand, as a recommendation from the Finance and Administration Committee.

Dr. N. A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): In regard to item 4, you pointed out that item 4 (a) is a matter of amendment to the Schedule, and you passed over that, but I think you did not mention item 4 (b).

The CHAIRMAN: I have considered that, and we thought it might be more expeditious to take it up at the time of the amendment on humpbacks to deal with the two matters together. But the Chair is entirely at your disposal. Do you wish to bring the matter up now?

Dr. N. A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): I do not think there is anything special I wanted to say about it.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): Just a formality. The election of the Chairman of the Scientific Committee has not been recorded in the report of the Scientific Committee. I hope the same has not been omitted in the case of the Technical Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: That must have been an oversight. Dr. Mackintosh, how do you account for it? It was his modesty, he did not want to say he had been re-elected Chairman.

Dr. N. A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): I am sorry, it was an oversight, an accidental error in the report.

The SECRETARY: The Chairman asked me to ask you whether you have all got Document XVI which is the Report of the Technical Committee. That has been put in all the pigeon holes in the document room, and would those of you who have not studied it, now look at it, as the Chairman would like to take it in a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we now come to consideration of the Report of the Technical Committee. Can we follow the same procedure which we did with the Report of the Scientific Committee. Does the Commission accept the Report? No objections. It should be pointed out now so that Mr. Anderson will not raise this point again, there is no indication that the Chairman was re-elected at this meeting of the Commission.

There is no need to take up paragraphs 1 and 2. We will deal with paragraph 3, the last paragraph, "The Committee recognize that these model sheets are designed primarily to meet the case of Factory Ships, but there is no reason why they should not be used with suitable adaptations in respect of Land Stations."

This matter seems to require a resolution for the record, and the Secretary I believe has such a resolution.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the Commission are asked to resolve "that the model sheets attached to the Report of the Special Sub-Committee set up at Cape Town be approved and circulated to all Contracting Governments with the suggestion that they should be adopted by them with suitable modifications." I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Commission be asked to indicate their assent. Are there any objections to that resolution?

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Could we suggest that this word "adaptations" be struck off, and "modifications", as suggested by the Secretary, be put into the Minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: "With suitable modifications", instead of "adaptations"?

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 4, "Laws and Regulations". The Committee were reminded by the Secretary that at the Oslo Meeting a summary of the Laws and Regulations from certain Contracting

Governments had been circulated (Second Meeting: Document 3) and that while further information had since come in, this document was still incomplete."

The Secretary, I believe, has a Resolution covering this point.

The SECRETARY: The Commission are asked to resolve "that the copies of Laws and Regulations received from Contracting Governments should be retained in the Commission's office in sufficient numbers to enable any Commissioner to consult them from time to time." That is intended to mean that if a Commissioner is away in a foreign country and wants to see a copy, we would send him a copy. May I take it that that Resolution, in those terms, is accepted, or does anyone wish to raise any objection?

That seems to be carried.

The CHAIRMAN: The second part. "The Committee were also informed that the Questionnaire decided upon at Oslo and now brought up to date in Fourth Meeting: Document IX was also still incomplete. With regard to the future of these two documents, the Committee recommend (a)" - We have dealt with (a). "(b) The Questionnaire with its replies to date should be printed as an appendix to the Third Annual Report, with later supplements as received." That also requires a Resolution.

The SECRETARY: You are asked to resolve "that the Questionnaire dealing with Laws and Regulations should be printed as an appendix to the Third Annual Report; any later replies being included in subsequent reports as a supplement".

The idea is merely to put a folding table in the Annual Report with the Questionnaires on the left-hand side and the replies running along the folding table. It is a matter of printing, but we will do our best to make it clear. May I take it that no one wishes to oppose that Resolution? That seems to be carried, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: "5. Infractions. The Committee had before them the summary of Infractions to which has since been

added an addendum containing the particulars relating to the land station season 1951, and the pelagic season 1951/52, for which the Committee were indebted to the International Bureau of Whaling Statistics, who had at very short notice produced a wealth of figures to fill the gaps caused by the non-rendition of a number of the returns from Contracting Governments.

"Some discussion took place as to the possibility of overlapping as between the returns rendered direct to Sandefjord and those rendered direct to the Commission by virtue of Article IX of the 1946 Convention. The Committee are satisfied that the Infraction returns on the special forms amended at the Cape Town Meeting must continue to be made to the Commission, especially as they contain information which does not go to Sandefjord, but they agreed that the Secretary should be allowed to make certain drafting amendments to the form to simplify its rendition. They also recommend that the Secretary should be instructed to communicate with the International Bureau where their assistance is necessary to complete the information required by the Commission in the matter of infractions."

It is my recollection - is it not so, Mr. Secretary - that the Commission instructed Mr. Dobson. I think they said he shall do it.

"The existing returns, above referred to, were referred for examination and report to a sub-committee consisting of Mr. Anderson (Australia) Chairman, Mr. Drost (Netherlands), Mr. Knudtson (Norway) and Mr. Leach (U.K.). The Sub-Committee reported to the effect that they had examined the returns for the pelagic seasons 1950/51 and 1951/52 and the land stations seasons of 1950 and 1951 in detail and did not consider that there were any outstanding points to which attention should be called. In the case of a number of land stations, however, the percentage of undersized whales to the total seemed somewhat high but, as the International Bureau had pointed out, a good many of the undersized whales in these returns included

short whales legitimately taken for local consumption as human or animal food." That again is a statement of the Sub-Committee. "The Sub-Committee also suggested that the Report form for recording infractions should in future include a separate space for recording the number of whales legitimately taken for the purpose named in the previous paragraph. The Committee recommend accordingly." I believe the Secretary has a Resolution.

The SECRETARY: You are asked to resolve "that the forms for recording Infractions, (that is the blue form and the white form,) should in future include a separate space for recording the whales legitimately taken for the purpose of human and animal consumption". May I take it there are no objections to that? That seems to be carried.

The CHAIRMAN: "The U.S.S.R. Commissioner explained that the two blue whales taken before the opening of the 1950/51 season were taken for use as fenders in exceptional circumstances, and agreed with the other members of the Committee that in general the taking of whales out of season for such use would be contrary to the principles of the Convention." That requires no action.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): At the Committee meeting I drew attention to the fact that, I think, the word "baleen" should go in before "whales" in the last sentence.

The CHAIRMAN: We will so change it, to read, "taking baleen whales". Any other comment?

"Whale Marking". Whale marking has been dealt with under the Scientific Report, that is Item 6.

Item 7 contains amendments to the Schedule which must be dealt with when we come to those amendments.

Item 8 is another item that must be delayed.

"9. The U.S.S.R. Commissioner sought the Committee's support for a proposal that the International Bureau at Sandefjord should

be asked to supply in future, to all Contracting Governments, the following additional statistical data.

"(a) Weekly information in respect of each factory ship of the catches of whales in terms of blue whale units; and

(b) Copies of all statistical data relating to each individual Whaling Company."

"It was explained that (a) would seem to be justified on the grounds of reciprocity, while (b) was put forward on scientific grounds.

"The Committee felt that in view of the very full total figures already supplied by the International Bureau, this additional demand might prove to be very onerous, and the Committee did not feel competent to make a recommendation one way or the other, but consider that the matter should come up for general discussion at a Plenary Session."

The matter is now open for discussion.

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Mr. Chairman, if the additional data is difficult for the International Bureau of Statistics, the Soviet Delegation propose that all Contracting Governments should supply each other with this data. Or, if this is not agreed, the U.S.S.R. could send scientific representatives, who would choose the needed figures, if the International Statistics Bureau does not object.

Mr. J.L. KASK (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, would it be appropriate for some spokesman from the International Bureau of Statistics to comment on this, whether it would be in order.

H.E. Professor B. BERGERSEN (Norway): It is absolutely all right for us; if this Commission asked the Committee of International Whaling Statistics to send this additional data, then we will do it.

The CHAIRMAN: I presume that under this arrangement the sum total data would be supplied when all the data from all the countries were available?

H.E. Professor B. BERGERSEN (Norway): Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN: It would have to be delayed until all the returns were complete?

H.E. Professor B. BERGERSEN (Norway): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: So it means that each Contracting Government would need to be rather prompt in submitting its weekly data if this was carried through. It would be that the transmission would take place when all the returns were in.

H.E. Professor B. BERGERSEN (Norway): Yes, all the statistical data; I do not think we can supply you with all the statistical data.

The CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by all the statistical data?

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): It means all the statistical reports the Soviet Fleet are sending.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that clear now?

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): We cannot possibly send all the statistical sheets in 15 copies to the different whaling companies; we could send them to the Contracting Governments.

The CHAIRMAN: Each week you send the total blue whale

units, is that right? Does that include the number of operating days, this weekly report, or does it include the total catch, the total production?

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): The total catch by weeks.

The CHAIRMAN: That total catch by weeks would be furnished to the Contracting Governments; that would be all the data?

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): Not with regard to (b).

The CHAIRMAN: What under (b) is furnished weekly in addition to that? What, in the weekly reports, in addition to your production statistics is furnished weekly?

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): Nothing.

The CHAIRMAN: So that would be all the weekly data then. Then (b) would not be appropriate here because that does not come in until the end of the season.

Mr. A. N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): (b) is meant for the season, not for the week.

(Continued in English): We want to see the same data at the end of the season which we sent to Sandefjord.

The CHAIRMAN: The end of the season, is that agreeable, Mr. Vangstein, now that we have this clarified?

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): No. Then I prefer to send it to Mr. Dobson, and he can copy it and send it to the Contracting Governments. It is a lot of work to have this drawn up in, say, 15 copies, or 20 copies.

The CHAIRMAN: I am still somewhat confused as to where we stand. Under (a) the U.S.S.R. requests weekly information to each Contracting Government; is that correct?

Mr. A. N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: That would be your function at Sandefjord, Mr. Vangstein?

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): Yes, but it is not enough to send it only to the Contracting Governments having expeditions.

Mr. H. S. DROST (Netherlands): I should say that the Netherlands' point of view is that we do not think it necessary to have weekly information for our Government.

The CHAIRMAN: That is 9(a).

Mr. H. S. DROST (Netherlands): But we have no objection when this information is sent to Governments about 4 to 6 weeks afterwards, but not immediately, otherwise, if we have had a good week, all the expeditions will rush to the same spot.

The CHAIRMAN: Has there been any instance when all the reports were in, in the same week?

Well, there is no time limit as to how promptly this weekly information is to be sent out; I suppose it would be at the convenience of Sandefjord - as long as it was sent out.

Mr. H. J. JOHNS (United Kingdom): If it is not the intention that sub-paragraph (a) should be an annual affair, but should be a weekly affair, I wonder just what conservation purpose it is intended to serve; if it is not intended to serve a conservation purpose, but only a commercial purpose, then I suggest

that it would be desirable that you should invite the views of all the people here to represent, in some sense, as advisers, commercial interests, because it would be their views, I think, that would be of most effect in this particular matter.

The CHAIRMAN: That is why I said the matter was open for discussion, I had hoped that we would get the viewpoints of those concerned.

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (U.K.): I believe that Captain Salvesen, among others, will have views about that.

The CHAIRMAN: I think he should express them.

Mr. R. TROUTON (South Africa): We are strongly opposed to the proposal that weekly figures should be disclosed; we object to their being disclosed. As it is now, they are collated and the information for conservation is acquired from the statistics as a whole, but there is no statement as to which particular expedition caught the whales in a particular area during a particular month; we object to the thought that this highly competitive commercial business should be disclosed. We all have our own methods and we all have our great endeavours for secrecy. We use scramblers on the wires to avoid people hearing what we are saying. If we go to that trouble, it seems rather contrary to our ideas that the whole information should be broadcast immediately after we have taken all the trouble to keep it secret.

H.E. Professor B. BERGERSEN (Norway): I must remind you of what I said yesterday, that it is absolutely necessary for the Committee of Whaling Statistics that the private companies feel absolutely sure that all the data which are sent in would not be misused. It is absolutely necessary for us, and I am quite sure that all of you will understand why.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): I am absolutely in agreement with Mr. Trouton and Professor Bergersen. I think you will all agree that the voluntary co-operation of the companies is most important and that it should be willingly and promptly given. You have asked for our co-operation in the matter of these meteorological reports, and we have given a very clear undertaking that the information as to the position of our expeditions will not be disclosed to our competitors, and that, so far as we know, is being satisfactorily done by means of a code specially arranged for the purpose. For this particular purpose we have no objection whatever to our weekly reports being rendered to all the Governments after operations have closed, but it would be most improper in our view if the scientific work of this Commission were to be confused with the co-operation amongst the companies in their active operations. The present principle is to disclose as little to each other as possible, and so long as that goes on, it would be most improper, in our view, if the International Commission were to be used to assist our competitors.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Larsen, you have not said anything.

Mr. E. LARSEN (South Africa): I also agree with Captain Salvesen.

Mr. L. de WAAL (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the words expressed by Mr. Trouton and Captain Salvesen and the other gentleman, who gave their views.

Dr. C. VON BONDE (South Africa): In terms of the Statistical Act of the Union of South Africa, all figures rendered are treated as highly confidential, and I presume that applies to the whaling statistics, therefore I wholeheartedly agree with what has been said.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kask, is it not true that our statistical data is confidential for the individual companies?

Dr. J.L. KASK (U.S.A.): It is.

The SECRETARY: Gentlemen, the Chairman has asked me to say one word before we put this to the vote. I have, while we have been discussing it, taken a hasty re-glance at the International Convention, and although there is quite a lot about what Contracting Governments shall do vis-a-vis the International Bureau or any other body, there does not seem to be very much as to what the International Bureau are bound to do on the information received. I confess that I have always regarded this information as being of a confidential nature.

There are two points that have emerged from the discussion which I would like to emphasise. One is that this may be a misuse of the information which is sent in weekly, and the other is that I personally - I speak as a layman - cannot see any possible way of its leading to the conservation of whales. It might in fact as Mr. Trouton or Mr. Salvesen said, lead to exactly the opposite. The record might lead to a rush to certain areas.

Now, Gentlemen, the Chairman thinks we should now take a poll on this Resolution, which will be as follows:

"Resolved that the International Bureau of Statistics should be asked in future to supply to all Contracting Governments the following additional statistical data:-

(a) Weekly information in respect of each factory ship of the catching of whales in terms of blue whale units, and

(b) Copies of all statistical data relating to each individual Whaling Company". - I have added, "at the end of the season".

That is the Resolution which covers 9 in the Technical Committee's Report.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Could they not be separated? The companies would agree to the second but not the first.

The SECRETARY: You would like me to take
(a) and (b) separately?

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): The companies would
have no objection to the second point.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it the companies have no objection
to the second part, at the end of the season, because that would
be available anyway.

The SECRETARY: Then the Resolution is accepted
insofar as it applies to (b) in the Technical Committee's Report,
Paragraph 9.

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (United Kingdom): I do think that on
(b) a good deal more elucidation is needed before the
Commission can vote satisfactorily. It seems to me that it would
be impracticable for the International Bureau to send round
copies to every Government of every single thing they get. I
should have thought it was necessary to decide what statistical
data is to be disseminated in that way before a vote can be taken
on the matter; something more specific.

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Before we come to sub-paragraph
(b) of Paragraph 9, I am still in doubt as to the meaning of
sub-paragraph (a), "Weekly information in respect of each factory
ship of the catches of whales in terms of blue whale units".
Does that mean that information in respect of each factory ship
on weekly catches of whales in terms of blue whale units is to
be supplied later, or do you mean that information should be
supplied weekly?

The CHAIRMAN: Well, it is now supplied weekly to the
International Bureau of Whaling Statistics, it is each whaling
expedition.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): We are supplying weekly, but the Soviet Delegate means that that information should be made available

The CHAIRMAN: Made available to every Contracting Government.

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Every week.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Just as soon as the Bureau has received that information. I see.

The CHAIRMAN: Now is that clear? Does everyone understand what the Resolution means? We will take 9(a) first.

The SECRETARY: I will now take the poll on the Resolution as it applies to (a) in Paragraph 9.

For Japan; U.S.S.R.

Against Australia, France, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, South Africa, United Kingdom, U.S.A.

Abstain Canada, Denmark, Iceland

Absent Brazil, Mexico, New Zealand, Sweden.

The SECRETARY: There are two in favour of the Resolution of 9(a); three abstentions; and eight 'Noes'. So that Resolution is lost.

In view of the British delegate's remarks about 9(b), are there any further observations which anyone wishes to make on that particular recommendation before we poll the Commission on it?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Solyanik, I wish you would indicate, under the statistical data, in what respect it differs from that which we now receive at the Commission meetings and through the published papers of the International Bureau of Whaling Statistics?

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): The reports received cover the broader areas, and we do not know at what time these were taken. The reports we send to the Bureau show the data and the exact place of each taking, and since we give such information to the International Bureau we would like to receive the same information in return, because it is of great scientific interest to us.

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): If the Commission so desired, we could of course send a copy of all statistical reports, but I think it is a lot of work if we send a copy to each of the Contracting Governments. I would prefer to send it to the Secretary, and then he can copy them and send them to the Contracting Governments.

The SECRETARY: We are here to do what you tell us, but I am rather accustomed to sending out a lot of papers, a lot of which are not read, and I have to rely on the services of the Ministry of Agriculture. Could Mr. Vangstein give me an idea in terms of sheets of foolscap what this sort of return would mean? Is it going to mean 100 sheets of foolscap?

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): Yes, at least, for each expedition. There are 30 whaling companies outside the Antarctic - this would not be 100 sheets, of course - but in the Antarctic it would mean about 100 sheets for each expedition.

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): There are at least 30 companies outside the Antarctic.

The CHAIRMAN: This would only apply to Antarctic whaling, as I understand it. Is that right?

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.) (interpretation): I agree with the proposition made by Mr. Vangstein that the information should be sent to the Secretary. Those who are interested in it

could send their technical workers, typists and so on, to take those documents.

The CHAIRMAN: The amended proposal of Mr. Solyanik is not unreasonable because these data if made available to one Contracting Government or to one or more whaling companies should be available on the same basis to all. In other words, if Mr. Vangstein would send the report to the Commission then the experts and stenographers of any country can come and extract what information they desire, but they do it at their own expense and not at the Commission's expense. That is at the close of the season after the returns are all in. I am just stating that as a Commission function; we are entirely at your disposal as to what you wish to do. It is a decision for the Commission to make as to what the responsibility of the Commission is in such matters.

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): What about sending this to the Technical Committee? It might go into it next year, and we could take it up at that time. You cannot ask us to do too much work, and I think this should be brought before the Technical Committee and it could be discussed next year. You are getting quite a lot from the Bureau. It has been working rather hard, and I think it is not quite right to ask us to do very much more.

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.)(interpretation): Norway has at her disposal such information. If this country and others give such information, we naturally want to get the same in return. There is no reason for keeping this secret, and postponing the decision on this question for another year.

H. E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): I think I told you yesterday that this is an international obligation. We were asked 22 or 23 years ago to do this, and the government has done it, and it is an official body working entirely as an official body on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN: Without cost to the Commission.

Mr. H. J. JOHNS (U.K.): I was only going to say that it is difficult, I think, for some of us over here to hear just what is said by the Soviet representative, and I wonder whether it would be possible for you to give us the gist of it from the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether I can give it in the exact words, but Mr. Solyanik has stated that the U.S.S.R. has furnished this detailed information to the International Bureau at Sandefjord, where it is available to the Norwegian Government, and therefore as a matter of reciprocity he thought the same information should be available to the U.S.S.R. Does that summarise it, Mr. Solyanik?

Mr. A. N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to be coffee time, so we will adjourn now and come back to the subject.

(Interval)

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, let us proceed with the work of the Third Plenary Session. We have not yet disposed of 9(b), and we have not concluded the discussion. Are there any further remarks?

His Ex. Professor BERGERSEN (Norway): Mr. Chairman, in case it may help to resolve the difficulty about the resolution we had in front of us just before the adjournment, I should like to state quite explicitly that the information furnished to Sandefjord is not made available either to the Norwegian Government, or to any companies in the Norwegian whaling industry, or to anyone else. The only information that any government or any industry gets is the summarised information that is made available to them all in the published Reports. If the Commission should require to have summaries in any different form from those now supplied, the Bureau will be very glad to do everything they can to meet that wish. In that event I would suggest that the matter should go before the Technical Committee at next year's meeting so that they may make recommendations as to the new summaries that would be of help.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that Professor Bergersen made this statement. I must admit frankly that there has been in certain countries mild feelings of uneasiness about the availability of such detailed data. Well, Professor Bergersen's statement will help me a great deal when I go back to my own country. I can tell all the interests concerned that we are treated on an equal footing; nothing will be disclosed to any particular interests whatever.

Thank you very much, Professor Bergersen.

Dr. C. VON BONDE (South Africa): I wish to second the proposal which Professor Bergersen has just put before us, that this matter be referred to the Technical Committee at the next meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you seconding the proposal made by Professor Bergersen?

Dr. C. VON BONDE (South Africa): That is what I am trying to do.

The CHAIRMAN: Then the matter is now open for discussion.

Dr. C. VON BONDE (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, this matter, I may say, was thrust before us in our Technical Committee meeting without prior notice, and we frankly did not have sufficient time to discuss it fully. I certainly think it needs far more time for consideration in detail.

Mr. R. R. ALEMAN (Panama): For the benefit of all of us in the room, Mr. Chairman, would you please have the Secretary read Professor Bergersen's proposal again.

The SECRETARY: (Reads statement made by Professor Bergersen).

That is the resolution which has been proposed by Professor Bergersen and seconded by Dr. von Bonde of South Africa.

Mr. A. N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Mr. Chairman, the Soviet Delegation states that the U.S.S.R. is ready to pay for the information it wants to get from the International Bureau. Our country is ready to give its contribution to cover the expenses of the International Bureau of Statistics. We consider that the statement made by Professor Bergersen is contrary to the ideas of international co-operation, and because we have been giving full information for recent years, we insist that we and all other Contracting Governments should get this same full information from the International Bureau of Statistics, if it is really international and does not look after the interests of individual countries.

In the Soviet Union we do not spare money for science, and we send to the Antarctic each year a scientific research ship, 'Slava - 15'. It is interesting for our scientists to know when and where

each whale has been killed. This scientific work would in future be published, and could be used by the scientists of the world.

We leave it to you to find an acceptable basis for you, but one way or another we would like to get such information, and we would like to settle this question positively now.

Mr. H. J. JOHNS (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I understand from Captain Solyanik's statement that he wants to get a decision on this matter swiftly, to get a decision this year. It is difficult, it seems to me, to discuss the details of a matter like this in a very large meeting, and I wondered whether the better way might not be to set up a small sub-committee for the purpose of going into this matter, today if possible, with a view to making some recommendation that the Commission can consider before the end of this week, before this meeting is over. If that general idea is acceptable to the Commission, I would like to suggest further that the sub-committee should consist of Dr. Von Bonde, who will bring with him, if he wishes, an adviser; a representative of Norway, who I should hope would be Professor Bergersen, who might bring with him Mr. Wangstein; and Captain Solynaiik himself, who would, of course, bring with him anybody that he wants.

Mr. J. E. CUMMINS (Australia): Mr. Chairman, could I ask Captain Solyanik for a clarification with regard to his last statement. I gathered that he was interested in obtaining for scientific information the location of each of the whales killed in the Antarctic. But he did not make any reference to the fact as to whether or not he wished to know which whaling expedition killed those whales. From a scientific point of view, there seems to be a lot in obtaining specific information as to the location where the whales are taken. If he agreed to that, just giving the information, it might raise a different aspect of the case.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): May I ask another point of clarification, please, on this proposal (b) which we are proposing now? Does "Copies of all statistical data relating to each individual Whaling Company" imply land stations as well, or is it just referring to factory ships in the Antarctic?

The CHAIRMAN: Do you understand the question?

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): It concerns only the Antarctic, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: It relates to pelagic whaling in the Antarctic.

The SECRETARY: Gentlemen, there is a motion before the meeting proposed by Professor Bergersen and seconded by Dr. von Bonde. Before the Chairman puts that to the Meeting for decision, Mr. Solyanik would like to move an amendment somewhat in the terms of 9 (b) but with an addition. His amendment will read like this:

Proposed that "Copies of all statistical data relating to each individual pelagic Whaling Company should be sent at the end of each season to the Commission for any Contracting Government to inspect or to copy".

Now that is a proposal which Mr. Solyanik has asked me to read and he wishes to put it as an amendment. Mr. Chairman, before we can put that, we must ask for a seconder.

The CHAIRMAN: Under parliamentary procedure, before we can deal with any amendment or even proceed with the original proposal, it will be necessary to secure a seconder.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): I will second that.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been seconded by Mr. Anderson.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we call the delegation, the amendment is now open for discussion.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, there is a very big distinction between two sets of different information. One set is sent to the International Whaling Bureau and it may or may not be desirable that such information is sent further in detail to the Governments. Another quite different set is sent individually to the Contracting Governments and that has got to be considered as a separate question - whether it is proper or desirable that information other than that sent to the Bureau should also be supplied in this way. The original suggestion gave instructions to the International Bureau to do something, and it would only send information that had been submitted to it; in the present wording it goes very much further and would involve all Contracting Governments sending all information which they secure from the individual companies.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Captain Salvesen, is there any further discussion?

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (United Kingdom): Could that point be met, Sir, if Captain Solyanik would agree to the insertion of two or three words which would say in effect "as sent to Sandenjord" or "as sent to the Bureau"?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Solyanik, do you agree to the amendment proposed by Mr. Johns?

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Yes, I agree.

The SECRETARY: Proposed that "Copies of all statistical data relating to each individual pelagic Whaling Company as already supplied to the Bureau should be sent at the end of each season

to the Commission for any Contracting Government to inspect or to copy."

Mr. Solyanik has agreed to that, and Mr. Anderson, as seconder, will agree to it.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the Secretary calls the delegations on the amendment, Mr. Trouton wishes to speak.

Mr. R. TROUTON (South Africa): The information which is being asked for is information which may be used either commercially or scientifically. Now, in so far as the information asked for is information which can be used commercially, I object to its being given; in so far as that information is information which can be used scientifically, I am in favour. I understand Captain Solyanik wishes to have the information for scientific purposes. It therefore is of no interest to him to know which expedition caught the whales and in which place, but what whales were caught in which place. I have no objection to that being analysed and given in greater detail than it is now, but I cannot see that the commercial aspect should be confused with the scientific aspect of the industry. On the commercial aspect, we pride ourselves we know a lot, and we have got a lot of information we do not wish to give to our competitors. We have also taken great care to keep secret our movements, our catchings, our number of whales caught on a day by day basis. We keep all that to ourselves, and we do not want our commercial acts and experience to be broadcast to the whaling industry, which is what it would be if our separate company results were made in effect public, because each Government would be entitled to have them, and so, I think, every Government would call for all this information in order to help its whaling companies on the commercial aspects.

I strongly object to the statistics being given on a company basis when information is required on a position; it is a question of where the whales were caught in the Antarctic, not who caught them.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Would the proposer of the motion agree to amending it, putting in a provision, saying "The confidential information as to which company caught the whales is excluded from the information made available to the other countries"? Then there would be no complaint. Naturally, they would object, of course, to their own route being disclosed, and their particular methods of fishing and everything else.

The SECRETARY: Pelagic whaling as a whole.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Yes, entirely pelagic.

The SECRETARY: The Chairman wishes me to say that we have now put some still further words into this draft proposal. Captain Solyanik has seen these additions, and he does not like them, and he thinks, from the point of view of reciprocity, that the U.S.S.R. are justified in asking for the original Resolution. He wishes it therefore made quite clear in the record that he accepts those words, or will accept these words, under protest.

I am going to read the Resolution as now finally amended. "Proposed that copies of all statistical data relating to pelagic whaling in the Antarctic as a whole, as already supplied to the Bureau, should be sent at the end of each season to the Commission for any Contracting Government to inspect or copy." I think the words "as a whole" are part of the earlier amendment, and they come out. The alteration is "relating to pelagic whaling in the Antarctic", and not to individual whaling companies.

Now, Mr. Anderson, that carries out the suggestion you made.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): It does not seem to be as clear as I would like it.

The SECRETARY: I will show it to you.

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): I am sorry, but I shall have to vote against this proposal. I cannot accept it without consulting the Chairman of the Committee on International Whaling Statistics.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Professor Bergersen. Are there any further comments?

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (U.K.): On a point of clarification, I would like to know what is meant by "copies" of information relating to the Antarctic pelagic season as a whole. Is there any such thing as can be copied without copying all the individual things? Does it mean a copy of all the individual reports that are put in by factory ships, or does it mean something in the nature of a summary of those?

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.) (interpretation): We would like to know where and when each whale had been killed, without naming the company.

The CHAIRMAN: Where each whale is killed, without reference to the individual company.

Dr. E.J. SLIJPER (Netherlands): What is proposed now is just the same as what has been done already by the International Whaling Statistics. I think from a scientific point of view it is of no importance to know the exact position of any whale in degrees and parts of degrees, but only in certain areas. And that is given already by the International Whaling Statistics. I cannot see any difference between this and what has already been done by the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics.

The CHAIRMAN: You mean on the Tables 12 to 16?

Dr. E.J. SLIJPER (Netherlands): I mean just the tables that have already been given. It is just the same as we now have. We need not take a resolution about what has just been done.

Dr. N. A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): 12 to 22, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. A. N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): In this table only squares are given, but there is no exact date and exact position, that has exact co-ordination.

Mr. R. TROUTON (South Africa): May I say that we do not record the position of each whale. The whale catchers are chasing round at anything up to 200 miles from the factory ship, and we do not really know where they are. We do not record the whales beyond recording the noon position of the factory ship, and the factory ship can well move 100 or 200 miles between one noon and the next, perhaps because the whales were caught in different positions. So the very plotting of the noon position is known to be wrong because the ship has moved. I would say that you will not know within 200 or 300 miles, even if you were given individual plots of each whale as recorded by us. We just do not record anything more than the whale caught, who caught it, and the noon position of our factory, and I do not think that that information, scientifically, is going to be of any benefit. You will find twenty blue whales caught on a spot, which is untrue; they have been caught in an area nearly as big as the North Sea.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Anderson and Mr. Cummins have interpolated a few more words. I will give you another version now. Mr. Solyanik is agreeable to this.

"Proposed that all data regarding the location and time of killing of whales killed in the Antarctic in the course of pelagic whaling, without any reference to individual whaling companies, should be sent to the Commission for inspection and copying by Contracting Governments".

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): At the end of the season.

The SECRETARY: "Should be sent for inspection to the Commission at the end of the season".

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): I agree with Mr. Trouton that for commercial purposes it is not interesting to know when and where a whale was killed - for Mr. Trouton is more interested in how much more oil to get - but it is interesting from the scientific point of view, and even what was in a whale's stomach.

The CHAIRMAN: Does anyone wish to speak on the matter of stomach contents of whales killed, whether that is recorded on your sheets?

It seems to me that the last question that Captain Solyanik has raised, is whether or not the individual companies record on the log sheets the stomach contents of all whales killed. If one of the companies can answer that, that answers Captain Solyanik's inquiry.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): The International Bureau issues forms to each of us, and on these forms a record of every individual whale that is taken up and measured is entered. The forms cover the date of killing, the place of killing (which as Mr. Trouton says, is within a wide range of the known position of the factory ship) and various other details such as the species, the sex, the length and whether or not there is a foetus. I think there is room for about twenty whales on each form. A very large number of whales is involved, but every whale taken and measured is entered in those forms and sent to Sandefjord.

The CHAIRMAN: But not the stomach content?

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): Mr. Trouton has asked

whether we enter stomach contents or not. I think we do. Yes, we do, we also enter the stomach content in that form all in the same line.

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): Some of the companies fill in the stomach contents, not all.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I would suggest that you read the latest proposal again and then take the vote on it.

The SECRETARY: This is the proposal which will be put to the Commission: "Proposed that all data regarding the location and time of killing of whales killed in the Antarctic in the course of pelagic whaling, without any reference to individual whaling companies, should be sent to the Commission at the end of the season for inspection and copying by Contracting Governments."

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Could I ask a point? Does "time" mean "date", it says "time" only. I do not think we would be interested in the particular time in 24 hours, it is the date, I think.

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Day of killing.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, day of killing instead of time of killing.

The SECRETARY: I will put this now to the Commission.
A vote was taken, as follows:

In favour: Australia, Canada, France, Iceland, Japan,
Netherlands, Panama, U.S.S.R., U.K., U.S.A.

Against: Norway, South Africa.

Abstentions: Denmark.

Not Present: Brazil, Mexico, New Zealand, Sweden.

There are four not present, there are two against, one abstention, and in favour ten. The resolution is carried.

As that was an amendment, strictly speaking the resolution ought to be put again as a substantive resolution. I take it I may presume that voting applies to the substantive resolution.

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): I want to know how we shall manage to give such details without disclosing the name of individual expeditions. We have got sheets filled in from twenty expeditions, and of course we can delete the names and send a copy of these sheets to Mr. Dobson, but if you go through these sheets then you can compare the total number of whales you find in those sheets with other tables. Then you can find which expedition is referred to.

The CHAIRMAN: Scramble the sheets.

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): How can we do that? We can delete the name of the factory ships, that is all. As far as I can see, that is the only way to do it, but that is not a lot of good, because all can understand which expedition it is, nevertheless, on the basis of the total number of whales caught.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): There is no need to connect those. It can be done if you want to do it, but if you do not want to, of course, you will not.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vangstein, I want to raise a question for my own personal information. If you scramble the sheets, how would you ever get the totals?

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): But you have the date on each sheet, first the second of January, and next the third of January. You have the position, and it is quite easy to

find the same date on the next and the same position.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): You could cut the sheets in four parts and scramble them.

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): As I told you, I have to consult with my colleague, the Chairman of the Committee of International Whaling Statistics, Mr. Gunnar Jahn. It might be that we will find it impossible to do this thing.

The CHAIRMAN: That is entirely up to the Bureau.

The last remaining item on the Technical Committee's Report is item 10, and as you recall that item has already been dealt with.

That concludes the work of the Third Plenary Session, and we will return here this afternoon for the Fourth Plenary Session at 2.30. At that time we will consider the amendments.

(The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

FOURTH MEETING

Thursday, 5th June, 1952

(Afternoon Session)

In the Chair: Dr. Remington Kellogg (U.S.A.)

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the fourth plenary session is now open. The Secretary has a communication to make.

The SECRETARY: I only wanted to remind you that amongst the papers circulated this morning, which are in your pigeon-holes, are two consignments of the reports of plenary sessions. Those are being produced as quickly as possible off the typewriter, being first looked over by the Secretariat, but I should be grateful if you would look at them as soon as they come off. We have XIV (A) and (B), and (C) will be here in a moment. Will you let either myself or Mr. Durrant or Mrs. Tait have your corrections because we do not want to circulate them with mistakes. Ultimately the whole of the documents XIV (A), (B), (C), (D) and (E) will have an addendum slip added to them with the corrections you give them.

The CHAIRMAN: As I stated this morning we will commence this plenary session with the consideration of the amendments to the schedule. If you will turn to item 11 on the Agenda, Amendments to the Schedule, the first one is, "Paragraph 4 shall be amended to read as follows, (the underlined words being new):-

It is forbidden to use a factory ship or a whale catcher attached thereto for the purpose of taking or treating baleen whales in any of the following areas:-

- (a) In the waters north of 66° North Latitude, except those between 66° North Latitude and 72° North Latitude and between 168° 58' 22.59" West Longitude and 150° East Longitude, where the taking or killing of baleen whales by a factory ship or whale catcher shall be permitted.
- (b) In the waters of the Pacific Ocean and its dependent waters between 20° North Latitude and 66° North Latitude eastward of a line running south from 66° North Latitude along the meridian 168° 58' 22.59" West Longitude to 65° 15' North Latitude: thence southwest-ward along a great circle course to the intersection of 51° North Latitude and 167° East Longitude: thence southeast-ward along a great circle course

to the intersection of 48° North Latitude and 180° Longitude thence south along the meridian 180° Longitude to 20° North Latitude."

The rest is as it is, except there is a correction (c). It should read, "In the Atlantic Ocean and its dependent waters north, (instead of south) of 40° South Latitude." This is just an error in typing.

The SECRETARY: In the later copies it is North.

The CHAIRMAN: These amendments are now open for discussion. The same amendments are referred to in document XVI, the Report of the Technical Committee, on page 2 under item 7. (

MR. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I think probably I should speak on this since it is one of Canada's proposals. I think probably this proposed amendment has created the most interest since we have met here, and probably some surprise, but I do not know why the surprise, because Canada indicated at Cape Town last year what we had in mind. The reasons for our proposed amendment to the north-east Pacific are quite simple. In our judgment the stocks of whales in that area are comparatively small and they could be over-exploited without too much difficulty. I think that is borne out by the relatively small numbers of whales which have been taken in that sector over many years. Our own experience, both in Canada and I think probably in other plants in that area, in Alaska chiefly, is that the north-east side contains not too many whales, and they could be seriously depleted if there is over-exploitation. In our judgment that would be the case if factory ships operated to any great degree. In 1943 our own catch statistics show that when we were operating there the number of whales in that particular season went down to something under 100. I think the exact figure is around 91. Therefore, it became totally an uneconomical operation. From 1943 to 1948 there were no whaling operations in that area. Consequently, the stocks had a chance to build up. Since then we have been

whaling again and it is doubtful whether an industry can be sustained there to any appreciable degree. Possibly from a land station, with its limited range of operation, an economical operation can be carried on, but if factory ships were to operate indiscriminately in that north Pacific area, then we fear the stocks of whales would go down to the point where there would be relatively none at all. The map showing the whaling areas sets out certain districts or areas which are closed to the operation of factory ships. Now, in our opinion, there must have been good reason for the decisions taken at that time on the Atlantic side and in other places on the map, to prohibit the use of factory ships, but we have failed to understand why at that time that north-east sector of the north Pacific was allowed to remain open. There must have been the same consideration of the depletion of the whale stocks, but apparently, for reasons unknown to us, that particular spot from 20° North Latitude up beyond the Bering Sea was left open to factory ships. Perhaps, had we been as interested in whaling at that time as we are now, we would have resisted that attempt to leave that open, and probably would have insisted that it be closed to factory ships. At the present time, however, and as indicated at Cape Town, we disagree with the decision made at that time when this area was left open.

The basis of our consideration is entirely one of conservation, which I believe is the Commission's main reason and main concern for being in existence. The preamble to the Convention, for instance, sets out the principles to this International Treaty. Without reading it all, Mr. Chairman, the main points are these, "Desiring to establish a system of international regulation for the whale fisheries to ensure proper and effective conservation and development of whale stocks." It goes on in the preamble to the Convention, saying, "Having decided to conclude a convention to provide for the proper conservation of whale stocks and thus make possible the orderly development of the whaling industry." In other words, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the basis and the main concern of this Commission is one of conservation

and propagation of the whaling stocks of the world.

We would have hoped that arising out of our submission on this proposed amendment, which is confined strictly to the north-east Pacific area, that the other countries interested there would have seen fit to follow those conservation principles, and say that they agree the whole area on both the eastern side and western side should be closed to factory ships, but our concern is primarily, Mr. Chairman, one of conservation only.

Again, in our judgment, there are apparently welldefined migratory routes for the whales in the north Pacific. There is probably some intermingling, but to what extent, of course, is not known. We feel very seriously that if these conservation measures are not taken, even on the limited scale which we have proposed by the present amendment to the Schedule, we are afraid we will become aware before long that the north Pacific whale stocks are depleted to a dangerous level, and the International Whaling Commission would be criticised for not fulfilling its responsibilities, namely, to ensure proper and effective conservation and development of whale stocks. Yesterday it was mentioned in the Plenary Session during discussion of this matter of stocks of whales in the Antarctic. I think it was stated then, as I listened to the discussion, that there is apparently some danger in the Antarctic because of the operations of a great many whale catchers attached to factory ships. Now, if that is an indication in the Antarctic, where the stocks are supposed - to the best of our knowledge - to be fairly extensive, that to us is a danger sign as well, and if factory ships are operated to any extent in the north Pacific the same thing will happen in that area.

I have also noticed that there has been some discussion in the Scientific Committee, which unfortunately I was not able to attend, about the line which Canada has proposed as dividing that north-east sector. It has been likened to either a political or a

geographical line. Gentlemen, that is not the case. It was purely on the basis of conservation, and purely, as I indicated at Cape Town, to try and divide up, somehow or other, a line which would be respected to distinguish between the north-east and the north-west section of the Pacific.

On the question of sperms. It is true that they do not to any extent appear in those northern waters beyond, possibly, somewhere a little north of 20° north latitude, but we have to include in the proposed amendments sperm whales because if sperm whales are not included in the area to be forbidden for the use of factory ships, then, of course, there is always the old story of they were out hunting sperm whales, but accidentally took some baleen whales. That is the position, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Clark. Are there any further comments?

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): May I ask one question? Why are you worried about that area? Is it known that any other factories are going to operate in this area?

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I do not know of any at all, but I think there is the risk or the danger of factory ships operating in that area. At the present time not much harm is being done, but it is open at the present time for anyone to go into that area with two, six or ten factory ships.

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.) (Interpreter): What is the meaning of the Scientific Committee on this matter, and what were the discussions of the Committee on this point.

The CHAIRMAN: You will find it in Document XV, page 3, item 8.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, I have already made some statements on the Scientific and Technical Committees, but

simply for the sake of the record I would like to restate our position in respect of the proposals made by the Canadian Commissioner. We have no objection in principle to having a closed area in the eastern sector of the North Pacific, if there is such evidence, as stated by the Canadian Commissioner, that whale stocks in that area are depleted. We are, however, very much concerned with the demarcation line, as it should be called, over the closed area on the west side. In our view, the line proposed here comes into the western side of the North Pacific in which we are interested. As scientific studies have not yet been completed, concerning the range of migration of the whale stocks on the eastern side, we consider it better that, for the time being, the line which divides the North Pacific into two separate areas should be the one which would not cause any controversy between the parties concerned. That is to say, the demarcation line should be drawn a little more on the eastern side. It is a kind of experimental demarcation line, and if later it should be found by scientific research that such a limited area for the prohibition of the use of a factory ship for baleen whales would not sufficiently serve the purpose, we may be able to alter the demarcation line of the closed area according to the scientific findings. Besides, from a practical point of view, the international date line, as suggested in this draft amendment, seems to be pretty difficult for inspectors and masters of catcher boats to trace. For instance, it is not so easy for them to follow the great circle from one point to another as it looks on the map, especially when the weather is foggy.

In view of the above, while accepting this idea, this principle, we should like to have a line, not the international date line, but some line which is a little straighter, which

would be easier for our inspectors to follow.

As Mr. Clark made a remark about the sanctuary of a closed area for factory ships which will catch sperm whales I will go on to make some remarks on this question.

The CHAIRMAN: Could you take up the sperm whale when we come to it.

Dr. J. L. Kask (United States): Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the Canadian Commissioner's viewpoint in principle. My country had many active operating stations in the area concerned; they were all land stations. When I was a young man, and engaged somewhat in whaling myself, we had a large whaling operation. Now we have none at all and the stock of whales in the area under consideration has not been sufficient to support a continuous whaling industry in that area. In the whole of the Pacific area involved this year there is only one small operation. That historically has been cut off for a number of years. We hope and believe that during that period of non-activity at all, on the Pacific coast, the whale stocks were allowed to build up to the point where at last a small operation on the American side, eventually on the Canadian side too, will be allowed to persist. The whale stocks in that area are very vulnerable to heavy fishing. So far as the line is concerned, we have no particular view point, but so far as the condition of the stocks of whales in that area is concerned, we support Canada's idea entirely.

Dr. G. J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, I believe, I am in a rather objective position, because you do not have anything for us up till now in the area discussed. But I

think that the idea of the Japanese delegate is going in a rather practical way, he is looking forward to a proposal that gives a compromise about this demarcation line. There is a possibility to support this problem by amending the Canadian proposal in this direction: instead of this circle line we get a straight line on the 175th degree for instance. Then you get a real straight line, you divide up the whole area and there is a possibility of getting acceptance on this proposal.

Mr. A. N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Mr. Chairman, the Soviet Delegation has always maintained and maintains now the principle that any corrections and amendments made in the Convention with regard to areas of whaling should be supported by the appropriate material received from scientific researches and whaling observations.

As it is known, in the North Pacific and in the Arctic waters north of the Bering Strait there were no active catchings during recent years. So, it is not clear, what whaling observations in the matter of baleen whale stocks in those areas could furnish the basis for the consideration of this question. Scientific research material of other countries on whaling in those areas also remains unknown to us and we are unable to give any estimation to it.

The Soviet Delegation is against the Canadian proposals on point 4(a) and 4(b), prohibiting the use of a factory ship or whale catchers attached thereto for the purpose of taking or treating baleen whales in the Pacific and Arctic Oceans, as it considers them to be scientifically groundless and unsupported by pelagic data.

The Soviet Delegation proposes to leave points 4(a) and 4(b) of the Schedule in the previous wording.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): May I just point out that on the question of the line there seems to be, on the basis of scientific evidence, just as much reason to close the North Pacific as there was to draw the line at 20° north latitude. In other words, what was the scientific basis for closing all the rest of the Pacific and the Atlantic to factory ships?

Dr. N. A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I was not present when the original decision was made, but in thinking what is meant by scientific evidence in this context, I would say that examination of previous catches and the analysis of the statistics all comes under the heading of scientific evidence. We have, of course, to consider the difference between what we can prove by scientific evidence, and what we can say is ^{probable} possible. But that would be my view on that particular point.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): In other words, I take it that the scientific reasons for the other areas being closed were based on the same as I have attempted to make here, and analysis of the catch statistics, not a question of counting the individual whales in a given area.

The CHAIRMAN: As a matter of further information, Mr. Vangstein, do you happen to have with you the issue of the International Whaling Statistics that contains a review of the North Pacific whaling? Perhaps you would just show Captain Solyanik the catch for the North Pacific on the eastern side.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments on this matter?

Mr. V. A. TVERIANOVICH (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): The Scientific Committee has already stated that the Canadian proposal has not sufficient biological grounds. To bring forward such a proposal one should have enough scientific and economic grounds. Pelagic whaling on the other hand in that area has been carried on during recent years on a very limited scale. So in our view there are no factors which could endanger the position of whaling stocks in that area. The Soviet Delegation is against the line proposed by the Canadian Delegation, and suggests that this question should be given more consideration and study in the future.

The line shown on the chart is contradictory to the scientific material and the principle of the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Now, the amendment is still before the Commission. Do you wish to speak further, Mr. Clark?

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): I think I have said all I want.

Dr. N. A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): May I raise one point? I am not quite sure if I have heard correctly, but I think the Soviet Delegate said the Scientific Committee said there were no biological grounds for the Canadian proposal. I do not think I quite agree with that. I think we did not specifically say that there were no full biological grounds. Although certain points were put forward on a biological basis, in fact we left the question rather open, and did not bring the discussion to a conclusion, partly because we had rather little time for it, partly because the Canadian representative was not there. I think that was one of our main reasons for referring the matter to the joint committee and not the Plenary Session.

Dr. C. von BONDE (South Africa): As far as procedure is concerned, we had notice that these amendments are going to be put on the order paper. Now if any further amendments are proposed to these amendments, have we not to have notice of that?

The CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily Sir.

Dr. C. von BONDE (South Africa): Could we make an amendment now?

The CHAIRMAN: The subject matter is here now. The final wording is subject to the ruling of the Commission.

Mr. V. A. TVERIANOVICH (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation) The Soviet representative on the Scientific Committee gave detailed motives for our objection, and in future the Soviet delegate is prepared to object to the proposal.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): That is rather a strange procedure, because I think it is laid down in the preamble to the Convention, as I understand it, that the principles of this Commission are ones of conservation. The Scientific Committee on the other hand has asked the whaling countries in the Northern hemisphere to give consideration and study to the question of the depletion of humpbacks in that northern area. But apparently it is all right on the one hand to talk of conservation, but then when you get a conservation proposal which is a real one and one of substance, then there is direct opposition to it, and apparently unequivocal opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Clark. Are there any further comments?

Mr. R. TROUTON (South Africa): I think historically

the great sanctuary in the Antarctic was created not on any scientific grounds in relation to that area, but it was created because in that area there was no commercial activity, and it was felt that by making a sanctuary out of that area the general breeding grounds and feeding grounds for whales would be protected. There was no scientific basis for choosing that. There was a commercial basis chosen, which was that no one would be hurt.

Now I would like to ask, are there any expeditions operating in the area under discussion? If there are no expeditions operating there, is there any intention in the immediate future to have any expedition operating in that area? If there is an idea of having an expedition operating in that area, will it be operating in the whole area, or could they have a reduced area? I am suggesting that it should be approached not from the scientific point of view but from the point of view of its being dead ground. That was why the South Pacific was made a protected area; it was made dead ground because there was nobody working there.

Now I do not know enough about the plans of Soviet Russia or Japan for operating in that area, but if they have any intention of operating in part of it, I should like them to say so, and then we would realise that there was a commercial reason for objecting to this scientific experiment. But if there is no commercial reason, then I think this scientific experiment should be tried, as was the great zone in the South Pacific. I would like for example to put up a proposal that if they will not accept 178° point something or other, will they accept 170°, or will they accept 160°, or 150°, you see?

Mr. A. N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation): We support the view of Mr. Trouton. If there is no active commercial or scientific whaling there, we do not have any scientific or commercial grounds to judge the whale stocks in that area; and to study the question in greater detail we should not close this area, but we should send a factory there to work

for several years, and then present us with data; and after a number of years, decide whether to close it or not.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): May I say, Mr. Chairman, the reason for Canada's proposal in drawing this line and thinking only of the North East Pacific was for the very reason given by Mr. Trouton and by Captain Solyanik: that we knew that there were operations - that Japan for instance and the U.S.S.R. were operating on a limited scale on the western side. So Canada's position was this: that it was entirely up to them if they felt the same way as we did on conservation grounds, that they would come forward with their proposal on the western side.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Clark. Were there any further comments? Since the item is on the agenda we must deal with it. But, before we go further, I must ask Mr. Clark, before we proceed with the polling of the delegations, I must ask you if you will accept Dr. Lienesch's amendment to set up the line at 175° instead of the International Date Line.

MR. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I have no objection at all, if there is a better line, to have it drawn up, but I should make the position very clear. I think our friends from the U.S.S.R. have made their position very clear, and I have attempted to make ours. Dr. Kodaki made his position clear. Dr. Kodaki, as I understand it, agrees with us as to the principle as a conservation measure. His main objection is the question of where the line is drawn. But I would like to say this, Mr. Chairman: that this is one of those things, unless there is unanimous agreement, so far as Canada is concerned they would not like to place any other country - Japan or any other country that might anticipate going to the North Pacific - in the position of voting in favour of the amendment and adopting it, and yet some other country being quite free to go in wherever they choose.

I think that as long as that is thoroughly understood, it may be undesirable because of that risk to place anyone in an embarrassing position. In other words, unless it is unanimous on conservation grounds, I think you should consider putting it to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: From the procedural standpoint we either vote or you withdraw the amendment for the present session.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): I do not know who the next move is up to. To make the position clear I would ask a question direct to Captain Solyanik. As I understand your position, you are absolutely opposed even in principle to this idea.

Mr. A. N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): We are not against this proposal in principle, but our suggestion is that we should study this question for a number of years and then, on the basis of the scientific material received during those experiments, decide this question, positively or negatively.

Dr. KASK (U.S.A.): I would like to add one word in this regard. We are not entirely without experience in that area as to what effect heavy fishing for whales has on the stock; when something like a dozen operating plants have gone out of operation progressively until no operation existed over a period of years, and for one reason only, that is that they were unable to get enough whales to continue their operations. Then, though that may not be considered very good scientific evidence, I think it is sufficient evidence to convince even a sceptical person like me that the area does not support very large operations for whales and needs protection.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clark, from the procedural standpoint, you propose and Dr. Kask seconds.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, following what Dr. Kask has said, I thoroughly agree with him; we have had quite a number of years' experience of what is happening in that particular area. With regard to the U.S.S.R.'s proposal, I was glad to hear they agreed in principle to the conservation side of it. That was something which had worried me to the moment; I thought that it was contrary to the entire concept of this Commission. But they have clarified that point now. However, I should like to ask just how long do they think that such an analysis of the statistics should go on. They say a few years; is it one, two, three, ten, fifteen or twenty years?

Mr. A. N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation) Should Canada send a scientific research ship to that area, and in a year or two present sufficient material, we should support this suggestion and support your proposal.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): Of course, Mr. Chairman, I will not say Canada is going to go to the extent of sending a scientific ship up to do this work. All we can go on is the actual practical result; if the decline in the catch goes on, then we know there are fewer whales.

Mr. A. N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation): Mr. Clark's remarks are based on the material presented by six catchers belonging to British Columbia and two catchers belonging to California, which are operating in an area of a radius of not more than 200 miles. But Mr. Clark proposes to close down an area with a radius of about 2,000 miles.

Dr. N. A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): It rather seems, Mr. Chairman, that basically there is no real difference of

opinion between the parties to this discussion. I wonder whether it might help to get the problem solved eventually if papers were prepared for the Scientific Committee and all sides of the question were put up together. Perhaps the Scientific Committee could, at some future meeting, either at the next meeting of the Commission, or even before the next meeting, help to sort this out and bring out some definite proposal which would have a chance of acceptance.

Dr. J. L. KASK (U.S.A.): I would like to clarify one item. That evidence that we were discussing was not from two catches in California and six in British Columbia, but in all stations from California along the British Columbia coast, and as far west as Akutan Pass on the Aleutian Islands.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I think if there is insistence on this purely scientific information that Captain Solyanik has mentioned, then I think the work of the Commission is going to be extremely difficult, because I have yet to see any real scientific information on which any of the decisions are based. It is an analysis purely of the catch statistics provided by the International Bureau.

Mr. V. A. TVERIANOVICH (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation): Soviet scientists have begun whale marking in the Far East, and would like to have as a minimum about three years to get the information and verify it. They would present their final figures on the position of these stocks in those waters. It will be necessary to use it for this purpose, and to decide if Soviet scientists would like to have it.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what has just been said about the whale marking, which I think is extremely valuable. The only point is this, that the whale marking which I assume you would be doing would be on the western side, not on the eastern side. So that during those three years the information

that is going to be assembled would be, I take it, all on that western side, and does not provide too much information possibly on the eastern pacific sector.

What I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, as time is getting along - I do not think we are going to get very far with this, except I think it has brought out some rather pertinent points - is that we have a sort of combination of what Dr. Mackintosh suggested and what D. Kask suggested, that the information on catch statistics for that specific area be assembled and analysed and submitted to the Scientific Committee for discussion next year. In the meantime, if that is acceptable, I would withdraw Canada's proposed amendment, because, as I said before, I would not want to have a vote taken, and place any other countries in an embarrassing position, unless it is unanimous.

The CHAIRMAN: Would that be agreeable, Captain Solyanik; to do a study of the available statistics by the scientists and Scientific Committee at the next Meeting?

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable to the remainder of the Contracting Governments here represented?

I assume that it is agreeable: that means that the statistical data will be assembled for study by the scientists and the Scientific Committee at the next meeting of the Commission.

Now we come to (2) 6(b), which is a change of wording.

"It is forbidden to use a factory ship or a whale catcher attached thereto for the purpose of taking or treating sperm whales in the waters of the Pacific and Arctic Oceans and their dependent waters lying between 20° North Latitude and 72° North Latitude and eastward of a line running south from 72° North Latitude along the meridian 168° 53' 22.59" West Longitude to 65° 15' North Latitude; thence south-westward along a great circle course to the intersection of 51° North Latitude and 167° East Longitude; thence south-eastward along a great circle course to the intersection of 48° North Latitude and 160° Longitude; thence south along the

meridian 180° Longitude to 20° North Latitude."

This amendment is now before you.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, that, of course, is tied in with the previous discussion and I suggest that the same thing be done with that as we have just decided on 4 (a) and (b).

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable?

Now it is necessary to make an amendment to 6(a), and the Secretary will now read it.

The SECRETARY: The amendment that stands before the Commission of which due notice has been given of 60 days, involves one four figure amendment: 1953 as it stands in the Convention at present is 1952, and if you do not extend that, then that 1250 humpback concession will disappear. Now, in Dr. Mackintosh's report, his Committee recommends the acceptance of this amendment, but in slightly different terms. In fact it says 1250 beginning on the 1st February but, knowing perfectly well that the International Bureau is physically unable to terminate the catching of humpback whales until an assessment has been taken, Dr. Mackintosh's Committee recommends, instead of taking that, another proviso. Instead of the words:

"provided that in the pelagic whaling season for baleen whales 1953 a maximum of 1250 humpback whales may be taken in these waters commencing on February 1st",

He suggests a proviso which I have attempted to commit to writing - I have not been able to circulate it - which would read like this:

..."provided that the taking of humpbacks shall be permitted on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd of February in each year, and if the number of humpback whales taken on those three days is less than 1250 the International Bureau of Whaling Statistics shall, in their discretion, specify one or more days later in the season on which further humpback whales may be taken so as to bring the total up to a maximum of 1250"

Those are the words, I think they meet the case: that is, I think, Dr. Mackintosh, the purpose of your Committee's recommendation.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I think so, the only thing we did not go into very definitely was the question as to whether it was to apply only to next year or to an indefinite number of years.

The SECRETARY: The only object of putting it in this form was in order not to alter it each year.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Mr. Chairman, is that not against the actual text of the amendment, as given for one year only, and now you want to make it for ever.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): And, Mr. Chairman, is there any scientific basis for that?

The CHAIRMAN: Well, it seems to me the simplest procedure would be to change the date from 1952 to 1953 as we have done in the past year. Is that agreeable, Mr. Anderson?

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I would agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN: Then, if this other proposal could be made next year Does the Commission desire a poll, or is that agreed?

/Agreed/

Gentlemen, we will now adjourn for a few minutes for tea.

/Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m./

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, can we commence business again?

I note from the Scientific Committee Report, Document XV, under 4(a) when we adjourned we were dealing with Item (2) 6(a) on humpbacks. We had not completed action on that paragraph. That paragraph stops with "February 1st". The Scientific Committee has made a proposal which the Secretary will now read. It follows right after "February 1st".

The SECRETARY: "The Committee see no reason for departing from the present limit of the catch of 1,250 humpbacks, but they recommend instead of a specified maximum of 1,250 taken in an undefined period the Commission should authorise the catch of humpbacks on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd February; and that if in that period the number of humpbacks killed is materially less than 1,250, the International Bureau of Whaling Statistics shall have discretion to specify one or more days later in the season in which further humpbacks may be taken up to a maximum of 1,250."

It was on that, Mr. Chairman, I read a proviso to 6(a) instead of the proviso as it stands in the Schedule at present.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you please read the proviso in line with this recommendation.

The SECRETARY: The proviso, which I drafted quickly, if you will look at the Agenda 6(a) you will see there is one figure underlined, 1953, and to meet the Scientific Committee you have to take out those three lines beginning "provided" and insert something like this: "provided that the taking of humpbacks shall be permitted on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd February in each year, and if the number of humpback whales taken on those three days is less than 1,250, the International Bureau of Whaling Statistics shall in their discretion specify one or more days later in the season on which further humpback

whales may be taken, so as to bring the maximum up to 1,250."

That follows almost verbatim the Scientific Committee's Report, it being pointed out to me in the tea interval that if that is accepted, the later provision in the Schedule as it stands now, namely 8(e), which gives directions to the International Bureau about warning people they are getting to the end of their time, will have to be amended.

The CHAIRMAN: The proposal is now open for discussion.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): The only thing I am not clear about, Mr. Chairman, is the effect not only on paragraph 8(e) of the Schedule, which refers to the catch of humpbacks, but also paragraph 8(c) above it. That provides for the reporting of the humpback whales. It seems to me we have just got to look after that. Do we, for instance, need the words "including nil returns on days when no humpback whales are taken".

The CHAIRMAN: That would not be necessary.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): As far as I can see, all we need is to have the Reports on the numbers of humpbacks taken, then if the catch in three days is materially less than 1,250, the Bureau has discretion to allocate

The SECRETARY: That is dealt with in my proviso. That looks as if in 8(e) all you would have to do would be to take out the last two and a half lines and stop after "Government".

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): The only other point I am not quite sure about is whether we need to specify what is 'materially less than 1,250', or is that left to the Bureau? Supposing it was 1,200?

The SECRETARY: I have put "is less than" in my suggested proviso.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): For 1249 you would allow another day's whaling.

Dr. N. A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): The Bureau would have discretion, would they?

The SECRETARY: If it was less than 1249.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): I think it would be confined to one year only.

The SECRETARY: If Dr. Mackintosh's recommendation is brought in, is it only intended to apply to 1953?

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): That is all we have power to deal with in this Plenary session, one year.

The CHAIRMAN: That wording can be amended.

The SECRETARY: To read "in 1953" instead of "each year".

The CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

Mr. F. H. CORNER (New Zealand): The New Zealand Government is most anxious to ensure that the already low stocks of humpback whales in the Antarctic should not be still further depleted, and is most concerned at the fact that in every year since the new Convention has been operated the authorised catch of humpbacks has been exceeded. In the hope that this proposal of the Scientific Committee might help to keep the catch within its proper limits, the New Zealand Government would be quite willing to test it out for a year, but in agreement with this proposal that catching should be

limited to a specified number of days, it gives its approval on the understanding that this limit of 1250 is regarded as an absolute maximum; and in exercising its discretion in this matter it would hope the International Bureau of Whaling Statistics would keep well on the side of caution.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): The position, Mr. Chairman, I think is that if 1250 are taken in two days, would the Bureau stop the whaling?

The CHAIRMAN: May I answer that?

Under the previous 8.(e) you had to give three days' notice.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): I thought we had a daily report now for humpbacks.

The CHAIRMAN: Even that we found was impossible.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): As I foretold in 1949. We are with New Zealand rather anxious to see that 1250 is not exceeded. I did propose that when they are exceeded it should be taken off the next year's quota, but no one seems happy about that. I would support, for Australia, the new idea of 1st, 2nd and 3rd February as a try-out for this season, but not to continue.

The CHAIRMAN: That is for 1953.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Inasmuch as this is an amendment to the Schedule, I will ask the Secretary to read the proviso again and the deletion, and then we will poll the delegations.

The SECRETARY: The proviso, as I say, will come in place of the last two and half lines in 6(a), as it appears on the Agenda, and the proviso will be as follows: "provided that the taking of humpbacks shall be permitted on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd February, in 1953, and if the number of humpback whales taken on those three days is less than 1,250, the International Bureau of Whaling Statistics shall, in their discretion, specify one or more days later in the season on which further humpback whales may be taken, so as to bring the total up to a maximum of 1,250." Now, if that is accepted it will mean a consequential amendment in 8(e), and if you look at 8(e) in the white copy of the Schedule, March 1952, you will see that that 8(e) ends up with the words, "three days in advance thereof. The taking of humpback whales in all waters south of 40° South Latitude shall be illegal after midnight of the date so determined." That procedure falls to the ground if you are going to have taking for three days. I think the consequential amendment is, from the words "three days" those lines go out. Have a fullstop after "Each Contracting Government".

The CHAIRMAN: You have the amendment now before you.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Johns raised this point with me and I would like to hear what he has got to say about the consequential amendment, because he was good enough to point out that if you are going to have the three days, it does mean a consequential amendment.

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (U.K.): I should have thought some larger change in sub-paragraph (e) of paragraph 8 was necessary, because there will be no point in the Commission or such other body as the Commission may designate, determining the date on which the maximum catch of humpback whales will be deemed to have been

reached. I should have thought that the whole of sub-paragraph (e) might very well come out.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable? I am inclined to agree with Mr. Johns that 8(e) has no force.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Are we not getting on to dangerous ground? We are now going to delete a sub-paragraph, or an amendment, which is not on the paper.

The CHAIRMAN: It is on page 3, paragraph 6 of your Agenda.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): The amendment only says the alteration of the year. This is a different thing altogether.

The CHAIRMAN: Look at paragraph 6 under (B). It says: "It is forbidden to use a whale catcher attached to a factory ship for the purpose of taking or killing humpback whales in any waters south of 40° South Latitude; provided that in the pelagic whaling season for baleen whales 1953 a maximum of blank humpback whales may be taken in these waters commencing on blank."

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): There are no blanks on my copy.

(The Chairman compared his copy of the Agenda with that of Mr. Anderson.)

The SECRETARY: Gentlemen, on the point that Mr. Anderson raised, Mr. Anderson is worried about cutting out a whole sub-paragraph of the Schedule, because necessary notice has not been given, but I think I can assure him if you are going to accept the amendment to 6(a), by cutting out 8(e) altogether it is merely a consequential amendment to an amendment of which full notice has been given in two places on the Agenda.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I could possibly explain how it is there appears the same suggestion or proposed amendment in two places on the Agenda. You will notice 6 (a) is really a re-write of the whole of that paragraph, without any change in it, except 1953. That was brought about when I submitted the amendments in connection with the North East Pacific. But then the United Kingdom commissioner, on another page, page 3 of the Agenda, where he is dealing specifically with an amendment to paragraph 6 of the Schedule, left the number of whales and the quota blank, as well as the date. That is why it appears twice on the Agenda.

Mr. H. J. JOHNS (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, if there is a difficulty about making this consequential amendment, taking out sub-paragraph (e), may I suggest for consideration that we make no change at all, beyond the ~~change~~ of date; the Commission should on this occasion confine itself to changing the date.

There is another reason for that also. One reason is that Mr. Anderson and possibly others want to make sure that the consequential amendment is consequential and no more. The other is, if Mr. Anderson is right in contending that it would be out of order to consider taking out 1952, and opening this provision generally for the future, instead of confining it to one year, then it is also equally wrong for the Commission at this stage to consider swapping over from the 1250 humpback whales to 1st, 2nd and 3rd February, because no notice of that either has been given in the Agenda.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe the Commission has already heard an expression of opinion from New Zealand and also from Australia that they are somewhat concerned over the overriding of the maximum limit of humpback whales during the past season.

I think that inasmuch as that is formally in the record, due consideration should be given to those statements.

Now it is entirely up to you, the Commission, to decide what you wish to do.

The SECRETARY: The Chairman desires me to just read this again with a view to seeing whether any one will propose or second. If there is no proposer or seconder, or if there is, then Mr. Johns could move an amendment on these lines: "providing that the taking of humpback whales shall be permitted on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd of February, in 1953, and if the number of humpback whales taken on those three days is less than 1250, the International Bureau of Whaling Statistics shall in their discretion specify one or more days later in the season on which further humpback whales may be taken so as to bring the total up to a maximum of 1250."

If that proviso is proposed, it will follow as a consequential amendment the elimination altogether of 8 (e).

The question which the Chairman wishes to put is, is there a proposer and a seconder to that proposal which follows as near as anything the recommendation of the Scientific Committee.

Mr. H. S. DROST (Netherlands): We accept this proposal.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): I second it.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any amendments? If not, the Secretary will proceed with the following resolution.

The SECRETARY: Will those in favour of the proposal, the additional proviso, and the elimination of 8 (e), say yes.

Australia - we want to think it over,

Brazil - not present.

Canada - no,

Denmark - abstains,
France - we want to read and study it,
Iceland - abstains,
Japan - yes,
Mexico - not present,
Netherlands - yes,
New Zealand - yes,
Norway - yes,
Panama - yes,
South Africa - yes,
Sweden - not present
U.S.S.R. - yes,
United Kingdom - yes,
U.S.A. - yes,
Australia - yes,
France - J'ai l'impression que je ne risque rien, yes.
Canada -

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, as it is unanimous, we have no interest, I should like to change my mind to yes then.

The SECRETARY: That is unanimous with two abstentions and two absentees, that is carried.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now deal with item (3) on page 2 of the Agenda which involves 9.(a) and 9.(b). That is dealt with on the Report of the Technical Committee, Document XVI, page 2 at the bottom, and runs to page 3. If you have had an opportunity to study your papers, the matter is open for discussion.

Dr. C. von BONDE (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, might I draw the Commission's attention to this Technical Report of the

Technical Committee, the first paragraph on page 3, right in the middle of that paragraph, where we say "with regard to the remainder, the Committee considered that the constitution of a small Sub-Committee (Chairman and two other Commissioners with the Secretary) was desirable, to which all these amendments could be referred, and which could have the advice of a member of the legal staff of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. This Sub-Committee should be asked to produce a revised Schedule for consideration next year." I wish to move that.

H.E. A.KI.JONSSON (Iceland): After having referred the final draft agenda to the Icelandic Government, I received from them instructions to make known to the International Whaling Commission that the Icelandic Government cannot accept the amendments proposed by the Canadian Commissioner in relation to subparagraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 9 of the Schedule. I informed the Secretary of the International Whaling Commission of this in a letter dated the 28th February, 1952.

I should like to explain in a few words the reasons why my Government cannot accept the Canadian proposals:

We must firstly object against the word "all" in "all the meat" etc., because it is considered impossible to define what these words really mean. In this connection I would like to draw attention to the fact that very often only part of the meat of the same whale is fit for human consumption. The fat meat, for instance, is not considered fit for human consumption. It also frequently happens that some of the meat would be unfit for human consumption because of damage to it from the shots. It seems evident that the man who kills the whale cannot judge beforehand whether "all the meat" from the whale which he is catching would be fit for human consumption. This judgment could only be made at the cutting platform, and even then it would probably be difficult to decide whether the nebulous definition of "all the meat", etc., has been fulfilled. The word "all" (the meat) would, therefore, only cause confusion and make

more difficult the implementation of the Schedule, and consequently the Icelandic Government cannot accept this wording.

Secondly, the deletion of the words "or animal food" cannot be accepted. Since whaling was begun in Iceland we have always used part of the whalemeat for animal food; in later years mainly for foxes and minks. In this connection, I would like to stress that the breeding of furred animals is a recognised trade in Iceland. If, therefore, the amendments to which I am referring were accepted, this limiting the use of the whalemeat would not only hurt the interests of the Icelandic Whaling Society, but would also hurt the interests of other trades in Iceland.

I should also like to point out that in connection with the whalemeat for human consumption, there would usually at the same time be available refuse meat fit for animal food. The latter one not fulfilling the conditions which are made for the meat intended for human consumption. It is, therefore, clear that the deletion of the words "or animal food" would limit greatly the use of refuse meat for animal food.

The conclusion of my remarks is, therefore, that the Icelandic Government would prefer to have the phrasing of sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) to paragraph 9 unchanged from what they are now.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I would like to rise first to second Dr. von Bonde's proposal to adopt the Technical Committee's recommendation; but also I would like to go on record as saying that I noticed the representative of Iceland has referred to the proposed amendment as being proposed by Canada. I would just like to explain it is not Canada. We were the authors of it, we do not take the responsibility. What happened was the same question came up in Cape Town last year, and there was a great deal of discussion. Finally, the former Chairman then asked the Canadian Commissioner and the United States Commissioner to try and prepare a formula for presentation at this 1952 meeting of the Commission of this question,

based on the discussion. That is what we undertook to do, and that is what we did, but we were not happy about it ourselves, although we were the authors.

H.E. A.Kl. JONSSON (Iceland): Mr. Chairman, I must apologise for having wrongly given Canada responsibility for this Amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. von Bonde, with reference to the Committee's proposal, the recommendation which you have made, and I believe Mr. Clark has seconded, there is one question in my mind as to what you mean by all these amendments.

Dr. C. VON BONDE (South Africa): In paragraph 7, amendments to Schedule, we have enumerated them there. We did not deal with Mr. Clark's amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: Just for clarification, if you would state what amendments it was proposed we should refer to the Committee.

Dr. C. VON BONDE (South Africa): There are only now (a) and (b).

The CHAIRMAN: Then it is just 9(a) and (b) which would be referred.

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): The Soviet Delegation does not see any logical grounds or necessity to increase killing of young whales by land stations for the purpose of using their meat as food for human consumption within the country where the land station is located, because the meat of ordinary sized whales is not yet used completely. That is why the Soviet Delegation suggests that the previous wording of paragraph 9(a) and 9(b) of the Schedule should remain unchanged.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a seconder to the amendment of Captain Solyanik, to keep it unchanged?

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): If I may suggest it, probably if Dr. von Bonde agrees, the proposal before the Commission now could be changed to this extent, that we deal now with the amendments, or the proposed amendments to 9 (a) and (b) on the Agenda. That would clear that out of the way, and I think what the Technical Committee had in mind was that the Sub-Committee should then be set up, if it is approved by the Commission, to deal with all the other amendments, of which there are a great many, which were proposed by the United Kingdom Commission. I think that is correct.

Mr. H. J. JOHNS (United Kingdom): That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN: We are in a procedural snarl. You will have to withdraw the original recommendation.

Dr. C. von BONDE (South Africa): I merely recommend that (a) and (b) stay as they are.

The CHAIRMAN: You withdraw your original proposal?

Dr. C. von BONDE (South Africa): Modify it, and it is the same as Captain Solyanik's proposal.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I agree with that.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I think that is the decision of the Committee. On my notes it says, leave it as it is.

The CHAIRMAN: It stands as it is. That simplifies the whole thing.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Johns, could you read your words, are they practically the same as the Order Paper?

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (United Kingdom): They are the same as in the Order Paper. Simply for the purpose of this subparagraph, where it says "whales taken", the words in inverted commas.

Mr. H.Th. KNUDTZON (Norway): I am uneasy about this proposal, from a legal point of view, because if you in one paragraph of the Schedule alone say that for the purpose of this question the words "whales taken" in this case has that and that meaning, you will find that in all the provisions where the word "taken" is mentioned, it has another meaning. I am not quite sure. We have no time to go through the Schedule, in the light of this, and I am a bit afraid that perhaps we may make an alteration which carries quite another meaning than was originally the intention.

The CHAIRMAN: In view of what has been said, and in view of the recommendation of the Technical Committee - Document XVI, page 3, the second paragraph, they recommend that a small sub-committee be set up to consider these amendments. That would be (4) and (B), that is the United Kingdom amendments on paragraphs 3, 4 and part of 5 on the Agenda. In other words, instead of considering these amendments at this meeting of the Commission, a sub-committee should be set up to study the whole question including the re-arrangement or revision of the Schedule, for consideration next year. If that is proposed, I would like to suggest one change. The sub-committee as indicated on page three of the Technical Committee's report, includes the Chairman. The Chairman will probably find it rather difficult to come here for two or three days during the year, to attend a meeting of this sub-committee, and I would therefore suggest that the Vice-Chairman be substituted for the Chairman. If that is agreeable, will someone make such a proposal?

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): There is no dissenting voice?

The CHAIRMAN: No, no dissenting voice.

The SECRETARY: The Chairman wants me to call attention to the fact that the next amendment on the order paper, in paragraph (4) top of page 3, is paragraph 18: at end add the following words:- "Whales taken" means "whales that have been killed and either flagged or made fast to catchers". That is neither a Canadian amendment nor a United Kingdom amendment. It was an amendment which I was instructed to put in at the Cape Town meeting. I have put it in where it seems to me a definition might go in. The Technical Committee did say, in regard to that paragraph, that they thought it was a desirable amendment on the previous papers. I think Mr. Johns, however, feels that whilst the amendment should be accepted, it is not the correct place to put it in - in the definition clause. He thinks those words should be repeated in three clauses. Perhaps Mr. Johns would make it quite clear.

Mr. H. J. JOHNS (United Kingdom): I think, Sir, when this matter was discussed on the Technical Committee, we were all agreed that words of this sort are necessary for a specific purpose, but that it would be undesirable to put them into the last paragraph of the Schedule, for two reasons. First, because the other definitions there are definitions of whaling, and this does not consort very well with them, and secondly, because it was undesirable to try to define the word "take" and "taken" in these words for the whole of the Schedule, without looking much more closely at it. This particular definition of whales taken is needed, as I think we all agreed in paragraph 8 (c), where humpback whales taken were discussed; in 13 (b) which deals with whales taken; and in 16. The reason for that is that the purpose in defining "whales taken" is, to make clear what are the whales taken for the purposes of the records that are dealt with in those paragraphs.

Dr. von Bondo has proposed it. Is there a seconder?
Mr. Anderson seconds it.

Mr. H. Th. KNUDTZON (Norway): Before we leave this question, I should like to revert to the proposal of Mr. Johns. I think, in the circumstances it would be very fine to have it made quite clear, with respect to the number of whales which have to be radioed to Sandefjord, the meaning of "taken". We have it here laid down that every factory ship shall report by radio the number of whales taken. We have had controversies in Norwegian factory ships between the inspectors and the managers, the inspectors maintaining that all whales which have been reported by radio as having been killed, should be reported to Sandefjord, but some of the managers saying that it is only the whales which have been actually taken into the factory ships, taken on board, which shall be included in the reports to Sandefjord. If we do not make any alteration of the Schedule, I would move that the Commission agree upon some Resolution about the understanding of "whales taken" in respect to reporting to Sandefjord. We have done so before, I remember, in London at the first meeting of the Commission. We gave solely an interpretation; it came on the record and we had to obey this interpretation.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to make such a proposal? Shall we refer it to the Technical Committee to come in with a Resolution?

Mr. H. Th. KNUDTZON (Norway): Yes, but I am not very much inclined to propose another meeting for the Technical Committee.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): It seems to me that our Commission has got along quite well for some time now, without these sort of ad hoc interpretations, though I can see the value of it. But you have a proposal before the Commission to constitute this sub-committee. To my way of thinking, the question of this "whales taken" is one of definition, and if that committee that is proposed to go in to the rearrangement of the entire Schedule would get to work, then you would have, I should think, at the very outset of the Schedule, the definition of what is meant. I think, unless we have that, we are only going to get more involved and mixed up than we are at the present time. I think it is absolutely essential that this matter of rearrangement of the Schedule be done first.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is that agreeable?

In constituting this Committee, I would like to ask Mr. Johns if he would be willing to serve.

Mr. H. J. JOHNS (United Kingdom): I should have been very willing to serve: I do not want to bring salt tears to anybody's eyes, but I am leaving the service of the Ministry this autumn, and I think it would hardly be appropriate that I should serve. I am very grateful to you for suggesting it.

The CHAIRMAN: Then as Chairman, I will appoint Dr. Lienesch, Mr. Knudtson and the Legal Adviser who is in the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, and the Secretary of the Commission.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): It says "two others".

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Johns will not be here. Is

that agreeable, or will it be necessary to poll the delegations?

The SECRETARY: The Chairman desires me to say that, as he reads the position, you have now set up the sub-committee to produce a revised Schedule and a re-arranged Schedule, and to that sub-committee will go all the amendments now on the paper, beginning with the amendments to Paragraph 13, and all the amendments put forward by the United Kingdom Commissioner, which take you right down to the end of Paragraph 12, that is on the top of page 5. That is our reading of the decision up to date.

But I want to call attention that there is an amendment by Mr. Johns at the top of page 4, Paragraph 8. Mr. Johns felt that that was a clarification amendment, and I think the Technical Committee did consider it was a desirable one. So it is for the Commission to decide whether it should go to the Committee or whether you would take a vote on Paragraph 8 "on which the taking of humpback whales is permitted".

The CHAIRMAN: We have a proposal either to refer to this sub-committee or to consider it now.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Let us consider it now.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clark has requested it be considered now. Is there a seconder? It is seconded by Dr. Kask. It is now open for discussion. That is Paragraph 8 at the top of page 4. If you will consider it with the previous Paragraph 8(c), the only substantive changes are the underscored words on page 4.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): It is a matter of new phrasing, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN: They are additional qualifications.

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (U.K.): May I just say, Sir, by way of explanation, that these words on the paper, of which of course due notice was given, are simply there for clarification. As the paragraph stands it looks as though throughout the whole of the pelagic season, whether or not humpback whaling is allowed, each factory ship in the expedition is under obligation to send in a nil return as regards humpback whales; and that, I am sure, nobody ever intended. So the simple purpose of this amendment was to say that those positive returns or nil returns, as the case may be, are to be sent in each day on which humpback whaling is allowed. There is nothing more sinister than that in it that I can see!

Mr. H. Th. KNUDTZON (Norway): The Commission has raised the question regarding the limitation of the taking of humpbacks which, in my opinion, makes this quite unnecessary; because you notice it is permitted to catch humpbacks on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd February, and I think they must be quite idiotic if they would continue to send humpback reports throughout the whole season. It is better to leave it as it stands.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): I quite agreed with Mr. Knudtzon, but the British Government stuck meticulously to the Convention and ordered us to send in nil returns on every day in connection with humpbacks. I therefore asked him to put the matter right here in other that he might meticulously give us a wider regulation.

As regards the factory ships, I asked them if it was really necessary to send in these returns, and they said all they wanted were the nil returns on the days it was required to make them. We did not do anything so silly in spite of the fact that we were rightly and properly ordered to do so!

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): I move the question be now put.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): I second that.

The SECRETARY: Will those say 'yes' in favour of the addition of these words, "on which the taking of humpback whales is permitted".

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

In favour: Australia, Canada, France, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, South Africa, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom.

Abstentions: Denmark, U.S.A.

Absent: Iceland, Mexico, Sweden.

The SECRETARY: There are two abstentions, and the others present are unanimous.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): May I ask a question for clarification?

May I assume that the sub-committee which you have appointed to deal with the series of amendments to the Schedule will be dealing with it between now and the next year's meeting, and that they will bring forward proposals within the necessary sixty days' notice so that they will be on next year's Agenda?

The CHAIRMAN: That is the intention.

The SECRETARY: I must see the Legal Adviser first. He is rather a king pin.

Dr. J. L. KASK (U.S.A.): I would like to add one word of encouragement to the Select Committee that is going to work on the recodification of the Whaling Schedule. As a freshman of this year at this Whaling Convention, I must say I have been rather overcome with trying to follow the various amendments to the Schedule, and I would like to add my support to my Canadian colleague in wishing that we do get a recodified Schedule out for

next year and at that time we act upon it, so we have something a little more orderly and a little more acceptable to you people. You people are all experienced in this matter, but we do have a little trouble in following the matter of the Schedule.

The SECRETARY: The Chairman would like to adjourn now and tomorrow at ten (I do hope it will be ready) we will have the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee which will deal with a number of points, including the last item on the Agenda. When that Committee's Report has been dealt with we will then conclude with item (C) on the Agenda "the possible alteration of the pelagic whaling season" - on which I understand the Whaling Commission wants to say something; "the possible amendment of paragraph 8 (a) of the Schedule" and "any other business" we may have to deal with. We should conclude tomorrow afternoon and we will start with the Finance and Administration Committee's Report.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to request that the Delegations please get here at ten o'clock, so that we can commence. Otherwise we may not finish, which will mean that we will have to come back on Monday. I hope we can conclude our work tomorrow.

(The Meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

FOURTH MEETING

Friday, 6th June, 1952

(Morning Session)

In the Chair: Dr. Remington Kellogg (U.S.A.)

The CHAIRMAN: We now open the Fifth Session of the Commission's Fourth Meeting. We deal first with Item 6 of the Agenda, which is your Document XVII, Report of the Finance and Administration Committee. Mr. Clark, when you have had a moment to look through your papers, perhaps you will present your report.

Mr. R.R. ALEMAN (Panama): I would like to make a comment with respect to the second paragraph of point 3.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman of the Committee has not made his report. We are waiting until all of you have had an opportunity to read the Document.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, this is the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee appointed by you at one of the Plenary Sessions the other day. The Committee met, and I was honoured by being appointed Chairman.

I think the Report is self-explanatory. The Commission is quite solvent at the present time. We have a small balance carried over.

There are some outstanding accounts: one from Panama for 1951/52 a very small amount, caused by the exchange differences; the other amount for 1949/50 of £100 from Panama; and the other £125 for last year from Brazil. That was drawn to our attention by the Auditors, who are the Accountants of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, and we have recommended here, you will

note, under the last paragraph in 3, that the Secretary be instructed to communicate with the Governments of Panama and Brazil, advising them that the Commission is operating on a very limited budget and that the Commission will appreciate receiving their outstanding contributions at as early a date as possible.

The Committee then, under No. 4, considered the estimated income and expenditure for 1952/53, as shown in Fourth Meeting, Document I(B). These items were explained, and there is no really substantial change, except that there are some minor increases as noted in the Report, and the Committee recommends that, with some slight changes in the estimates, the budget be approved, and that the assessment for the 1952/53 fiscal year be £150 for each country. I think that if we can obtain these payments, the Commission will again be quite solvent and in good financial shape.

The other item - under No. 5 - which your Committee was instructed to consider, was the place and date for the next meeting. I think the explanation which we have given in No. 5 is quite self-explanatory. I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, that knowing something of the courtesy and hospitality of the Japanese, the Commissioners would certainly have a very fine time in Tokyo; but unfortunately, because of the circumstances set out here, it was considered that the Commission should meet again in London.

The question of the date of the next meeting to be held in London: we recommend that it be held during the first two weeks of July. I think if we can obtain a calendar later on, we can set the precise date.

The Committee also dealt with the matter under No. 6, of travelling and living expenses of the Secretary while he is attending meetings in London. That seems to be very fully justified to your Finance and Administration Committee.

I think those are all the remarks I have to make, Mr. Chairman, except that I should now like to propose the acceptance of this report.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Clark. Is there a seconder to moving acceptance.

Dr. J.L. KASK (U.S.A.): I second it.

Mr. R.R. ALEMAN (Panama): I really do not want to discuss the Report; I just want to make a very small comment. In Paragraph 2 of point 3, you can see that Panama paid its contributions for the years 1950/51 and 1951/52 with a very small difference of 14s.9d. because of the exchange regulation.

Now, with respect to the 1949/50 contribution of £100 which is outstanding, I had a little difficulty in convincing the officers of the Government that that should be paid, because I believe it was in November 1949 that Panama notified the State Department that it would abide by the principles of the Convention; and besides, at that time there was not even a whaling expedition in Panama. However, I have told Mr. Dobson that if he wanted he could leave this outstanding, because I thought I might be able to convince the proper Government officers that this payment should be effected. If not, I think in the course of the year I will claim that we will have to pay that, and then raise it, and see what is decided next year. I will do my best to see that it will be paid.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Aleman, I wish to make it clear that the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries acted as auditors for the Commission and, of course, you know how Government auditors operate; it is on the books and each time they send in a statement that it is still outstanding, they report that to the Commission, and this is the reiteration of their statement.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): In representing the Japanese Government, I feel compelled to express deep regret that the Finance and Administration Committee find it difficult to accept our Government's invitation. I do not know yet whether you will

approve this report of the Finance and Administration Committee, but reading through the report, I think I can understand the point that the Committee has found it impracticable to go to Japan.

I should like to say now, in case you may accept this report of the Committee, I hope that the other Commissioners will always keep in mind our enthusiasm in inviting all of you to Japan; you may have an opportunity at a later stage to consider the possibility of going to Japan for some meeting in the future. Please take this as an invitation standing all the time.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Kodaki.

Now, the Secretary has a series of resolutions to move.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): Did the Committee give any consideration to altering the annual meetings to biennially or every three years? I mean there is not only the expense in money but the expense in time of officers coming a long way. We have now had four meetings; it might seem desirable to increase the period between meetings.

The CHAIRMAN: Would that not probably be an item for the Agenda next year?

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): I wondered whether the Committee had given it consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: Not in the report.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): The Committee, of course, was not instructed to deal specifically with that particular question, but it was considered in a minor way. As there was no formal resolution or amendment before the Commission, of course, we had to deal with it on a strictly informal basis. On the point that Mr. Anderson has made about the length of time that these meetings take, you will notice in the report that your Committee believes that it is possible at future meetings that they can be held and completed within a maximum of one week. But we did not give, except on a very informal basis, consideration to the question of whether the Commission should meet once every two or three years.

Mr. H. J. JOHNS (U.K.): If it is not out of order to touch upon the point raised by Mr. Anderson, I think if it were to be arranged that there should be meetings in alternate years instead of every year, that would involve a change in the Rules of Procedure. In the course of last year's meeting and again of this year's meeting I have had informal conversations in the sub-committees at tea time and coffee time on the subject, and I know that there are quite definite feelings both ways. I suggest that it would be a very good plan if Mr. Anderson would agree to put a motion of that sort on the agenda paper for next year so that in all events it could be discussed and thrashed out.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): The Committee recommends that the next meeting will be held in London in the first two weeks of July. Personally, I would like to have a meeting as early

as possible. I do not know how they chose the date for the next meeting. Frankly speaking, I think most people, apart from the whaling operation business, would prefer to come rather later in the summer, because in the office things would not be so busy as in June or the beginning of July. So if it is possible I should like to have a meeting as late as possible, say from the second week of July to the third week of July.

The CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will speak on that.

The SECRETARY: Gentlemen, as regards the date of the meeting, when we first started meeting it was generally settled that it was desirable to have it either late or in the middle of July. There were two considerations affecting that, one was that we were very dependent upon the International Bureau of Whaling Statistics for the statistics on which the meeting would be based and we did not feel that we could press the International Bureau to get those statistics out so as to meet at such an early date, for instance, as this date we are meeting on; so that at Oslo and in South Africa it was latish in July. There is also the other consideration that if you have it later than that we may not be able to get the amendments to the Schedule, such amendments as we make, through the usual procedure of ninety days in time to come into force in the succeeding whaling season. Those were the two main considerations; we fixed the meeting in June at Cape Town rather exceptionally. But if I may say so, from the secretarial point of view, this early date is rather too early, and I think it is a bit early for the International Bureau; but later we may have other difficulties.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Why can you not change it from the first two weeks of July to the latter part of July?

H. E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): It is too late to have

it in the last part of July? I must ask you not to have it later than the first part of July and if you could have it still earlier it would, of course, be better. but not later than the first part of July.

Dr. J.L. KASK (U.S.A.): May I speak about the date? Most of us who came here this year enjoyed the long weekend of Whitsuntide, but it is pretty hard on the amount of time that we have to spend away from most of our permanent jobs. I would like to point out that in the first week of July there are at least two national holidays, and maybe more, that may again intervene. Both Mr. Dooson and I will be attending the International North-West Atlantic Commission meetings soon after we get through with this one, and that meeting which starts on the 30th June, includes the 1st July, which is Canada's Dominion Day, and the 4th July, which is our holiday in the United States; again we will be faced with the same sort of thing, that we will be spending holidays away from home and with considerable expense of time. If we could arrange this so that we could meet at a time when there was a dearth of national holidays and at a time possibly a little advanced to the first week of July so that we would at least not be competing with the height of the tourist season, I think it would be highly satisfactory at least to our delegation. I would suggest, if we could get a date so that **it** will not conflict with holidays, some time during the last two weeks of June would be better.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): If you have national holidays on the 4th July, can we not meet, say, from the 7th or 8th July instead of having it in the month of June?

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kodaki, it is my understanding from previous conferences that the whaling companies like to know the proposed amendments that are going to be submitted to Contracting Governments as soon as possible so that they can make the

necessary arrangements for the season. Consequently, I have been advised from time to time that we should hold it as early as possible, but I have also been advised by the Secretary that there are certain Coronation ceremonies next year in June and it might be difficult to find lodgings, but I think he had better speak on that point.

The **SECRETARY**: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not a prophet but the last week in June is a very busy week in London. There are all sorts of athletic competitions on, like Wimbledon and so forth, and accommodation might be very difficult; as far as I can see, if everybody wishes to have it in the last ten days of June I do not think there is very much in it, but you would have to see about accommodation early. From the office point of view, there is nothing in it at all, but you will bear in mind, of course, that if we have it **earlier** we must not press the **Ministry** of Agriculture too strongly: we asked them to get a financial statement as to what we have spent up to the 31st May - I asked them to get it actually on the 5th May - so we do not want to press them too hard. But I do not think it makes much difference whether we have it in the last weeks of June or the first in July.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Would anyone care to move that the next meeting of the Commission be held in the last ten days in June?

Dr. J. L. KASK (U.S.A.): I will so move.

H.E. Prof. BERGERSEN (Norway): I second this.

The **CHAIRMAN**: We will take it in its order when we come to it.

The **SECRETARY**: I will move a number of resolutions - to meet Mr. Clark's point, I think. The first one is in regard to the acceptance of I A which is the statement of accounts for the

year ending 31st May.

Resolved that "The Provisional Statement of Expenditure as drawn up by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (Fourth Meeting Document I (A)) be approved with such modifications as the Ministry may find to be necessary, when they have been able to examine all the accounts up to 31st May, 1952."

That is the first recommendation.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): I so move, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): I second it.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the Commission that we poll the Commission, or is it accepted?

[Accepted]

It is accepted.

The SECRETARY: The second resolution is:

Resolved that "The Estimated Expenditure for 1952/53 (Fourth Meeting Document I (B)) be approved with two modifications, Travelling Expenses being raised from £100 to £450, and the item for Contingencies being reduced from £688 to £338, the item under Travelling being divided as to £100 Secretary's Expenses, as to £310 Experts' Expenses when engaged on behalf of the Commission between the meetings."

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): I so move, Mr. Chairman.

H.E. Prof. BERGERSEN (Norway): I second this.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): What are the travelling expenses for the meeting in London?

The CHAIRMAN: If I may speak on that point, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Dobson lives down in the country.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): They are not all for Mr. Dobson?

The SECRETARY: Well, Mr. Anderson, we put this £450 to be on the safe side but the fact that we are not going to South Africa or Japan does not necessarily mean that there are not a number of visits that have to be made, for instance, by Dr. Mackintosh who has been in the last year twice to Stockholm to see the Chairman and to have informal meetings with him. It is those sorts of things we want to provide for.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Is Dr. Mackintosh an officer of the Commission?

The SECRETARY: He is not an officer of the Commission, but when he is asked by the Chairman to go and discuss scientific points with him, his office could not be asked to pay his expenses, it falls on the Commission.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Has that been covered by any motion - any formality? It is the first time I have understood that to happen.

The SECRETARY: It has always been taken for granted. The answer to you is no.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anderson, is it not reasonable to assume that the Commission is responsible for expenses involved in its work? What I want to bring up is this: if there is a question of procedure involved, would someone make a motion that we should be.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I do not think the fullest knowledge has been given to the delegates on it. We have got to go back and face a Treasury like everyone else. Australia has not got much money. They will say: "Why this increase?" I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN: That is quite right. What I had reference to was the work of the Scientific Committee that continues all through the year.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): The Convention says, we must pay our own expenses, every delegate. I am not saying they are not right. I think it should be cleared up and definitely stated so that we can explain to our own member countries what is the position.

The CHAIRMAN: I quite agree with you, because I will be confronted with the same situation.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): There is an increase in the fee.

The CHAIRMAN: Supposing we ask the Chairman of the Finance Committee to explain.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON:(Australia): I think we should be given more details.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): The explanation is this, for the very point that has already been brought out, and I

think it is covered, probably not in detail, in No. 4, "In considering the budget for 1952/53, the Committee felt that the item for Travelling and Subsistence should be increased to £450 to provide for unforeseen travelling expenses required by the Secretary in connection with the work of the Commission during the ensuing year." That should probably have read, "In connection not only with the Secretary's work" - but Dr. Mackintosh might be asked to go, and we have also set up a number of ad hoc committees. In so far as Dr. Mackintosh is concerned, my understanding is he is not a delegate, actually. He is one of the United Kingdom advisers, and if he is asked specifically by the Commission to undertake some work, then I think the Commission should bear his travelling expenses. He is Chairman of the Scientific Committee, of course. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Anderson's point. If it requires some formal action to put it on the official record, then I think we should adopt some resolution. I have not thought it through yet, Mr. Chairman, but I think we could draw up one which would go into the record about this question of paying expenses for people who do work strictly on behalf of the Commission.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Actually the report is not in order. It refers to the Secretary's travelling only.

H.E. Professor B. BERGERSEN (Norway): Let us have this quite clear. I understand Mr. Anderson is not criticising this.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Not at all, it is a matter of the Treasury record.

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): You know, all of you, that we have had quite a lot of material, quite a lot of statistics and a wonderful report from Dr. Mackintosh, and all that must be paid for.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): What is it for?

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): I would like to state here that I asked Dr. Mackintosh kindly to come over and discuss this matter.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Is there any reason why that should not be reported back to the Commission?

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): It has been.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): It has not, we have never been told that Dr. Mackintosh went across to Norway a certain number of times and that the expenses were met by the Commission. We have never been told that. It is not in the report at all. There is no mention made of it.

The SECRETARY: There was not a report last year. There was a resolution that there should be an ad hoc committee of scientific experts.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): There is no record of the expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it meet the situation, Mr. Anderson, if the Secretary drafts a resolution to cover the work of the ad hoc committees, and the Chairman of the Scientific committee, during the interim between meetings.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Yes, and I think the item should be shown separately in the accounts.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): What do you mean, Mr. Anderson? Do you want detailed expenses? Because, if that is what you require I think the Secretary would be prepared to obtain that from the Ministry. So far as Canada is concerned we are quite content. We accept this in the spirit in which it is made, but if you want a detailed statement I am sure it could be provided if that is required by your Government, or any other Government, but the statement which is drawn up clearly indicates the items. In other words, what we call in Canada our "estimates vote." If you want a break-down of each detail, then I assume it can be given.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clark, will not the situation be covered by a resolution stating that the Commission will defray the expenses of the ad hoc committees in the interim, and also the required travel by the Chairman of the Scientific Committee?

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): Well that, Mr. Chairman, was what I had in mind, with the qualification, "not if they are delegates." Because the Convention states that each delegate shall pay his own expenses, but in the case of Dr. Mackintosh, or any other who is not a delegate - an accredited delegate - and the Commission asks him to do a special job, then I think such a resolution would cover it.

The CHAIRMAN: We are confronted with this situation. We have asked an ad hoc committee to rearrange the Schedule; that is the work of the Commission. It seems to me under our procedure and under Canada's procedure that since it is Commission work, the Commission should assume that responsibility.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): I am not trying to shelve responsibility, I just want to make it clear. When all is said and done it simply says, "travelling and subsistence". We have no details at all. I know it is not Mr. Dobson's expenses, it must be something else. I think it should be a

separate item on the expenses. It gives an indication of what this is costing. Dr. von Bonde, although a delegate, is also Chairman of the Technical Committee, (I do not say yourself, you are so cautious and so wise) and someone might say send him a cable to come from Africa, we pay his expenses, we will find we are up to £2,000. If you can take one Chairman of a committee, you can take another.

The CHAIRMAN: If we have assigned him a specific job.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): He has got a special job as much as Dr. Mackintosh.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): I think there is a difference here again. In the case of Dr. von Bonde he is an accredited delegate, he pays his own expenses, regardless.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): All expenses of experts of any Government have got to be borne by the Government concerned.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): Not if the Commission asks him to do some work.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): Has the Commission asked Dr. Mackintosh to do any more work than they have asked Dr. von Bonde? If Dr. Mackintosh is head of our scientific side and he is appointed to that, all well and good.

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): Mr. Chairman, do you realise, my friend Mr. Anderson, it would be pretty difficult for the Commission to have scientists to do the necessary work if you are taking this view. We must certainly have this work done

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): Let us see how much it is costing us. That is what I want to know. Surely we are entitled to know the details of expenditure.

The SECRETARY: May I say at once that in the Document I (A) there is an item, "Travelling and subsistence £360" against an estimate of £450. I can tell you at once that £360, almost to the nearest penny, was incurred in the cost of my boat to South Africa and back, which I think was £290, and the cost of one visit by Dr. Mackintosh which I automatically refunded to him through the Finance Division of the Ministry of Agriculture, because I had a request from the Chairman that Dr. Mackintosh was wanted for urgent consultation. The thing we have got to settle is, was that ultra vires, or should it be put right, that any expert who is engaged for special work of the Commission should be refunded his expenses by the Commission, and not ask his own country to do it. With that in view you look at the Convention which says, "The expenses of each member of the Commission and of his experts and advisers shall be determined by his own Government." That appears to indicate you cannot pay anything for anyone else. Nevertheless, we did bear that special charge.

For next year the Finance Committee decided to be cautious, and put in again £450. Dr. Mackintosh would not have to go to see the Chairman, but if Dr. Kellogg fell ill and telegraphed for me, that at once involves £250. It would be perfectly easy, if you feel this is rather more than a token vote - I speak subject to Mr. Clark and the Committee - it would be quite easy to put the travelling expenses back to £100, as it originally was. If we find it is exceeded we take it from somewhere else.

I would like to remind you I have visits from the Chairman, which were extremely delectable to me and my work, and for which he made no charge against the Commission. How he paid them I do not know. I suppose a generous Government paid them for him.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Dobson has given the explanation which, so far as I am concerned, is quite satisfactory,

on the item of travelling expenses for last year. We are now dealing with the estimates for the current year, 1952/1953. A sum of £450 has been recommended. How that is to be spent we do not know until we meet again next year, when the details can be given. It may happen that there are no other expenses, except any travelling which the Secretary might do, so how we can, at this stage of the game, give details of who is going to travel and how it is going to be paid, I do not know.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): Surely the Chairman does not say he jumped it up to £450 from £100 and yet he has had nothing to go on. He had other reasons. He must have had reasons to think that other people would be travelling. That is all we want to know. If you leave £100, or £350, for other experts required by the Commission to do work during the next year, all well and good; then I have got something to put up. At the present time, on our draft estimates we see £100. Now it has been increased to £450. There is no explanation given, but the Secretary has got to bear the lot. We know it is not in the Secretary's personal issue at all.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Anderson has raised a point, I think. He says that the Chairman or the Committee did not know what we were doing. I thoroughly disagree with that. We put that in for a particular purpose.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): Tell us; it is not secret.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): May I suggest, since you have brought this up, you prepare whatever you want that will satisfy you. As far as I am concerned, if it is agreeable, we will accept it.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clark, can we ask the Secretary to read the proposed draft?

The SECRETARY: I have endeavoured to rough something out, but I confess I am a little shattered by this. In the Convention we cannot alter the validity of III, 5. "Resolved that the travelling and subsistence expenses of any delegate or expert who is desired either by the Commission or by its Chairman to perform any specific work for the Commission, shall be borne by the Commission."

The CHAIRMAN: I would prefer to delete the "Chairman" and say, "required by the Commission."

The Secretary wishes to read the amended resolution.

The SECRETARY: Gentlemen, on the report of the Finance Committee, we are dealing with the expenditure estimated for 1952/1953, and in view of the point raised by Dr. Anderson, the Chairman thinks we should add some words to that resolution, arising out of the Finance Committee's report. The resolution will now read: "Resolved that estimated expenditure for 1952/1953 (Fourth Meeting Document I (B)) be approved with two modifications. Travelling expenses being raised from £100 to £450, and the item for Contingencies being reduced from £688 to £338, the item for Travelling Expenses being divided as to £100 Secretary's expenses, and as to £350 experts' expenses engaged on behalf of the Commission between meetings."

I understand, if we split it like that, it gives Mr. Anderson of the Australian Government, and any other Government, a more detailed explanation as to how we think the expenses may be spent in the course of the year.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I move that resolution, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I second that.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any exceptions to this resolution? If not, the Chair assumes that it is agreed.

The SECRETARY: Now we come to the third resolution: "Resolved that the contribution to be asked of each Contracting Government for 1952/1953 be raised from £125 to £150 as in 1950/1951, with an explanation as to the increase appended."

The CHAIRMAN: Will someone move the adoption of the resolution.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): I move that.

Mr. A. N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): I second that.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion? Then it is agreed.

The SECRETARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the report of the Finance Committee I have again to refer to the outstanding contributions. May I just say the Ministry of Agriculture are our accountants. The auditor is the Auditor General, so we have someone at our backs to say there is 14/9d. outstanding. "Resolved that steps should be taken to obtain without further delay the outstanding accounts from Panama (£100 for 1949/50 and 14/9d. in respect of 1951/1952), and the outstanding contribution from Brazil for 1951/52 (£125)." That is only formal. May I take it that is agreed to? May I move the resolution?

Mr. H. S. DROST (Netherlands): I second that.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?
Then it is agreed.

The SECRETARY: The next resolution affects the Committee's recommendations as regards date and place of next meeting.

Resolved that the next (fifth) Meeting of the Commission be held in London during the last ten days of June, the first plenary to be held on 22nd June, the whole meeting to be completed, if possible, in a week, and no Committee to meet until after the first plenary.

Dr. C. von BONDE (South Africa): May we say Monday morning?

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I would so move.

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): I second that.

The CHAIRMAN: It is agreed.

The SECRETARY: I would like to say that I have been handed £125 from Brazil, so that clears that.

The CHAIRMAN: It appears it would be Monday, June 22nd.

The SECRETARY: I will put that in the resolution specifically, and not "the last ten days", Monday, 22nd June.

The next resolution deals with the small point about my travelling expenses: Resolved that the Secretary be refunded his travelling and subsistence expenses at the usual authorised rates whenever the Annual Meeting is held in London.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I move that.

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): I second that.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? Is there any exception? If not, the Chairman assumes it is agreed.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Clark will put me right, I think this is the final resolution: Resolved that the cordial thanks

of the Commission be accorded to the Japanese Government through the Japanese Commissioner for their generous invitation for the fifth Meeting, of which, for various reasons, the Commission have found themselves unable to recommend acceptance."

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Thank you for your kind words.

Dr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I move acceptance.

Dr. J.L. KASK (U.S.A.): I second that

The CHAIRMAN: Then it is agreed.

The SECRETARY: Subject to Mr. Clark, I think I have dealt with all the points in the Finance Committee's report.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clark is that adequately covered?

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Yes, thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I have been advised that it is now time for coffee.

(The Meeting adjourned at 11.15 a.m.)

The CHAIRMAN: Let us continue with the work of this Plenary Session. The Secretary has a brief statement to make.

The SECRETARY: It is just this: As you were leaving the room to go to coffee, I think I did make it clear to some of you that a cheque was handed to me covering the outstanding contribution from Brazil; and at the same time Mr. Aleman very kindly came and gave me £1, for which I gave him 5s.3d. change. That settles the question of all except the original contribution.

The CHAIRMAN: At this Session we still have to consider Item C on page 5 of the Agenda.

(1) Possible alteration of the pelagic whaling season which now extends from 2nd January to 7th April, both days inclusive.

Now, if you will recall, at the Fourth Plenary Session it was agreed that there would be no change. So Item (1) has already been agreed.

Item (2) Possible amendment of paragraph 8(a) of the Schedule to reduce the number of 16,000 blue whale units.

You have the recommendation of the Scientific Committee, Document XV, on pages 2 and 3. Is there any member of the Commission who desires to make a statement?

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): You will see in the Report of the Scientific Committee that I suggested that it might be considered to reduce the 16,000 blue whale units just a little, perhaps to 15,500. But I understood that the members of the Committee were not prepared to discuss this question this year, and they wish the question to be re-examined and brought before the next meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Professor Bergersen. Are there any further comments?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): Mr. Chairman, on the question of the 16,000 blue whale units, the feeling at any rate in so far as

we had it in mind at the Committee was that it rather went with Sanctuaries, Item 7. Hence, I think the operative words are, "If further restriction of the Antarctic catch is required, consideration should be given to the closure of Area II in whole or in part, the reduction of the total limit and the reopening of the present sanctuary in the Pacific sector of the Antarctic." Those three points all go together.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Mackintosh. Any further comments? If not, the Secretary will poll the Delegates on the continuation of the present limitation of 16,000 blue whale units for 1953.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): If we failed to carry this, it would mean that no whaling takes place in the Antarctic at all. There is no alternative provided, is there?

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): How about an increase?

The CHAIRMAN: With the scientific data?

The SECRETARY: Those in favour of the status quo, no change in 16,000 blue whale units, will they please say "yes", or "no" if they are against.

A vote was taken as follows:

In favour: Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, South Africa, U.S.S.R., U.K., U.S.A.

Against: None

Abstain: Norway

Absent: Brazil, Mexico, Sweden.

The SECRETARY: With one abstention and three absentees, that is carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has another comment to make.

The SECRETARY: Gentlemen, I would just like to make a personal observation, reverting to a point which Dr. Anderson raised, and I think Mr. Clark, with regard to the Document II of the Fourth Meeting, the draft Third Report. The draft Report was provisionally accepted, but I was not quite sure how it was left. As I understood it, it was left that I should complete the report in consultation with the Chairman. This is the usual way of leaving it. But I want to assure Mr. Anderson on one point and Mr. Clark on another. Mr. Anderson pointed out that this draft report (which of course went out 60 days before the end of the year to which it relates) had a blank in Paragraph 2, which was at that time put in in the hope that we might have some other adhering Governments. As there are no adhering Governments, that blank goes out, and that clause has to be amended.

At the end there were some blanks with regard to the season's catch, and those have been put right in my copy, with the help of Mr. Vangstein.

Those I think were the only blanks. But in addition, Mr. Clark had some correspondence with me about no record of any catches outside the Antarctic area. Those I have put in in a new paragraph, and I am indebted to Mr. Vangstein again for helping me.

The only other point is that we have settled in full Plenary Session that the Chairman's Report should be printed as an appendix, but in addition to that we are going to print as an appendix the folding tables showing the questionnaire replies.

I just want to make quite clear that you are satisfied and that I need not circulate that Report again with a couple of corrections, and that I agree it with the Chairman for its issue.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): That is satisfactory to me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: That leaves one other item on the Agenda, Item 15, Any Other Business, which will be taken up this afternoon. All of you are aware that we are invited to a reception at the British Museum of Natural History at 4 o'clock. I sincerely hope that we can conclude our final session prior to 4 o'clock. We will meet here at 2.30, and I trust you will be prepared to close this meeting of the Commission this afternoon.

Mr. J. E. CUMMINS (Australia): Could I please ask whether, in the Scientific Committee's Report, Item 4 (b) has been approved by the Commission? That is the setting up of a Sub-Committee to study the regional limitation of catch of humpback whales in the Southern Hemisphere. You will remember that it was omitted when the Committee's Report was considered.

The CHAIRMAN: I quite agree with Dr. Cummins; it is an oversight. We have not dealt with Item 4 (b) in the Report of the Scientific Committee, Document XV, on Page 2.

I will read the recommendation of the Scientific Committee:

"It was agreed that the problem is one of some complexity and the Committee recommend that a sub-Committee should meet before the end of 1952, when results of the Summer Season are available, to consider the problem and make proposals for the Fifth Meeting; the sub-Committee to consist of Mr. Cummins (Australia), Dr. Budker (France), Professor Bergersen (Norway) and Dr. Mackintosh (United Kingdom)."

Is there a motion for approval? Mr. Drost, Netherlands, has made the motion for approval. Is there a seconder? It is seconded by Dr. von Bonde, South Africa.

Dr. N. A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): May I bring up a point, of which Professor Bergersen reminded me. It also says, "the Committee recommended this matter should be given further study between now and the Fifth Meeting when the further tables referred to above are available." That includes really the consideration, I think, of the 16,000 blue whale units limit. Could it not be arranged that the two figures are considered at the same time by the same Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Would it not be best to dispose of the first item and then come back to this. Is there any further discussion? This is for the appointment of a Committee to make a study. Is it agreed?

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): This is solely for the humpback study?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): I think that Committee will have to be nominated by the Assembly. I think you have got to get the consent of the countries concerned to nominate the people they want. The Committee cannot nominate people offhand.

The CHAIRMAN: The idea is this is a study.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): You read your own Articles. It is the Plenary Session that appoints the Committee. Draft a formal resolution appointing so and so, and so and so.

The SECRETARY: We will put the formal resolution: Resolved that the sub-Committee mentioned in paragraph 4(b) of the Scientific Committee's report to consider the problem of humpbacks and to make proposals for the Fifth Meeting should be set up and should consist of Mr. Cummins (Australia),

Dr. Budker (France), Professor Bergersen (Norway) and Dr. Mackintosh (U.K.).

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I nominate Mr. Cummins as the Australian representative. Otherwise he would be nominated against the Commissioner's wish. Things should be done through the Commissioner. They are not being done through the Commissioner.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well. How about France? France nominates Dr. Budker. Norway nominates Professor Bergersen.

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (U.K.): I have pleasure in nominating Dr. Mackintosh.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now complied with the formality. Is there a motion to accept this resolution? Dr. Kodaki moves. Seconded by Dr. Kask. Is that agreed, or shall we poll? Agreed.

That brings us around, as Dr. Mackintosh has already mentioned, to item 7, and it has been suggested that that item should also be referred to the same Committee.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): We do not want to come in on the purely pelagic expedition. We are not interested.

The CHAIRMAN: you would prefer a separate committee?

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): It would be better to have someone represented who has an interest.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well. Can I have a motion to let this Item 7 go over until the next meeting of the Scientific Committee, or would you prefer to have another sub-committee appointed now to deal with this matter?

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): I would like a sub-Committee to take the question up. I think it would be a good thing to have done.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): We do not want to be involved in something we have no particular interest in. We would prefer to have some country that has a major interest in it.

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): Could we not appoint another member who could come as soon as we are prepared to discuss this question?

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): You have the Vice-Chairman who is interested.

The CHAIRMAN: It involves the nomination by each country who is interested of a representative.

The Chair awaits nominations.

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): Could we ask the Netherlands if they are willing to have a member on this Committee?

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): We believe that the combination wanted now is not such a very good one, because we have to wait for the tables prepared by Mr. Vangstein to start with. On the other hand, I have got the impression that every nation concerned in this question would like to prepare their own views before getting in any committee to make recommendations before the fifth Meeting. It would be better to keep this last question out until the fifth Meeting of the Commission. That is my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN: In other words, Mr. Lienesch has recommended that this matter be delayed until the sixth Meeting when the statistical matter is available.

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): We discussed this

question in the Scientific Committee, and we found that it had some data. I am quite sure we could have a preliminary discussion. Of course, this thing must be discussed in the Scientific Committee's next meeting; that is obvious. But I thought that it would be helpful to all of you to have this short lay-out of statistics and what we could collect during the coming months. That is what we discussed.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): I got the impression from Mr. Vangstein that the tables could not be prepared before the end of this year, about December. We are quite willing to give full support to the study, but I would prefer to have inside talks at home with my people who have to handle this stuff before getting in such a committee. If we can take it that way, I myself have the impression that this Report for the Scientific Committee could come in rather late. I would prefer to get it straight away in the Scientific Committee, without this small study group before it.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I am just trying to follow this discussion. I notice there was reference made to the sixth Meeting. It is the fifth.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): If the matter is not discussed between now and the next meeting - that is to say, if the catch figures of the Antarctic, which Mr. Vangstein is hoping to prepare, ^{are not ready,} Tables 12-22/ then it will be a matter for the sixth Meeting, because if this consideration is deferred until the meeting of the Committee at the fifth Meeting, it would not be possible to do anything about it until the sixth Meeting.

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): I feel it is my

duty to say that if the Norwegian scientists find that the 16,000 blue whale limit shall be reduced, they will propose it and have it on the Agenda. I thought it would be better for all of you if you could discuss this question a little before, so that we could have a broader outline on the question; but it is up to the Commission.

Mr. F. H. CORNER (New Zealand): It does seem that this item No. 7, Sanctuaries, is one of the most important of all, from the general point of view of conservation; and if, as Professor Bergersen says, next Session some proposals are to be made concerning the reduction of blue whale units, it would be useful if it could be linked with the other. Any steps that could be made in the meantime to give study to this question would be of great value indeed. I think perhaps this same Committee could be charged with carrying out the task, even if it is in a preliminary way. It could, I think, be the same Committee; and perhaps if the Australian Representative was not interested in attending he could just be absent. It seems a very strong Committee, even with three members.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is inclined to agree with the Representative of New Zealand; and would like further to remark that it might be advisable to have an impartial man on the Committee - one that was not directly concerned.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): I would be agreeable to nominate Mr. Cummins, subject to any check from Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: This matter of sanctuaries will go to the same Committee for a preliminary study in advance of the next meeting of the Commission.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): One other point: I wondered whether you could make an appeal - or the Commission could - for all the stations, especially the land stations, to provide early scientific reports for the information of the Committee. We just could not wait. They want all the data they need before November. It is the individual scientific reports we want.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we could probably ask each Commissioner to request the appropriate office in his own Government to furnish this statistical data as early as possible, in order that it will be available for study by this sub-Committee - the scientific reports. I think that is perfectly proper.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): We will have the results of our own coastal periods, and so will France and Africa. There must be some other shore stations that will have biological reports.

Mr. V.A. TVERIANOVICH (U.S.S.R.) (interpreted): In so far as the proposed sub-Committee will deal with point 7, we consider it necessary that the Soviet Republics should be represented on this sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: That is quite agreeable. That was why I asked for nominations.

Mr. V.A. TVERIANOVICH (U.S.S.R.) (interpretation): We do not want to nominate our representative now.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee is approved subject to the addition of the U.S.S.R. Representative. The same can be done in respect of the Netherlands.

Are there any further comments.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): On a point of clarification, there are two sets of data we want which

will affect the dates on which the ^{sub-committee} Commission meets. This is rather important, as we are dependent on Mr. Vangstein for Item 7. We also need information on the catch at the tropical land stations in the Southern Hemisphere during the present year, and the data will not be ready until the end of the year. For Item 7 we need the further tables referred to at the top of that page, under Item 6.

"The Committee recommend that tables should be prepared on the lines of Tables 12 to 22 in the new statistics to cover past seasons".

Those are the two things. Perhaps it will be possible to get them ready about the same time.

The CHAIRMAN: In other words, this Committee would not meet until after 1st January.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): It might be December: I do not know what Mr. Vangstein can do.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I think all the tropical land stations will have their figures by the end of October. We could send them direct to the Commissioners. Our seasons end then.

The CHAIRMAN: We will leave that to the Chairman of the sub-committee to set the date for the meeting.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): There is no Chairman of the sub-committee; we will have to have a convenor.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you wish the Chairman to appoint a Chairman?

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I think he should, or a convenor. Let the Committee elect its own Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Since Professor Bergersen will be advised

probably first when the tables are available, I will appoint Professor Bergersen the convenor.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I think that Mr. Vangstein cannot get these figures out - it might be too much. The information will be available from the actual countries that are whaling in tropical areas. It would be made available.

The SECRETARY: The Chairman wants to make quite clear what we have settled. We have settled upon the setting up of this Committee mentioned in 4(b) of the Scientific Committee's Report and, to that Committee shall go the matters mentioned in 7 of the Scientific Committee's Report. The Committee will consist of Mr. Cummins (Australia), Dr. Budker (France), Professor Bergersen (Norway), Dr. Mackintosh (U.K.), a representative of the U.S.S.R., and a representative of the Netherlands. The convenor of the Committee will be Professor Bergersen.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): We are equally interested in such work as others. Unfortunately we are geographically far away from the centre of the world; but I should like to request you that we should have the freedom to have an expert to attend the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: You wish to have a representative from Japan?

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): If it is obligatory to attend, when an expert has been nominated as a member of a sub-committee, I cannot give the assurance that he can always attend such meetings. But we would like to have the privilege of joining. If it is all right, I would like to request you to include Dr. Omura on the sub-committee.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Are we not getting a little confused by putting too many things on this Committee. We started off with two nations represented - two tropical interests. The Committee will end up by being as big as the Commission itself. I do not blame them wanting to be nominated. I am sorry the two items are mixed. I still think I was right in not mixing them in the first place. I think 4(b) should be left to the small committee and the other dealt with by another committee. It looks as if it is going to be very confused.

The CHAIRMAN: Under Commission procedure, each Government has the privilege of nominating someone.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): They were not interested in the other matter - sanctuaries and the 16,000 blue whale limit - that is why they are interested now. That should be done by a separate committee.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, if this resolution is to go through, I think it will be something like this: "Resolved that the recommendations of the Scientific Committee in paragraph 4 of their report be accepted: the sub-committee consisting of Mr. Cummins (Australia), Professor Bergersen (Norway), Dr. Budker (France), Dr. Mackintosh (U.K.), with a member to be nominated by the U.S.S.R. and the Netherlands and Japan. To this sub-committee should be referred the subject matter of paragraph 7 of the Scientific Committee's Report." That is the resolution which you are asked to pass. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to draw a red herring across, but I would like to remind the Commission that last year they agreed to a small scientific working party consisting of Dr. Mackintosh, Dr. Budker and Professor Bergersen. It seems to me that could have gone on quite happily and have dealt with all these matters without any further trouble. You are getting the whole Commission on to this Committee. That is the resolution, Mr. Chairman, which I think we should vote on.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other observations? I agree it is getting complicated. I suggest we poll the delegations on this resolution.

Dr. C. von BONDE (South Africa): In that resolution it was not mentioned that Professor Bergersen was to be the convenor.

The SECRETARY: Professor Bergersen to be the convenor. Thank you very much.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): I would like to move an amendment to that resolution: That the original committee, as listed in the Scientific Committee's Report under 4(b), and nominated by their respective Governments, be appointed to carry out the work listed in item 4(b), and that the other matters be left to the sub-committee.

Mr. A. ANZIANI (France): I second that.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Anderson, you are resolving as an amendment that the sub-committee mentioned in paragraph 4(b) of the Scientific Committee's Report, namely Mr. Cummins (Australia), Dr. Budker (France), Professor Bergersen (Norway) Dr. Mackintosh (U.K.) with Professor Bergersen as convenor, should be appointed to consider the problems in 4(b) without any reference to those in 7.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): That is right, and 7 will be dealt with by another committee.

Mr. H. J. JOHNS (U.K.) Does Mr. Anderson insist upon those last words about another committee?

MR. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): Delete them.

The SECRETARY: Without reference to those in paragraph 7?
Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): Make no reference to paragraph 7.

The SECRETARY: May we take the amendment first?

A vote was taken as follows:

In favour: Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Japan, Netherlands,
New Zealand, United Kingdom, U.S.A.

Against: Norway, South Africa, U.S.S.R.

Abstentions: Panama.

Absent: Brazil, Iceland, Mexico

Nine in favour, one abstention, three against. That Resolution is carried, and it is not put as a Substantive Resolution.

Now we have to consider what we do about Item 7.

Dr. J. L. KASK (U.S.A.): I would like to point out that if we do constitute a Committee of this size, as has been indicated, and the Commission stands the expenses of the people attending, it might run into considerable expense.

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): I think there is still some confusion about the question of expense. So far as I am concerned, my understanding is that the expenses will only be borne by the Commission for people who undertake a specific job for the Commission.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): Would it not be best that for any person who accepts nomination on this Committee his country undertakes to pay his expenses? It is the responsibility of the office. That is one of the reasons why I wanted the Commissioner to nominate him; then the Government of that country is responsible for him.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair awaits a motion for the consideration of Item 7. How shall we dispose of it?

Mr. G. R. CLARK (Canada): May I rise on this point, since there has been considerable discussion. Canada, of course, is not primarily or directly concerned in the Antarctic whaling, but we are interested and concerned in the conservation of whales generally. That is the reason why we are signatories to the International Treaty. It seems to me in dealing with items under 7, and also the question of No. 6, (ii), limit of 16,000 blue whale units, that a Committee should be formed: the convenor to be Professor Bergersen, and the Commissioners of the respective countries should nominate their representatives to that committee. That committee could be convened at almost the same time as the other, so that there would be continuity. There may be some countries who will not participate in those other items.

Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): May I second this suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN: I await nominations from the Commissioners for membership on this Committee, to consider items 6 (ii) and 7.

Mr. F. H. CORNER (New Zealand): I understand that this will be a sub-Committee of the Scientific Committee and that, perhaps, does affect membership on it. There are a number of countries, presumably, who are not interested in this question, and who want to ensure, by some form of membership, that their interests are safeguarded; but since the sub-Committee will be reporting to the Scientific Committee - and then of course there is still a further stage where the Scientific Committee would have to report to the full Commission - some countries who are directly interested might feel it is not completely necessary to be on the sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Under our Rules of Procedure, any Commissioner can nominate a representative to the Scientific Committee, if he so desires.

Mr. F.H. CORNER (New Zealand): I was just suggesting some restraint in the nominations to the committee.. I admit any member has the full right to nominate anybody.

The SECRETARY: May we poll the Commissioners with regard to nominations to the sub-Committee?

Nominations were taken by roll-call as follows:

None: Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, New Zealand, South Africa, Sweden, U.S.A.

Absent: Brazil, Iceland, Mexico, Panama.

Nominations: Japan - Dr. Omura
Netherlands - a representative
Norway - Professor Bergersen.
U.S.S.R. - a representative
United Kingdom - Dr. Mackintosh

There is a Resolution to this effect:

"Resolved that a sub-Committee be appointed to consider the matters referred to in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the sub-Committee's Report, the sub-Committee to be convened by Professor Bergersen, and to consist of Dr. Omura (Japan), a representative to be nominated by the Netherlands, Professor Bergersen (Norway), a representative to be nominated by the U.S.S.R., and Dr. Mackintosh (United Kingdom)."

Is that agreed? Or, would you like me to poll the countries?

(Agreed.)

The CHAIRMAN: I believe that concludes the work of this Session, and we can now adjourn.

(The Meeting rose at 12.45.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

FOURTH MEETING

Friday, 6th June, 1952

(Afternoon Session)

In the Chair: Dr. Remington Kellogg (U.S.A.)

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the Sixth Plenary Session has now opened. The Secretary has one or two matters that he wishes to bring to the attention of the Commission.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I was allowed to make a remark this morning about the draft Third Report and there was one thing I omitted. There was one particular word, which I take full responsibility for, in that Report which I know was not very acceptable to one of the countries and I am taking steps to alter that word so that it will appear in a less objectionable form.

The other thing which I may perhaps say just now is, you all have the copies of the Press Notice and if not, they are in the Documents' Room, but may I ask you when you leave the building for good after this session, which is the final one, to help yourselves or ask Mrs. Tait in the Documents' Room for all copies of the documents which you require. Then, I shall only have to send to the Contracting Governments such documents as will not be ready by this afternoon.

The Chairman now wishes me to call your attention to Document XVIII which is the Press Notice. I have already had one or two amendments. Mr. Lienesch's initials are the wrong way round. Mr. Vangstein points out that in the third paragraph "417,000" should read 169,991. Then, in paragraph four, Mr. Johns has suggested that the words "no alteration in the opening and closing dates of the Antarctic season" should be added at the end. That is to say, the paragraph will read "The Commission made no alteration in the present limit as regards pelagic whaling

in the Antarctic, namely 16,000 blue whale units, and no alteration in the opening and closing dates of the Antarctic season".

Now, gentlemen, the Press Release is for your consideration. May I say that I am very much indebted, and I am sure the Commission is very much indebted, to the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries for providing me with the help of their publicity officer. I want you to realise that we are an international commission, and as your secretary I have no particular leanings towards the British press or any other press. Therefore, we were fortunate in being able to use the services of the Ministry of Agriculture's Press Officer who saw to the first Press Notice, when we invited the press to be here, and will handle this one, when you have approved it.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): Mr. Chairman, there appears to be no reference made to the alteration in the hump-back catch in the Antarctic. Should that not be in the Press Notice?

The SECRETARY: No, we do not put any amendments in.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): No alteration in the date?

The SECRETARY: No alteration in the opening and closing date of the Antarctic season, that is the 2nd January. That was a specific resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Since any amendment recommended by the Commission is a matter between governments in the first instance they have 90 days to accept or reject it.

There is no alteration, there is no change there, Mr. Anderson. If we had made a change, we would not have been able to say

much about it. In other words, the members of the Commission should not disclose any information to the press since all recommendations of the Commission are a matter between Governments, except the information contained in the Press Notice and that, of course, is subject to the Commission's approval.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): Mr. Chairman, merely on a point of fact, with reference to the Antarctic land stations season, 1951, there is no such thing; it ought to be "land stations 1951/52". Mr. Vangstein agrees with me.

The SECRETARY: I discussed this with Mr. Vangstein this morning and this is according to what he told me: "Outside the Antarctic in 1951..."

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): No.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): Just prior to that.

The SECRETARY: "...amounted to so many barrels" is that right, "and with the catch of the land stations season 1951".

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): '51/52. It is the same season in each case for the Antarctic.

The SECRETARY: Thank you very much. Otherwise that is all right.

Mr. H.J. JOHNS (U.K.): Would it be desirable, Sir, at the end of that paragraph, to put in last year's figures, so that it reads "amounted to 656,426 barrels as compared with so many in 1950" so as to show the same comparison as is shown at the sentence before.

The SECRETARY: As against 382,000

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway); 382,699.

The SECRETARY: ... in the previous year, 382,699 in the previous season.

Mr. J.L. KASK (U.S.A.): This may be quibbling, Mr. Chairman, but in the third paragraph you have "the total catch in the Antarctic 1951/52 pelagic whaling season amounted to so many barrels". Should that not be barrels of oil, or expressed in whale units? I think most of us know it is barrels of oil, but I do not know if others do.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other corrections?
If there are no further corrections to the Press Notice

Dr. C. VON BONDE (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, in the penultimate paragraph, "As regards the remainder of the proposed amendments, the Commission decided to set up a sub-committee to examine the whole Schedule and to produce a revised Schedule", should we not say, "Incorporating these proposed amendments"?

The CHAIRMAN: No, not necessarily.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): There is no reference to the other committees appointed.

The CHAIRMAN: It is the question, how detailed you want to make it, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I would not regard it as detailed at all; it is just a very nice evasion. If we have a good press notice it would save us answering any questions, and your

newspaper reporters will not have to be ringing up at all hours.

Mr. J. L. KASK (U.S.A.): I think, the parenthesis in the last sentence of your report should close behind 'fifth', that would be better.

The SECRETARY: Yes, I have that, thank you.

Mr. Anderson, I did not realise you wanted a reply, I only said that whenever we have put out one of these things we have succeeded in getting half an inch in the paper or nothing at all. Therefore, as I explained to you, we were assisted in this matter - as technically I have nothing to do with the Press - by our Press Officer. I went through it with him and said, 'From your experience if you were sending it out from the Ministry of Agriculture, would you be fairly satisfied that this is suitable and not too long', and I thought we should not make it any longer. Even so, we shall not get it in. But I do understand your view that we may be badgered by people who want more information, and then we can give it to them. I do not want to withhold anything, except on the question of amendments. I am in the hands of the Commission as to what they want to do. But I did notice only a short paragraph in 'The Times' about our first meeting and three quarters of an inch in the Telegraph.

Mr. R. TROUTON (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, we catch whales and we produce oil, I would like the word "production" to replace the word "catch" in "The total production in the Antarctic in the 1951/52 pelagic whaling season amounted to 2,328,869 barrels of baleen whale oil or with the production of the land stations season 1951/52"... and further along again comes the word "production" in "Outside the Antarctic in 1951 the total production amounted to ...".

Mr. W. KLING (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make one comment, I think today is the 6th of June not the 7th June.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): Without being unduly annoying, the Press Notice reads "The International Whaling Commission, set up under the International Whaling Convention of 1946, held its first Plenary meeting on 3rd June, 1952". I would say that it should be the First Plenary Session of the Fourth Annual Meeting, otherwise they might have thought we had just been asleep since 1946.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other corrections?

Mr. F. H. CORNER (New Zealand): There is no reference in the report to the fact that this Meeting of the Commission did concern itself with the question of conservation, I think there might be one small reference to that. With regard to the study of the question of humpback whales, that might be of interest.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): There is no mention of which countries are represented.

The SECRETARY: That was put in the first Press Notice, when we issued an invitation to the Press to come here.

May I be allowed to put in at the end of the first paragraph "Certain Committees met during the previous week", at that stage I think we should repeat what was in the first Press Notice, I think it should be set in here - a notice that the ratifying countries numbering 17, with their names, were present, Commissioners and observer countries. If you will leave it, we will put it in in full there. I think that might reasonably be expected.

The CHAIRMAN: Would that be agreeable to you, Mr. Anderson?

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): Yes.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, perhaps this ought to have been circulated; on 20th May the Ministry of Agriculture and Scottish Home Department issued a Press Notice, which was shown to me, to this effect:

[The Secretary read the Press Notice issued by the Ministry of Agriculture and Scottish Home Department on 20th May, 1952.]

In view of that very full statement, we are not repeating it all in this; but that does not mean that this is adequate if you think it is not adequate.

Mr. F. H. CORNER (New Zealand): I do not want to press this, but before the meeting opened, a Press Notice went out saying the job of this Commission was to conserve its stock of whales, and various other things, and now we should give a kind of account as to how we have fulfilled the job; there is no indication that we have done this job which we set out to do. I would have thought it might be acceptable just to make some mention of the two conservation actions which we did take.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Corner, would it be agreeable to you to allow me to draft a paragraph on the conservation which would come in the second paragraph?

Mr. F. H. CORNER (New Zealand): Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further corrections? If not, shall we poll the delegations, or is the Press Notice as now drafted agreeable to all concerned?

[Agreed.]

It is agreed

Mr. Secretary, the Commission has now agreed to the Press Notice, subject to the interpolation of an additional statement as suggested by Mr. Corner of New Zealand.

We now come to another matter; an opportunity will now be given to Governments having observers at this meeting of the Commission to make a statement if so desired. I understand that Admiral Mariano of Italy desires to make a statement.

Rear Admiral A. MARIANO (Italy): The Italian Government greatly appreciates the opportunity of being present as an observer at the work of the International Whaling Commission. The Italian Government has received a note from the repository Government of the Convention of 1946, on the subject of ratification adherence by the Italian Government to the Convention. The point of view of the Italian Government is that the ratification adherence will come in a further stage of our whaling interests; at the present moment they are still at a preliminary stage. I will recommend to the Italian Government to give adherence ratification as soon as possible, convinced as I am that the Italian Government is aware of the importance of the results of the work of the International Whaling Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Admiral Mariano. Does the observer from Argentina wish to make a statement?

Mr. W. BRUNET (Argentina): I only would like to thank all the delegates for their kindness and especially the Chairman and Mr. Dobson for a few modifications that will be put down in the report.

The CHAIRMAN: Is Commander Milheirico of Portugal here?

[Observer from Portugal not present]

Peru and Chile are not represented.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): I have two subjects which I should like the Commission to consider. One is the question of lost whales. I would like to call the attention of this Commission to the whaling statistics and the Antarctic Season 1951/52; page 5, which gives us the number of lost whales. You will notice that 258 whales were lost during the last season, 1951/52, that is to say, in average, a little over 13.5 whales were lost for each factory ship. The number of lost whales in the previous year, that is to say 1950/51, was also about the same as last year.

In our experience, the cause of lost whales in most cases lies in the damage of tail flukes in the bad weather. Our expeditions, therefore, in order to comply with the regulations on the complete utilisation of whales as set up in Paragraph 12(a), do their utmost, disregarding the considerable time to be involved - I am sure Mr. Kask knows about this - to haul the whales with tail flukes damaged, with the use of chains as illustrated in this sketch and shown in the photographs. I suppose most of you do the same thing, but anyway we do our best to prevent such loss of whales. The hauling operation takes from five to ten hours; our expeditions were successful this year in hauling 119 whales the tail flukes of which had been damaged, thus, they lost only 5 whales altogether during the last season.

We do not know very well how much effort is made and what methods are used by other expeditions to prevent such loss of whales, but in view of the fact that through such efforts as made by our expeditions many whales can be saved from wasting, would it not be proper that some recommendation be made by this Commission to each Contracting Government to cause every possible measure to be taken by factory ships under their jurisdiction for the prevention of lost whales?

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Kodaki. Are there any comments from other delegations regarding this point? Dr. Kodaki has requested the Commission to make recommendations to prevent the present number of lost whales.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): Mr. Chairman, I think the Commission might like to be enlightened on certain technical points in that connection. I think we are all rather shocked by the very high figures of whales reported as lost, but there are very grave difficulties which have to be overcome. I assure you that we as a company - and I think that is equally true of all the British and Norwegian companies - do our utmost to prevent whales from being lost. Dr. Kodaki has suggested that it is easier than it really is.

There is one method by which you can lose whales: it is by allowing the tail to break in the slip. the whale may fall down the slip and you may have difficulty in picking it up. That is most uncommon. When a tail is broken, either owing to bad weather or owing to other circumstances, the expeditions I know do their very utmost to recover the whale. I do not know, although there may be one exception, that there is any instance among the British ships of having lost any whales in that way. We all have buoy boats and tow boats, and we go out of our way to recover whales that are lost in that way. On that score you may be assured that we will do everything possible, because we cannot count on replacing these whales, and we want them very much. It is a matter of shame to us losing any whale in that way.

I went down this year on a whaler myself, and on two occasions I saw how whales were lost. On one occasion the factory was operating in reasonably good weather, and we had ten or fifteen whales alongside, which is normal and proper. A sudden storm arose and they were all broken off. The Master gave instructions to the catchers to stop whaling and come and pick them up. I happened to be on one of the catchers that was out whaling. All the catchers without exception turned back to

recover their whales, the whales that had already been delivered to the factory. But in spite of that, owing to dark and fog and various other things, three or four of them were not recovered.

On another occasion the catchers had operated very successfully and were most of them bringing in two or three whales each when a sudden storm came up and most of these whales broke away from the catchers themselves. There again the catchers made every possible endeavour to get them. From my experience I would say that it was most uncommon for any whales to be lost which could be got back again. On the particular occasion when the factory lost them, the catchers were taken off operating for the rest of the day and spent their time looking for their own whales.

If you want to make a recommendation of that description to the Governments, it does not do any harm, but I do not think either that it does any good; because the gunners lose. One of the new features of our contract as opposed to the past is this, that in the past, once the gunner had delivered his whale to the boat or floating factory, he and his crew were paid for it. It happened at that time that if a whale broke away from the floating factory, nobody was interested to pick it up. So the companies, in negotiation, arranged that no man should be paid for a whale unless it were worked up. Now, when the factory loses a whale it does its best to inform the ships that their particular whales have been lost and bring the catchers back to recover their whales and deliver them to the floating factories. That is a practical step that has been taken to make the man who originally took the whale come back and find it; because otherwise he will not be paid. I do not think you will devise any more practical way for making the gunners interested in recovering and re-delivering the whales that have been temporarily lost.

There is one other point. If one compares the Japanese figures with those of most of the others, the Japanese run a

different system, in that they make a very large use of fresh meat, and I think of fresh blubber. That involves on the whole a very large number of small vessels, and that again involves operations in relatively quiet waters. I think I am right in saying that the Japanese, more often than we, seek calm waters, because that is more essential for their operations with their very large fleet of meat boats and other small craft of that description. I have always expected that the losses on Japanese operations will be less than ours; although I have not checked up, I would guess that that would be the case. That, I would say, would be the particular reason for it, that they tend to operate in calmer waters for their particular type of expedition. Whereas we, more and more, operate, with our Russian colleagues, out in the depths of the roaring seas.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): I have to thank Mr. Salvesen for the explanation of how they try to prevent loss of whales. But when we compared the figures shown in the statistics with ours, we felt that there may be some way (for instance to be reconsidered by the Technical Committee) in the common interest to minimise such loss. However, we did not have time to raise this question in the Committee, so I thought that recommendation might help all the interests engaged in Antarctic expeditions.

Well now, Mr. Salvesen said that the Japanese, because they use whale meat, usually go to more calm waters. But I do not think it is the case - because we put such great importance to the production of meat. At the same time we must catch more whales, and we cannot always choose calm waters. I do not think that is wholly the case - that that is the only reason why we do not lose so many whales as others do.

I do not want to press my point too far; if it is not agreeable to the Commission we may discuss this question next year. But I should like to call the attention of the Commission to the fact that it might be necessary to explore further some better method to

prevent such waste. I think that is one of the very important matters we must consider in this Commission.

If it is not accepted to make any recommendation, I shall withdraw my suggestion, and I want to go on to the next question.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion?
Mr. Kodaki has suggested, in the event that the Commission at this Session does not wish to make a recommendation, he will withdraw it. But I understand he wishes to bring it up again at the next meeting.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): I think the members of the Commission do not agree with me, so I will just drop this question for the time being, or perhaps until the next meeting.

I should like to draw attention to another point; this is concerned with weather reports. During the whaling season in the Antarctic, the Japanese expeditions send a weather report twice a day to the Australian meteorological observatories. In receiving such reports, we are told that the Australian observatories, without any malicious intention but simply inadvertently, broadcast the names of ships and their positions in their weather announcement.

In view of the above, I should like to request the Australian Commissioner, possibly supported by the Commission, to find some way out of approaching the Australian meteorological authorities with a view to making some kind of arrangement between those authorities and the Antarctic expeditions in a way similar to those offered last year by the South African meteorological authorities in Cape Town.

As you will recall, they kindly proposed to make a pre-arrangement for the use of a certain type of code for the name and position of each factory ship in order to keep its position confidential.

If such arrangements could be made, I feel sure all the expeditions operating in the Areas 4 and 5 would be willing to co-operate with the Australian observatories in exchanging weather reports; that is, on the one hand the expeditions in those areas will report the weather conditions in their respective localities and, on the other hand, they can listen to the weather broadcast from Australia, especially the weather forecast meant for the Antarctic.

The Japanese expeditions have been willing, and will be willing, to continue to send weather reports to Australia for mutual benefit; but I presume such arrangements as I mentioned now will be highly desirable for all the whaling interests operating in those areas in the Antarctic as well as for the general public concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I will, therefore, move that this Commission will make a special request to the Australian Commissioner to make efforts on the lines I have suggested. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Anderson, Australia.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I am sorry the Japanese positions have been disclosed. I have no actual knowledge of this, of course; but I will take it up with the Commonwealth Meteorological Bureau, and I am certain that they will look into using a code. Naturally, I am interested; they are helpful to other expeditions. We have meteorological stations on Heard Island and MacQuarie Island, and the information from them has been made available to the general public.

I can assure the Japanese Delegation that the matter will be gone into.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): I should like to know from the Commissioners here if other expeditions are also sending weather reports to the Australian Meteorological observatories.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): I can answer that. As far as our Company is concerned, up to this year we reported only to the Falklands and to South Africa, but the request was made - I think by the Admiralty - that we should report also to Australia, and we were given an assurance that the same arrangements for secrecy would be made in the case of the reports to Australia which had satisfactorily been made in the case of South Africa. On the basis of that assurance, we have already agreed to send our reports, when we are in the appropriate area, to Australia as well. So, I think you can take it for granted, when Mr. Anderson assures us that the matter will be duly arranged, it is as good as already done.

H.E. Prof. B. BERGERSEN (Norway): The Norwegian expeditions report to South Africa, I understand. Of course, we thoroughly agree with Captain Salvesen. As a Commissioner I will ask the Norwegian expeditions to do the same.

Mr. H.S. DROST (Netherlands): The Netherlands expeditions only report to South Africa.

Mr. H.K. SALVESEN (U.K.): I will approach the Admiralty and take it upon myself to write to them and make quite certain that they approach the various other Governments as well. That might cover the position.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): I must thank Mr. Anderson for the trouble he will take to assure that some arrangements will be made between the Japanese expeditions and the Australian observatories;

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any further business that any Delegation wishes to bring up?

Dr. C. VON BONDE (South Africa): If this concludes our Fourth Meeting, there are just a few words I should like to say.

Firstly, I think we owe a debt of gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, for the way in which you have conducted our proceedings.

Secondly, to our Secretary, Mr. Dobson, who, as usual, has been indefatigable in his labours and unruffled in his temper, also to his staff we owe a debt of gratitude, and especially to these verbatim reporters - the young ladies working throughout our meetings using these machines, we owe them a debt of gratitude.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I think I am speaking on behalf of the various Commissioners - I do not think the Secretary need take a poll on what I intend saying now - our thanks are due to the Government of the United Kingdom for arranging the meeting here in London this time, and helping us to get to a successful conclusion to this Meeting. We owe them a debt of gratitude and, I think, a vote of thanks.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. von Bonde.

If I may step out of the Chair for a moment, I would like

to have the opportunity of saying a few words in closing the work of the Plenary Session.

When one looks back over the past twenty years, one observes that the need for restrictive regulations on the taking and treating of whales has been recognised, and that the need resulted in the agreement to establish this International Whaling Commission.

I wish to repeat again at this Meeting a statement that I made at the first Meeting held in London; and that is, it is obvious that all countries engaged in the taking and treating of whales must exercise the utmost good faith and intelligent self-restriction to avoid excessive depletion of whale stocks.

To my friend, Professor Bergersen, the Chairman of the International Whaling Commission for the past three years, may I say that the Commissioners owe him a debt of gratitude for his untiring efforts to develop sound conservation policies as regards whaling, and for the genial manner in which he has handled the many difficult decisions required of him in that capacity.

Mr. Dobson and his staff also have been untiring in their effort to provide the necessary facilities for these meetings, and providing all of us with the required guidance and material.

To the International Bureau of Whaling Statistics and their hard-working staff I would like to add the continued thanks of the Commission.

And I will again repeat in part what Dr. von Bonde has already said. Thanks are due to our British friends for making these excellent facilities available for the use of the Commission,

and for their general grand hospitality.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I ought not to intervene after your final word, but it might make for the comfort of the Commission if I ask them whether they are satisfied with this accommodation. This was not the accommodation I planned last September; when I came back from South Africa I planned accommodation in Church House, Westminster. I would just like to know whether you prefer this part of the world or whether you prefer Westminster. Perhaps it is an awkward question to ask so late, but there is the possible alternative for next year if we get busy with it.

Dr. G. J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): The acoustics in Church House were better.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): If possible, may we have the meeting at Church House because we have earphones and everything and it is also more convenient.

Mr. F. F. ANDERSON (Australia): I think we are all satisfied with the accommodation here. It is awkward from the transport point of view to get here, or to get away more than to get here - which is a very important point when you knock off!

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further comments I will declare the Fourth Meeting of the International Whaling Commission closed.

(The Meeting rose at 3.40 p.m.)