

SIXTH MEETING, DOCUMENT XIV (A)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

SIXTH MEETING, FIRST PLENARY

MONDAY, 19TH JULY, 1954

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

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

I now have the honor of introducing Mr. Shigeru Hori, Minister of Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SHIGERU HORI: Mr. Chairman, Your Excellencies, and Gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to welcome, on behalf of the Japanese Government, the representatives to the Sixth Meeting of the International Whaling Commission in Tokyo.

This Marine Hall in which we are gathered here today for the Sixth Meeting was completed just about a week ago. This was made available as the result of the joint efforts of the fisheries industry of Japan. I am very happy, therefore, to welcome you all in this conference room as the very first guests to make use of the building.

Most of you have come to Japan for the first time, but I hope that you will enjoy yourselves not only while you are in the city, but also during your travel throughout our country after the conference is over.

As the Minister in charge of agriculture, forestry and fisheries, I especially want you to see the actual conditions in our rural districts.

Wherever you travel in Japan you will see mountains. Even from Tokyo, which is situated in the largest plain of Japan, only two hours' travel will take you to the mountains. It is this mountainous terrain that limits the arable land of Japan to only 14 percent of the total land. You may be surprised to know that the average size of farm per farm household in Japan is only one hectare. I hope that you will notice, when you travel in the rural areas, the tremendous efforts and the ingenuity of our farmers in deriving the maximum production from their very limited land.

It is this topographical handicap, Mr. Chairman, that has forced the Japanese people to make the most strenuous efforts to exploit the sea resources for food.

On almost every beach, in almost every cove, on the lakes and streams, you will see signs of fishing activity.

Even if you have no time to go out of the city limit, I hope that you will find an opportunity to visit the Tokyo Central Fish Market. This, I believe, is the largest in the world both in area and in the volume of fish handled. There you will be surprised, I am sure, to find the greatest variety of fish. Probably you will also see some whale meat.

I wonder, Gentlemen, why a nutritious and palatable food such as whale meat is not eaten in many of your countries.

In Japan people started eating whale meat from ancient days, and whaling was established as an industry as early as in the 17th Century. I hope that the pictures of old Japanese whaling as illustrated in the booklet prepared by our Fisheries Agency will be of interest to you. Even in those days, as you will see in the picture, almost all parts of the whale carcass--meat, blubber, and bones--were utilized. It will also interest you, Gentlemen, to know that the whalers in those days were prohibited due to religious belief from killing calves or female whales accompanied by sucklings.

Mr. Chairman, it can be said, therefore, that Japanese whalers had observed the principles of complete utilization of carcasses and the protection of stocks three hundred years before they were codified in our Whaling Convention.

The spirit of those whalers of the 17th and 18th Centuries still exists in the hearts of our whalers. I am happy to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Japanese whalers of today are very faithful in the observance of regulations. Not only do they observe the written regulations, but also they exercise great care and efforts to avoid the waste of resources, such as missing the killed whales in the sea.

In the Antarctic operation, for example, when a catcher-boat loses a whale which has been killed, the entire fleet suspends operations for a time in order to be engaged in an all-out search.

The significantly low rate of lost whales of Japanese fleets in the Antarctic, as compared with the fleets of other countries, is a result of these and other practices which may seem irrational from the standpoint of profit-making.

On behalf of the government of Japan, Mr. Chairman, I am also happy to say that we are not only in full agreement with the basic principles of the International Whaling Convention, but also that we are desirous of seeing that these principles be extended also to other fisheries, as was the case with the North Pacific Fisheries Convention which was concluded two years ago between Japan, the U.S. and Canada.

The essence of the International Whaling Convention, as I see it, is international cooperation to make it possible for mankind to derive the greatest possible benefit from the whale resources of the world without depleting the stocks. This Convention, Mr. Chairman, is a working example of the recently concluded fisheries treaties in which the long established principle of freedom of the high seas is adapted to the need for conservation of resources.

We all know, Gentlemen, that the whaling competition in the Antarctic has contributed immeasurably to the improvement of whaling technique and equipment. At the same time, we have developed devices for protecting whale stocks from depletion which might otherwise result from the increased efficiency of catching.

We have another example of international competition in the history of Japanese whaling. In the latter part of the 19th Century, when Japanese whalers were still using the traditional and primitive gears and methods, a number of American whalers came close to our coast. It was these Americans who stimulated the modernization of Japanese whaling. I wish to point out, Mr. Chairman, that if the Japanese whalers had not faced the competition from Americans in those days, the whaling industry of our country would not have developed so rapidly as it did. But I also wish to point out that if our Government had not been prudent enough to institute whaling regulations as early as in 1909, only a decade after the first steam-powered catcher boat was launched, we would not have been able to maintain the whale stocks.

Not only for whaling but also for fisheries in general, our Government has long been seriously concerned with the conservation of resources. Broad authority to regulate fishing activities has been delegated to the Government since the enactment of the first Fisheries Law in 1901. The greater the efficiency of fishing became, the more rigid enforcement was made of the regulations.

The adjustment of higher fishing efficiency with the need for conservation of fish resources is a problem which has to be solved if these resources are to be most effectively exploited for the benefit of mankind, not only for the present but also for the future generations. This problem requires the highest wisdom for solution.

In order to solve this problem fairly and effectively, we need the advice of scientists in establishing the requirements for conservation and also in teaching us the most effective methods. We need strong national governments which can regulate their respective nationals, and we must have international collaboration to carry out the required measures.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I should like to mention specially and emphasize the fact that the heavy dependence of the Japanese people on the whaling industry as well as on the use of whale meat is by far greater than it is understood by the outside world. It is, therefore, desired that the Commission, during the course of the current meeting, may sympathetically consider the interests of the Japanese consumers of whale products and the whaling industry as well in the light of Art. V of the Convention.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, you have shown to the world a high degree of wisdom. You have inspired fisheries people everywhere with your remarkable example of cooperation. You have gathered here today to continue and expand your efforts for further conservation of whale stocks with due regard to the interest of the whaling industry. I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that this conference, through free and constructive discussions and with the spirit of cooperation, will reach decisions which will best serve the basic principles of our Convention.

On the conclusion of the Minister's speech, the Chairman expressed to him the Commission's cordial thanks for his inspiring address.

Mr. A. KODAKI: Mr. Chairman, would you permit me to say just a few words to extend my personal welcome to all of you who have come a long way to Tokyo to participate in this meeting. It has long been my dream to have a meeting of the Commission at least once in Tokyo while I was a member of the Commission. I am very happy that my dream has come true. Therefore, I should like to extend my hearty welcome to all of you and particularly to our beloved Chairman, Dr. Kellogg, and to our most capable Secretary, Mr. Dobson, and many others who have been my associates in this work for nearly 20 years. I should say that even the weather in Tokyo is welcoming you with much brighter climate than it should have been at this time of the year. But in this respect, I have to apologize for one thing: that is, as I expected it would be very very hot at this time and those of you who had come from Europe may find our climate very trying, I finally gave up the original idea to take all of you to the various whaling grounds in this country, but we are simply happy to make the necessary arrangements for those of you who would desire to make a trip not only to the whaling grounds but also to many places in Japan. So, if any of you wish to make such a trip, will you please get in touch with Mr. Mori over there before the conference is over because hotel accommodations and transportation facilities are extremely limited in certain districts. But, Gentlemen, we will do our best to make your stay as pleasant as possible, but there are several elements which will prevent us from giving you full satisfaction, not only the climate but also our poor financial situation and lack of various facilities, etc., and I do hope you will excuse us for them.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, once again I welcome you and wish you a very happy stay in Japan. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kodaki. Before we proceed further with consideration of the agenda, it is my responsibility to request the press, all visitors and all others who are not members of delegations to withdraw from this room. According to the Rules of Procedure only Commissioners and their advisers and staff of the Commission may be present. (The Press withdrew.)

I have been requested to remind all speakers to use the microphone in front of them.

Before we proceed with the agenda, Mr. Dobson, our Secretary, has a few announcements to make.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, first of all I am asked to announce the parties that will be held during the coming week. In the first place, there is Mr. Kodaki's party this evening at 5:30 to 7:00. There is a visit to the Science Museum at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday. There is a party to be given by the Association of Whaling Industries at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, that is, after the visit to the Science Museum. There is to be a play, a Kabuki play, at 4:00 p.m. on Saturday, and there is a visit to the Tokyo Central Fish Market on Friday at the early hours of 5:00 a.m. to 7:00 a.m. And I am asked to say that Commissioners and their experts are invited to bring their wives to all parties, including the fish market on Friday.

I am also asked to request that all representatives present, as they leave the Hall after this meeting, will visit the registration desk as I understand the Association of Whaling Industries

wishes to give them a small token of welcome and of their pleasure of seeing them here.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say about the arrangements, the general arrangements, which have been made for the comfort of the Commission. But I would like now to say a word, if I may, about the important point of papers circulated for the Conference. I am very anxious that all the Commissioners and their experts should have all papers that are available. They will realize that as many papers as possible were sent out with the agenda, but we could not send all the papers for the simple reason that some could not possibly be prepared, for instance, the financial statement, before the end of the financial year. You will find in front of you a blue folder and that blue folder should contain with the papers that you have brought with you, a complete set, which now comprises 11 numbered documents. You can very soon see whether any of those documents are missing. If they are, then, I would ask you to see Miss Uwano at the reception desk. And behind her she has a small supply of all those documents, 1 to 11. Now that will not be all the documents you will receive, as in previous years there will be a number of documents circulated as we proceed with our deliberations. And I will announce later whether they will be laid on the table.

This morning while you were assembling, certain documents were circulated which are not numbered documents of the Conference. In the first place, we are greatly indebted to Mr. Vangstein who has produced the figures of the whaling catch for 1953-54 in these two papers that I hold in my hand. Those have been circulated around the table this morning while you were assembling. Secondly, there are the two printed volumes on international whaling statistics, volumes XXXI and XXXII. Those have also been circulated and they are for your consideration.

Thirdly, we are indebted to Mr. Ruud for an addendum to the Ernern Report. You have already had one copy of the first report which is like this in cream color (Document IV) but now there is an addendum to it.

Gentlemen, these are the papers that have been circulated. If you will only let me know, or let Miss Uwano at the reception desk know if you are short of any document, I will see that you will be supplied with it. May I say that we haven't got very large stocks of documents already circulated but, at the same time, I don't want to take any back to England, so I hope you will replenish your stocks before leaving the Conference.

May I say one final remark. There will be a tea break at 11:30 this morning in the lounge at the end of the room, and it is now 7 minutes to 11:00.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest now that we introduce the members of all Delegations. Some of you may not have attended previous meetings of this Commission. Will each member rise and announce his name. We will start with Australia.

Mr. F.F. Anderson, Australia
" R. Moore, Australia
" G.R. Clark, Canada
" G. Gibson, Canada
" I. Bodenhagen, Denmark
" F. Toussaint, France
Dr. A. Kodaki, Japan
Mr. M. Tachikawa, Japan
Dr. H. Omura, Japan
Mr. Y. Nara, Japan
" G.J. Lienesch, Netherlands
" L. de Waal, Netherlands
" E.J. Slijper, Netherlands
" G. Elshove, Netherlands
" R.M. Miller, New Zealand
" J.T. Ruud, Norway
" E. Moe, Norway
" E. Vangstein, Norway
" R.R. Aleman, Panama
" J.M. Marchand, South Africa
" D.J.C. Plummer, South Africa
" Peder Hammarskjold, Sweden
" A.N. Solyanik, U.S.S.R.
" V. Tverianovich, U.S.S.R.
" Y.M. Pavlov, U.S.S.R.
" R.G.R. Wall, U.K.
" N.A. Mackintosh, U.K.
Sir Vyvyan Board, U.K.
Mr. W.M. Terry, U.S.A.
" J.P. Martin, U.S.A.
" R. Suarez-Barros, Chile
" L. Cozzi, Italy
" C. Miles, F.A.O.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Gentlemen. The Commission may now wish to proceed with consideration of the agenda. All of the Commissioners have received copies of this agenda for the Sixth Meeting sometime ago. May I now ask if any member has not a copy of the agenda before him. Also, if any member has any suggestions or objections or additions. If there are any objections or withdrawals, we should have them now. With respect to the organization of the work of the Commission, the first matter to be considered is the approval of the agenda. Is it necessary to take a formal vote? If I hear no objection may I assume that the agenda is approved?

(No objections.)

We now come to the matter of appointments to Committees. The Commission will be polled in pursuance to Rule 18 of our Rules of Procedure as to whether the Delegations desire an alteration of the representation on these Committees or whether or not they wish representation. I will now take first the Scientific Committee and will call countries and if you will indicate who your representation will be on the Scientific Committee. Australia?

AUSTRALIA: Anderson
The CHAIRMAN: Canada?
CANADA: Gibson
The CHAIRMAN: Denmark?
DENMARK: Bodenhagen
The CHAIRMAN: France?
FRANCE: No.
The CHAIRMAN: Japan?
KODAKI (Japan): I nominate Dr. Omura who will be assisted by Mr. Nara and Mr. Kawakami.

- The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kodaki. Now, the Netherlands?
NETHERLANDS: I would like to propose Dr. Slijper.
- The CHAIRMAN: New Zealand.
NEW ZEALAND: No representation.
- The CHAIRMAN: Norway?
NORWAY: Ruud.
- The CHAIRMAN: Sweden?
SWEDEN: No representation.
- The CHAIRMAN: Union of South Africa?
SOUTH AFRICA: Marchand.
- The CHAIRMAN: U.S.S.R.?
U.S.S.R.: Tverianovich.
- The CHAIRMAN: U.K.?
U.K.: Mackintosh.
- The CHAIRMAN: U.S.A.?
U.S.A.: Kellogg.
- DENMARK: I have to make a correction. Nobody from Denmark.
- The CHAIRMAN: Nobody from Denmark. Nobody from France. We will now take the Technical Committee. Australia?
AUSTRALIA: Mr. Moore.
- The CHAIRMAN: Canada?
CANADA: Clark.
- The CHAIRMAN: Denmark?
DENMARK: No.
- The CHAIRMAN: France?
FRANCE: No representation.
- The CHAIRMAN: Japan?
JAPAN: Kodaki will be assisted by Mr. Tachikawa, Mr. Nishibori, Mr. Miyake and Mr. Maeda.
- The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Netherlands?
NETHERLANDS: Mr. de Waal.
- The CHAIRMAN: Norway?
NORWAY: Mr. Moe.
- The CHAIRMAN: Panama?
PANAMA: Aleman.
- The CHAIRMAN: Sweden?
SWEDEN: No representation.
- The CHAIRMAN: Union of South Africa?
SOUTH AFRICA: Plummer.
- The CHAIRMAN: U.S.S.R.?
U.S.S.R.: A.N. Solyanik.
- The CHAIRMAN: U.K.?
U.K.: Sir Vyvyan Board.
- The CHAIRMAN: U.S.A.?
U.S.A.: Mr. Terry, Mr. Martin.

The CHAIRMAN: It is the responsibility of the Chairman to nominate the three members of the Finance and Administration Committee for consideration of our fiscal statement, and I so nominate Mr. Wall, Mr. Marchand and Dr. Kodaki. Each of these Committees will elect their chairmen at the first meeting. Now we propose, unless there is objection from the members of these Committees, to have the Finance and Administration Committee meet tomorrow morning at 9:30, while the Scientific Committee and the Technical Committee will meet here this afternoon at

2:30 to commence their deliberations. The Secretary can tell you where these Committees will meet.

The SECRETARY: The Scientific Committee will meet in this Hall here. The Technical Committee will meet upstairs in the second door marked "special dining room." The Technical Committee upstairs, the Scientific Committee in this hall, and the Finance and Administration Committee will meet on the fifth floor in the Secretary's Office.

The CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will now report on the status of the Re-arranged Schedule.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, you will recall that at the last meeting of the Commission, by unanimous vote, the Commission accepted a Re-arranged Schedule which had been prepared by a special committee of which one of the legal advisers of the Ministry of Agriculture was a member and whose services were of the utmost value to the Committee. It was then decided by the Commission that the Re-arranged Schedule, of which copies were circulated at the time and of which further copies are available now if you want them, should be sent to each contracting Government who were asked to indicate in writing, I repeat, in writing, their assent, the idea being that with the last assent being received from the 17 nations who are members of this Commission, it would then be possible to notify all the 17 nations that the Re-arranged Schedule was in force. The Re-arranged Schedule could not however be sent out until the amendments, which were made at the last meeting of the Commission, had gone through the 90 days period of deposit and had in fact come into force. It was not, therefore, until the second half of October that I was able to notify all Governments that the amendments which they had made at the Fifth Meeting were in force and they were now invited to indicate their assent in writing to the Re-arranged Schedule in which those amendments were included. The assents came in dribblets. It was hardly expected that they would all come in together, but I am exceedingly sorry to tell you that until a week before I came to Tokyo, there were two outstanding countries, Brazil and Mexico, from whom I had received no reply. I sent them frequent reminders, but I am glad to say that I have now received a letter from London saying that Mexico are willing to assent to the Re-arranged Schedule, while Brazil undertook to notify their assent to their Tokyo representatives, but I have not received it yet. I think you may take it that Brazil will assent within a very short time. That leaves only Panama who unfortunately have to submit the re-arranged schedule to their Parliament for ratification and it is impossible for Panama as I understand to ratify before the first of October, when their Parliament meets. Mr. Aleman was good enough to suggest that we should accept the Panamanian assent subject to ratification by Parliament, but Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether that would commit itself to the Commission. I, as Secretary, could not advise the Commission to accept anything unless it is an absolutely clear assent. The position, therefore, is, Mr. Chairman, that until we get the final assent from Panama and Brazil, we can't notify the parties concerned that the Re-arranged Schedule is in force. The matter is

further complicated by the fact that at this meeting you have a number of proposed amendments to make, which if they come into operation will affect the original Re-arranged Schedule, so that even if we accepted the Re-arranged Schedule at the middle of this meeting, we could not bring it into force until the amendments we made at this time have gone through the 90-day period. I have, therefore, circulated on the table a short statement of each amendment, as it relates to the Re-arranged Schedule and I hope that when you come to agree on any of these amendments, I should be authorised to insert after its reference to the Re-arranged Schedule, so that when the new amendments come into force, the Re-arranged Schedule, assuming that Panama and Brazil have agreed, will automatically be brought into operation with the amendments we have made.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. R.R. ALEMAN (Panama): Mr. Chairman, subsequent to May 28th, 1954, when I brought to the attention of the Secretary to the Commission the fact that Panama could not finally assent to the Re-arranged Schedule before 1st October of this year, this matter was discussed by me with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs who informed me that as soon as translation was completed by the Foreign Office, they were going to notify the State Department in Washington, and if Panama adhered to the Re-arranged Schedule subject to subsequent approval by the Assembly, I am very sure that before October, most probably first of that month, the State Department will receive formal notification that Panama has adhered to the Re-arranged Schedule which shall be accepted in final form. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Aleman. Before we go further, I would like to say that Item No.19, the Date and Place of the Next Meeting, should be referred to the Finance and Administration Committee for consideration. I just want to make sure that we do not overlook it. We will now go on to Item 7, the "Report of the Special Scientific Sub-Committee set up, with Professor B. Bergersen as Convener". This is Document II. Unless I hear some objection, this report will be referred to the Scientific Committee.

It is my understanding that the Technical Committee would also like to consider Item 7. In the event of two committees considering the same item, it may be necessary for the two committees to iron out difficulties when they arrive, so just bear that in mind.

In the case of the General Scientific Report by Dr. N.A. Mackintosh (Sixth Meeting, Document III), if there is no objection, I refer that to the Scientific Committee, and the same is true of Item 9 of the Report on Whale Marking (Sixth Meeting, Document IV).

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I suggest that Item 9 might also be referred to the Technical Committee as it seems to me to be a technical matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well, that goes to both committees. As for Item 10 "Statement of infractions committed during the land station season 1953 and the pelagic season 1953/54," Document V, I believe it is certainly true that it should go to the Technical Committee. I doubt if the Scientific Committee has anything to do with it.

On Item 11, we will pass over for the moment. Item 12, "Amendments to the Schedule, arising from the Scientific Sub-committees Report (Document II above) and from other sources". The whole of Item 12 is referred to the Scientific Committee except such items as may appear appropriate for consideration by the Technical Committee. This again may require a joint session.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I think that the Rules of Procedure provide for the Technical Committee to consider amendments to the Schedule.

The CHAIRMAN: Very good. Now Item 13, the use of helicopters and/or other aircraft for killing whales, Document VI, seems a matter for the Technical Committee. Items 14, 15 and 16, Reports by Committees, will be given due consideration at a later Plenary Session. At the last Plenary Session, Items 17 and 18 will be considered. It would be appreciated by the Secretary that if you would read the draft of the 5th Annual Report before it goes up for consideration at the Plenary Session, it would save us so much time, as it is just a draft. It is now about 11:20. We propose to have the tea and coffee break now. As soon as we return, if Mr. Vangstein is prepared, we will hear the review of the 1953/54 season's catch. The coffee break would be for one-half hour. We will return for Mr. Vangstein's report before lunch.

The Meeting adjourned temporarily at 11:20 a.m. for the coffee break.

The Meeting was resumed at 12:00 p.m. after members of the Delegation had adjourned for coffee.

The CHAIRMAN: The Meeting will come to order. The Secretary has an announcement to make before we continue.

The SECRETARY: I am asked to enquire how many are returning to the Imperial Hotel and how many are remaining at this Hotel for lunch, as a bus may have to be hired for those who wish to return to the Imperial Hotel. It is possible that all of you may want to have lunch in this Hotel so those who are remaining, please indicate by a show of hands.

A show of hands was indicated and the Secretary counted the number of people remaining in the Hotel for lunch.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vangstein, adviser to Norway, has a speech to make on the Survey of Whaling Activity in and outside the Antarctic, but before we go on, Mr. Solyanik of the U.S.S.R. has a statement to make.

Mr. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): I wish to make a statement in connection with the item on the Agenda as to the next meeting. I am authorized by the Government of U.S.S.R. to extend a cordial invitation to this Commission to meet next year in Moscow in July, 1955.

The CHAIRMAN: Your kind invitation will be referred to the Finance and Administration Committee for consideration. And now, if Mr. Vangstein is ready, we will proceed.

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): Besides tables relating to whaling in the Antarctic in season 1953/54 and outside the Antarctic in 1953 the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics has prepared new tables respecting whaling in the Antarctic for a number of years, going back to 1931/32. Part of this material was sent direct to the Commissioners in the middle of June in order that they might have an opportunity of studying the material before this meeting took place. Some of the material has now been distributed to the Commissioners. There are many figures and much paper, but I can assure the Commissioners that in future we shall not encumber them with so many figures. It is as a matter of fact not our fault that there has been such abundance of tables in the last two years. It is the Chairman of the Commission, Dr. Kellogg, who must take the responsibility for this. It was he who before the war induced the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics to group whaling operations in the Antarctic into four areas. This was done for seasons from and including 1933/34, and constituted a relatively large work, as the statistics relating to earlier seasons had to be worked up again. Dr. Kellogg was apparently satisfied with this, but it was not long before he set forward new desires. He wanted to have the statistics grouped in 10° squares in the same way as Professors Hjort and Ruud had done in the Publications of the Norwegian Whaling Council. We sabotaged the request in a handsome way the first years, as we considered it a larger task than we could overcome. However, Dr. Kellogg reminded us repeatedly of his desire, and as modern statistical machines became available, the work was started. This meant that we yet again had to revise the statistics from the foundation. The statistics have now, however, been so arranged that it is a relatively simple matter to compile new tables and surveys.

At the meeting in London in 1953, we submitted to the Commissioners revised statistics relating to the operations in the Antarctic in seasons 1937/38 to 1952/53 inclusive, except the war seasons. In June this year we sent out to the Commissioners statistics relating to seasons 1931/32 to 1936/37 inclusive, as well as preliminary statistics for season 1953/54. In our revised statistics a number of details are given concerning the operations per 10° square.

We have, in our judgment, furnished a sound basic set of statistics, and it now remains for the Commissioners, and first and foremost the Scientific Committee, to build further on that. It has meant a lot of work to revise the statistics in respect of these 16 seasons, and I trust that the Scientific Committee, and other scientists who are interested in whaling,

will be able in the future to show that our work has not been in vain.

It would perhaps be of interest to revise the statistics in respect of all the seasons since the beginning of pelagic whaling. This would, however, be a difficult matter, as we have not position records from the factory ships for the first seasons of pelagic whaling. I imagine, however, that the companies could provide us with some information, so that revised statistics also in respect of the first seasons would be fairly complete. On the other hand, I think that the work of revising the statistics with respect to the earlier seasons ought not to be undertaken unless our scientists give cogent proof that such a work will have value for whaling research. We are reluctant to spend more time on new tables before we are sure that the value of the tables is proportionate to the labour.

At the meeting in London in 1953, a Sub-committee was, as you know, formed with the mandate *inter alia* "to study the catches of pelagic factories and land stations outside the Antarctic". In order that the Sub-committee should have the utmost information about whaling in fields outside the Antarctic, the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics prepared a publication which gave a collective survey of whaling since this commenced in 1868. With respect to the first period, the statistics are not entirely complete, but the material collected is in every case so abundant that it provides a fairly correct picture of the course of whaling in the various fields. A copy of this summary has also been sent to the Commissioners. I may mention that the Committee of International Whaling Statistics intends to publish this summary as an ordinary publication of the International Whaling Statistics, and we hope that the publication will be issued some time this year. The tables of this publication will in the main be formulated in the same way as International Whaling Statistics Nos. II and XVI.

The Committee of International Whaling Statistics has now issued publication Nos. XXXI and XXXII, and these have been distributed to the Commissioners. No. XXXI gives detailed information about whaling in fields outside the Antarctic in 1952 and No. XXXII the same about whaling in the Antarctic in season 1952/53. The manuscript of these publications was ready in September 1953, but it has unfortunately taken 9 months to get the publications printed. This is due, however, to circumstances over which we have had no control.

The statistics for whaling in fields outside the Antarctic in 1953 will be printed in Publication No. XXXIII. We have already received information from most of the companies, and we have therefore prepared a provisional issue, which has been distributed to the Commissioners. In spite of repeated applications, it has unfortunately been impossible to procure records of the catch and production from 4 companies, namely, two which operate on the coast of Peru, a company on the Chilean coast and another on the coast of Spain. Further, we lack particulars from some companies respecting the sex and size of the whales captured. Apart from this, the statistics should,

as far as the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics knows, be complete. The provisional issue of No. XXXIII is accompanied by a general map showing the locality of the land stations and areas where the factory ships have operated.

In fields outside the Antarctic whaling was undertaken in 1953 from 49 land stations and 2 factory ships. In addition whaling was performed by the aid of rowing boats from land stations on the Azores and from Madeira. The companies which have rendered catch reports produced altogether about 398,000 barrels whale and sperm oil. We lack statements from 4 land stations. Three of these stations produced about 11,000 barrels of oil in 1952, while the fourth operated for the first time in 1953. The total production in 1952 was about 430,000 barrels oil. Thus the production in fields outside the Antarctic is a little less than in 1952. In fields outside the Antarctic, the companies which have sent in reports captured altogether

336 blue whales
2,640 fin whales
2,339 humpback whales
1,551 sei whales
5,852 sperm whales.

The world catch in 1953 comprises the catch in the Antarctic in 1952/53 and in fields outside the Antarctic in the calendar year 1953.

The world catch of blue and fin whales in 1953 was largest in the Antarctic, where 92% of the blue whales and 90% of the fin whales were captured. The taxation of humpback, sei and sperm whales was, however, greatest in fields outside the Antarctic.

The world catch amounted in 1953 to 43,439 whales in all, and 2,515,933 barrels whale and sperm oil were produced. The world catch in 1952 was 49,832 whales, and 2,908,850 barrels whale and sperm oil were produced. Thus the world catch in 1953 shows a decline in production relatively to 1952 of about 370,000 barrels oil. The decline in the catch and production is primarily due to the lower catch and production in the Antarctic in 1952/53, which in its turn is due to the fact that the operations stopped before the quota was complete, and to a smaller catch of sperm whales.

In the Antarctic 17 pelagic expeditions and 3 land stations were in activity in season 1953/54, employing 227 catchers. This is 1 pelagic expedition more than in season 1952/53.

The 17 pelagic expeditions had the following nationality:

9 Norwegian
3 United Kingdom
1 South African
2 Japanese
1 Dutch
1 U.S.S.R.

The 3 land stations had the following nationality:

- 1 Argentine
- 1 United Kingdom
- 1 Norwegian

The 17 pelagic expeditions employed 206 catchers in all, which is an average of 12.1 per factory ship. This is 2.3 catchers less than the average in 1952/53. The reason for this reduction in the number of catchers is that the whaling companies concluded an agreement in 1953 for a limitation of whale catchers. The keen competition for the permitted number of blue whale units has in the postwar seasons led to a great expansion of the catcher fleet. A large catcher fleet has naturally yielded a larger daily catch, but the total catch for all the expeditions as a whole has remained the same. The only advantage of a large fleet of catchers has been therefore that the season has become shorter. Catchers are expensive to buy and to operate, and it is more economical to use fewer boats and instead to allow the whole expedition to remain in the field longer. The question of few or many catchers has no significance from the point of view of regulation, but it has great economic significance for the companies.

At the meeting of the Commission in London in 1953, important changes were made in the Schedule of the Convention, which had significance for the pelagic operations in the Antarctic in season 1953/54. The maximum catch was reduced from 16,000 to 15,500 blue whale units. Relatively to season 1952/53, this did not result, however, in any reduction in the catch. As the Commissioners will remember, the Committee of International Whaling Statistics erred considerably in its fixing of the closing date for the hunting of baleen whales in that season. Previously, the Committee had been fairly accurate in fixing the closing date, but in 1952/53 the total catch was 1,133 units less than the permitted maximum.

The Committee was criticized, but it defended itself by the plea that it had proceeded in the same way in fixing the closing date as formerly, and that the fault lay in the long notice which had to be given before the closing date. At the meeting of the Commission it was, on the notion of the Norwegian Commissioner, who is also a member of the Committee of International Whaling Statistics, resolved that the operations should be terminated by 4 days' notice, instead of 14 days, as previously, and that the companies, from the date 14,000 blue whale units had been taken, should send in daily reports. The new rules for reports and notice have made the task of fixing the closing date considerably easier. It was in fact somewhat of a nervous strain to fix the closing date according to the earlier rules, as a too early date might have great economic consequences for the companies. On the other hand, a too late closing date might lead to an overstepping of the permitted maximum. With a 4 days' notice we should be assured against excessive divergencies from the permitted figure. Last season the total catch amounted to 15,449 units, but we cannot count on being so lucky every time. Weekly catch reports were transmitted by the Bureau of International Whaling

Statistics to the Contracting Governments which had pelagic expeditions in the Antarctic and to the individual whaling companies. From the date we received daily reports the managers on the pelagic expeditions were also kept informed. Notification of the closing date was sent to all the Contracting Governments, to the companies and to the managers of the expeditions.

Except for last season it has, in all the seasons since and including 1949/50, been permissible to capture 1,250 humpback whales, and it was then left to the Committee of International Whaling Statistics to fix the closing date. As the system of reporting and terminating the operations did not work satisfactorily, it was at the meeting in London in 1953 resolved to fix a definite hunting period for humpback whales, namely, February 1st to 4th inclusive. On these four days, 594 humpback whales were captured. Three expeditions took 544 of these, representing an average of some 50 whales a day for these expeditions. The remaining 50 humpback whales were taken by the other expeditions.

In order to protect the blue whale still further, it was resolved at the meeting in London in 1953 that the opening date for hunting of blue whales should be January 16th. The opening date for hunting of fin whales remained, however, the same as in the previous two seasons, namely, January 2nd. In all previous seasons there has been the same opening date for hunting of blue whales and fin whales. It is naturally difficult to say anything certain as to how many blue whales were saved in these 14 days. In the three foregoing seasons an average of 1047 blue whales were captured from January 2nd to 15th. It must be reckoned, however, that some of the blue whales which were spared in the period January 2nd to 15th last season were captured later on in the season.

From statements to the press after the return of the expeditions, it appears that some of the managers were not satisfied with the arrangement of a different opening date for blue whales and fin whales. They say that it had the effect that the factory ships congregate on the best fin whale grounds, with the result that these were disproportionately taxed. It looks as if the blue whale occurrences are largest the farther east one goes, and that the fin whale occurrences are largest in the middle and western fields. It is correct that last season there was very little whaling activity in the eastern fields, and that most of the factory ships took their station in the middle and western fields. It is difficult to say, however, if it is the alteration in the opening date for hunting of blue whales which is the cause of the great concentration of factory ships in the said fields. It must be noted that whaling has had a tendency to move westwards in recent seasons. In season 1950/51, whaling was relatively evenly distributed over the 4 areas, namely:

Area II	about 20%
Area III	about 22%
Area IV	about 22%
Area V	about 28%

In Areas II and III, the catch in 1950/51 constituted 50% of the total catch. In 1951/52 it constituted 56%, in 1952/53 70% and last season about 77%. This indicates that the great concentration in the middle and western fields last season is a continuation of a development which commenced already in the 1951/52 season.

The baleen whale operations as regards the pelagic expeditions terminated on March 18th, and the total catch amounted to:

2,684	blue whales
24,971	fin whales
594	humpback whales
251	sei whales
<u>28,500</u>	baleen whales

equivalent to 15,448.9 blue whale units. This is the lowest blue whale catch since pelagic whaling commenced, except for the war seasons. Second to season 1937/38, the fin whale catch in the last season is the largest in the Antarctic. In 1937/38 about 1500 fin whalers more were caught than last season. The blue whale catch last season amounted to 9.7 % of the total blue and fin whale catch. In the seasons round about 1930/31 the ratio was almost the reverse. In seasons 1947/48 to 1950/51 inclusive the blue whale catch varied between 25 and 30% of the combined blue and fin whale catch, as compared with the said 9.7% last season.

Ever since the first international agreement was concluded special measures have been taken to reduce the catch of blue whales, and thereby save the stocks. This has been done by moving the opening date for the hunting of baleen whales forwards. In 1932/33 the operations began on October 20th. The opening date has subsequently been moved forwards at regular intervals and last season it was, as stated, for blue whales January 16th. This has naturally led to a lower catch of blue whales. But even when we compare the blue whale catch before and now in the months in which whaling in all seasons has been carried on, it appears that the blue whale forms a constantly lower proportion of the combined blue and fin whale catch. I draw attention here to the memorandum on "The Condition of the Antarctic Whale Stocks" submitted by the Norwegian delegation at the last meeting in London, and to the "Memorandum of the Dutch Delegation" on the same subject.

Last season 2,666 blue whales were captured between January 16th and the close of the season. From January 16th onwards in season 1952/53, 2,822 blue whales were captured. (These figures relate to processed whales.) Thus there was in the two said seasons from January 16th onwards a decline in the catch of blue whales of about 5.6%. In seasons 1947/48 to 1951/52 inclusive, the blue whale catch from January 16th onwards has formed 20-30% of the combined blue and fin whale catch, as compared with about 15% in 1952/53 and about 12% last season.

The catch of blue whales per catcher day's work from 16/1 onwards was last season 0.21, as compared with 0.20 in the same period in the previous season. In Area V, there was a marked fall

in the catch of blue whales, namely, from 0.21 per catcher day's work in 1952/53 to 0.12 last season. As a matter of fact, there has been a considerable fall in the catch of blue whales in Area V in last 4 seasons, namely:

1949/50	0.84	blue whales per catcher day's work
1950/51	0.55	-ditto-
1951/52	0.35	-ditto-
1952/53	0.21	-ditto-
1953/54	0.12	-ditto-

The number of blue whales per catcher day's work in Areas II and IV from January 16th onwards was approximately the same as in the preceding season. In Area III, there was a rise in the catch from 0.21 to 0.27 blue whales per catcher day's work.

The average catch of fin whales per catcher day's work rose considerably in all the Areas last season. The average for all Areas was 1.53 as compared with 1.23 in 1952/53, and 0.84 on an average for seasons 1931/32 to 1952/53. The larger fin whale catch per catcher day's work relatively to earlier seasons must, of course, be appraised in relation to the lower catch of blue whales. To make up for the decreased catch of blue whales, the catch of fin whales has naturally increased. In this connection, it may be mentioned that the catch converted to blue whale units, in the first two weeks last season, when it was not allowed to hunt blue whales, was on an average larger than the catch in any of the other weeks of the season. This may indicate that the expeditions managed to replace the blue whales with fin whales, and that the preservation of the blue whales in the first fortnight did not lead to a smaller catch in the said period. The reason for the relatively large catch in the first fortnight may, however, be that the weather conditions were more favourable than later on in the season.

The pelagic expeditions have since 1925/26 captured altogether approximately 255,000 blue whales and approximately 307,000 fin whales.

The average size of captured blue whales was in 1953/54 78.1 feet, which is 0.6 feet higher than in season 1952/53. In the latter season, however, there was a low average size. In seasons 1948/49 and 1949/50 the average size of blue whales was 79.1 and 79.0-feet respectively, but in all the other postwar seasons, the average size has ranged from 78.0 to 78.4 feet. The average size of fin whales was last season 67.1 feet, which is 0.2 feet lower than in 1952/53.

The 16 expeditions which have sent in specified records captured and processed 2,531 blue whales in all. Of these, 101 were under the legal size (69 feet or less). This is 4% of the total catch. The same expeditions had 711 undersized fin whales in a total catch of 22,165 fin whales, or 3.2%. In seasons 1951/52 and 1952/53, the catch of undersized fin whales was 2.4% and 2.7% respectively, of the total catch of fin whales.

Managers and gunners have since the return home stated that the operations were hindered by bad weather. As usual, the catch

results vary somewhat for the different expeditions. The total catch for all 17 expeditions amounted, however, to the total number of blue whale units which it was permitted to catch. The catch results alone tell us, therefore, nothing about the whaling conditions last season. In order to get a picture of these, it is necessary to compare the catch with the time in getting it and the material employed. The latter is best expressed in catcher day's work. The average catch of blue whale units per catcher day's work was last season 0.98, as compared with 0.86 in the previous season. In the other seasons since 1947/48, the average catch has varied between 0.84 and 0.94 units per catcher day's work. When it relates to the average catch of blue whale units per catcher day's work, it must be noted, however, that the number of catchers last season was reduced by voluntary agreement between the companies. With a lower number of catchers it should be possible to utilize these in a more rational manner, and thereby obtain a larger catch per day. This circumstance acquires significance, however, only when one compares the average catch in 1953/54 with the average catch in 1951/52 and 1952/53. In seasons 1948/49, 1949/50 and 1950/51, however, the factory ships employed approximately the same number of catchers as in last season. The relatively high average catch per day's work last season does not indicate therefore that the whaling conditions have been worse than in the other seasons since the war.

The average yield per blue whale unit was last season 128.6 barrels, as compared with 128 in season 1952/53 and 129.4 in 1951/52. The reports from the companies indicate that there was a relatively low oil yield at the beginning of the season, but that it rose considerably toward the end of this. It is the expeditions which have operated in Area II which show on an average the highest oil output, namely, 141.5 barrels per unit. In all the seasons, since and including 1947/48, the oil yield per blue whale unit in the said Area has been higher than in any of the other areas. The lowest yield was in Area IV, namely, 114.1 barrels per unit. The oil output varies relatively much as regards the individual expeditions, namely, from 157.3 to 108.3 barrels.

The reason for the large variations in the oil yield may lie primarily in the nature of the raw material. A blue whale unit is, as is known, equivalent to one blue whale or two fin whales. No regard is paid to the fatness or size of the whale. An expedition which gets large, fat whales ought naturally have a high oil output per unit. But the possibility cannot be excluded that not all the expeditions are equally effective with respect to extracting oil from the whales.

These are some remarks on the whaling activity in and outside the Antarctic in recent years. If any of the Commissioners desire further particulars, attention is drawn to the material distributed and to the material already sent.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Vangstein. Before we adjourn, may we remind all members of the Technical Committee that they will meet at 2:30 this afternoon and that the Finance and Administration Committee will meet at 9:30 tomorrow morning.

The SECRETARY: His Excellency, the Ambassador of Argentina, has invited everyone to a cocktail party on Friday at the Argentine Embassy from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. No cards will be issued, but you are asked, as you leave, to indicate at the reception desk whether you will be attending this cocktail party.

The CHAIRMAN: Unless there are other matters that some of the Commissioners may wish to bring up at this time, the Commission will adjourn until Wednesday at 9:30 a.m. We intend to work the Committees on Tuesday and try to come up with solutions to some of the problems that had come up in the agenda. The meeting will now adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

- - - - - oOo - - - - -

SIXTH MEETING, DOCUMENT XIV (B)
(Corrected)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

SIXTH MEETING, SECOND PLENARY

WEDNESDAY, 21ST JULY, 1954

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

The CHAIRMAN: Will the session please come to order. The Secretary has a few remarks to make.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I have to report that we are very glad to welcome here the Mexican delegate, His Excellency the Mexican Ambassador, Mr. Manuel Naples Arce. We also are glad to welcome at this meeting the Brazilian delegate from the Brazilian Embassy, Mr. Wilson Sydney Lobato.

I have to inform you--I like to keep straight with the papers--that you will find around the table certain documents which I will just refer to, Documents XII to XVI. XII is a progress report from the Netherlands, Norway and the United Kingdom; XIII is a report which we received from the U.S.S.R. on whale marking; XIV (A) is the verbatim report of the first plenary meeting; XV is the Scientific Committee's draft report; and XVI which you will be considering in a moment is the report of the Finance and Administration Committee.

I wonder whether I might bother you on three small points. In Document IX, which is a list of the members, Commissioners and experts attending this meeting, it would save us perhaps the trouble of recopying if you will note that we gave one of the Australian delegates an extra initial. Please correct it. In Document XIV (A) there is a more serious point on page 7. The U.S.S.R. representative on the Scientific Committee should be entered as A.N. Solyanik in place of the words that are at present in the statement. We are sorry we made a mistake about that. We would like to correct it now. Then with regard to.....

U.S.S.R.: Just a moment, Technical Committee. Representative on the Technical Committee is Captain Solyanik.

The SECRETARY: The Technical Committee, was it? Thank you very much. It is page 7. Then as to Document XII, I am sorry that we forgot to turn over a page, and on page 2 of Document XII we made an incomplete copy, so Document XII has been relaid around the table in its complete form, the second page having originally been erroneously copied.

Now, Gentlemen

Now, Gentlemen, I am asked to say that there will be facilities tomorrow, no Friday, to visit the fish market which, I believe, is one of the things to see in Japan. The visit will take place from 5:10 a.m. to 6:15 a.m. and a bus will leave the Grand Hotel at 4:45 a.m. and the Imperial Hotel at 5:00. It is a very early start but I am asked to inquire whether you will kindly indicate quickly to me who would like to pay this visit and join the bus at those times--4:45 a.m. at the Grand Hotel and the Imperial Hotel at 5:00 a.m. Now of those staying at the Grand Hotel could you give me your names quickly.

Mr. Clark, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Ruud, Mr. Moe, Mr. Vangstein, Mr. Pavlov, Captain Solyanik, Mr. Tverianovich, and your interpreter--I haven't got her name.

Anybody from the Imperial Hotel? Mr. Wall, Sir Vyvyan Board, Mr. Marchand, Dr. Mackintosh, Mr. Plummer, the Swedish representative--I've got his name--Dr. de Waal, Mr. Lienesch, Dr. Slijper, Mr. Lobato, Mr. Moore, Mr. Anderson. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any names omitted?

The SECRETARY: Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Lienesch?

DR. G. J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, with regards to some mistakes in one of the papers I am sorry to say that in Document XIV we couldn't find on page 6 the name of Dr. de Waal of the Low Countries and also the name of Mr. Elshove was missing.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we get that information afterwards so we can insert it. That is Document XIV.

DR. LIENESCH (Netherlands): We must correct it, so we should like to call your attention to it.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, may I say that as in previous cases the only person who had seen Document XIV since it came off the typewriter was myself and it was always understood that I expect everyone here to send in their corrections. We shall then issue an erratum slip because Document XIV (A) will be followed by Document XIV (B) and Document XIV (C). But it is for each Commissioner to notify Mr. Mori or myself of any correction and at a later stage we shall, for record's sake, issue an erratum slip. Thank you, Dr. Lienesch.

The CHAIRMAN: If we may now proceed with the agenda the first item to be considered this afternoon is Item XIV, "Report by the Finance and Administration Committee." Mr. Wall?

Mr. R.G.R.

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Document XVI?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is Document XVI.

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Mr. Chairman, I have pleasure in bringing the report of our Committee to the Commission. We first of all considered the statement of income and expenditure for the year ending 31st May 1954, which is Document I (A) for our meeting. We have studied the itemized account of expenditure for the year and thought the figures were correct and we were assured that they have been certified by the Commission's Auditors of the English Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries and we, therefore, agreed to the figure of expenditure of £185⁴/₁₆/₂. That leaves a carry-over, as the Commission will see, of £1,457, allowing for the payment of all contributions for that year, three of which, however, are still outstanding; and we would, if we may, express the hope that the three outstanding contributions will be received as soon as possible. I think on that part of our report that there is really nothing more to say and I would propose, if I may, that this statement of income and expenditure for the year 1953/54 should be approved by the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a motion to that effect? Mr. Clark has moved that we second it. Mr. Lienesch seconded. All in favor say "Aye".

(All in favor.)

The CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

(None.)

The CHAIRMAN: Carried

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.) Thank you, Sir. Would you than wish me to go straight on to the next matter, "Date and Place of Next Meeting"?

The CHAIRMAN: That will come up on Friday.

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Well, then, may I turn to page 3 of our report, paragraph 4, which deals with the budget for the current year. The budget we bring before you is attached to this report as Document I (B) Revised, replacing the earlier Document I (B) which has been on the table previously. There, we have set out on the left the itemized budget for expenditure in the current year and it will be seen that we have made one or two amendments from the original Document I (B). Firstly, we have found it necessary to raise the figure for travelling and subsistence from £650 to £800. That item covers not only the costs of travelling and subsistence in respect of the

/present meeting

present meeting in Japan but also certain other visits involving expenditure, notably in regard to scientific affairs, abroad. But the particular reason for putting up the figure is that travel costs in respect of this meeting have been somewhat higher than originally contemplated and that accounts for the proposed increase.

The other item we have amended is item 6, "Special stationery facilities, including cost of annual report, convention and foreign postage", which we have put up from I think it was £200 to the present figure of £250 and there we have had especially in mind that the Rearranged Schedule may be approved and printed and that will involve certain expenditure. Therefore, we propose a figure for the year of £2,580.

Now, therefore, if I may turn to the income side, we had a balance from the previous year of £1,457. We have put down the contributions at the same figure as before from each Contracting Government, making a total of £2,550, and from our estimates that would give us a carry forward or a balance of £1,427 into the next financial year. Now that balance is very slightly less than the balance we have brought forward into the current year. We have considered whether it is a large balance to carry forward, but we have been influenced by three considerations: The first and most important, perhaps, as we have mentioned in our report, is that we understand the Commission may wish to publish one or more scientific reports within the next year or two and it seems desirable to have some money available against that eventuality; but secondly, I think we have to consider, just as a possibility, that the Headquarters of the Commission in London may not at all times be available in the present building of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. I am not suggesting for a moment that any change is proposed--it isn't, but I think we should bear in mind that one day some changes may occur at a result of which the Commission will find the cost of accommodation and necessary staff may be heavier and it seems desirable again to have some money in reserve against that. Lastly, the contributions do not always come in at the same rate as the expenditure goes out and if we have not some sort of a reserve that has to be covered by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries in London. There may be difficulty on that score and it is desirable to have a working fund against these considerations.

For those various reasons, we suggest carrying forward this balance of 1,427, and the recommendation we wish to bring to you is that contributions for next year from each Contracting Government should be £150 as before.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank, Mr. Wall. Any one wish to comment on this statement of finance and expenditure?

Dr. A. KODAKI: Mr. Chairman, no comment. But I think the third line from the top "scientific report", I think that must be plural, "one or more scientific reports". I think we have to put "s"., "reports", line 3 from the top of page 4.

The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: Plural instead of singular.

Mr. W.M.TERRY (U.S.A.): I understand Mr. Wall's explanation of this carrying forward the balance of £1,427. It does occur to me that it is a rather large sum to hold back for contingencies sake. It is somewhat more than 50% of the operating budget of the Commission we are holding in reserve, and to me it is a rather unusual budgetary procedure.

In connection with this statement, we have been asked by our Government to let the Commission know that it is rather important for us in our budgetary procedure to have an estimate of some sort of the expenses of the Commission for the coming year in our hands sometime before the Commission meet, preferably in 60 days, and we were wondering if some arrangements could be made to provide us with such an estimate.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Secretary?

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I am only too anxious to supply any member of this Commission with an estimate of what the expenditure is likely to be and within certain limits, I think one can give an estimate over a series of five years for that matter, but I would like to explain to Mr. Terry in particular that one of the facilities that we have in connection with this Commission is that the Ministry not only houses us at a very small cost but they are also our bankers in the sense that they do our accounts and the Government Auditor is the auditor of our accounts. Therefore, as Secretary, I have to undertake no such vexatious duties, but I can hardly go to the Ministry and ask them to give me a statement of the Commission's expenditures in any year, much before the 31st of May when the year ceases. As a matter of fact, in this case as I was going away to Canada, I asked the Ministry about a fortnight before the end of the year and they did produce it fairly soon after the end of the year, but until I get that statement and I am satisfied that the bills have been paid and what exactly the amounts are, I can't prepare the budget for the next year, which is my responsibility. I can certainly at any time make a note to notify the members what I think the expenditure will be within round figures. We do that--I think Mr. Terry is remembering--we do that in the case of the other body for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. We just give a round figure. If that is all that is required, I am perfectly willing to do my best to supply them.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments? If not, may we accept the statement of the Finance Committee, unless someone wishes to move the acceptance. Mr. Clark? Mr. Ruud?

Mr. J.T.RUUD (Norway): We are willing to accept.

The Chairman

The CHAIRMAN: All those in favor say "Aye".

(All in favor)

The CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

Mr. W.M.TERRY (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, the United States would wish to abstain on this. Our instructions don't at the moment cover the carrying over of such a large balance.

The CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will so record. Mr. Dobson wishes to make a comment.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I understand that you would like to have a rough estimate as to what this Commission might cost if we ceased to receive facilities we do from the Ministry of Agriculture. I don't think that anyone can give a very close estimate, but I can say this, I think, from my knowledge of staffs in London. Accommodation for a single room will certainly cost us three or four times what we pay now. Then there will be fuel and lighting, telephone charges, but as regards staff, there would certainly have to be either a clerical officer or a skilled stenographer fairly highly paid who would take charge of the office because there is no need for me to be there all the time, but if we had an outside office, we should have to have it occupied all the time. And I don't think it will stop at a stenographer because there are certain times when we have rush jobs when I merely turn the whole matter over to the Ministry's typing pool. And, therefore, I can't estimate in terms of one staff. But the staff will be very much more costly. The room will be very much more costly, and I could put it in round figures--I have worked it out once or twice. I should say that the cost of the Commission will probably be in the region of £5 or £6,000 instead of its present round about £2,000. I don't know whether Mr. Wall would disagree with those figures.

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): I quite agree with them, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Then may we proceed with item 17, "The Draft of the 5th Annual Report for approval as Document VII"?

The SECRETARY: I have nothing really to say about Document VII; it is just a rough draft. In the usual form of the Annual Report which we had been in the habit of issuing during the last four years, this will be the 5th Report. It is only, as I say, a rough draft; it contains a number of blanks which, I am happy to say, Mr. Vangstein has already enabled me to fill up but I am only too glad to be notified, as I have been from South Africa, of one or two verbal corrections which I would be glad if anyone would let me know. Of course, it would be carefully checked over before it is finally sent to be printed. I would like to call your attention to one point and that is, among the appendices, you will see that we have taken the opportunity of putting in the list all those who attended the meeting of the Commission, the agenda for the last meeting and the Chairman's report of the last meeting. Then we have to put in a statement

in a statement of income and expenditure and that is what you have just approved. We have also put in a list of all the reports that we have received during the year which form the nucleus of our library. On this occasion, I have taken the liberty, without even consulting the Chairman, of putting it in Appendix 4, which is a copy of our Rearranged Schedule. When at that time I decided to put this in, we were not too hopeful of getting the necessary assents to the Rearranged Schedule. It seemed to me that such a lot of time has been occupied in preparing this Rearranged Schedule, that we might at least publish it so as to have it in the printed record; so, therefore, I have ventured to include it in Appendix 4 and it has already been printed in anticipation of appearing in that report.

I do not think there is anything more to say, Mr. Chairman; if there are any suggestions for improvement in this report for making it more readable, I should be delighted if the Commissioners would indicate their wishes. Otherwise, this report would be printed as soon as I get home and will probably be available for the Commission about a month from that time.

The CHAIRMAN: May we have a recommendation for approval subject to these corrections? Printing takes rather longer than we like.

Mr. R.G.R.WALL (U.K.): May I just make one point? Paragraph 24 speaks of "the pelagic season in 1953/54" and the word "pelagic" occurs subsequently. This is just a point of phrasing. Is it not more correct to say "the Antarctic season" because "pelagic" also covers the North Pacific, I think.

The CHAIRMAN: That would be better. Thank you, Mr. Wall.

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.) Then it occurs in 26 as well as in 27.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, I will make a note of that. Any other suggested corrections?

Dr. G.J.LIENESCH (Netherlands): It is not William Barendsz, it is Wilhem Barendsz. This is very important.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further suggestions? If not, would someone care to move the acceptance of the reports subject to the corrections being made by the Secretary.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): I vote that this report be approved.

The Chairman:

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kodaki, Dr. Marchand moved and seconded that we accept the report subject to the corrections which will be made by the Secretary. All in favor, please say "aye". Those opposed?

Gentlemen, inasmuch as the Technical Committee and the Scientific Committee haven't completed their reports, it is proposed to adjourn this session now and have both the Technical Committee and Scientific Committee meet at once following the adjournment of this session. Now we propose to have another plenary session tomorrow, Thursday, at 2:30 p.m., and at that time the reports of the Committees will be in, we hope. I understand that the Chairmen of the two Committees are agreeable to that time. If there are no further comments, this session will stand adjourned and the two Committees will at once commence their work.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Pp. 2, 3, 5, 6

SIXTH MEETING, DOCUMENT XIV (C)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION
SIXTH MEETING, THIRD PLENARY
THURSDAY, 22ND JULY, 1954

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

The CHAIRMAN: Will the Commission please come to order. The Secretary has one announcement to make but before he starts, I have been advised that the dining room here will serve whale meat tomorrow at noon. They have a young whale which they will serve in steak form and the management here would like to know who wishes to have dinner here tomorrow and have whale meat for lunch. Will those attending please hold up their hands?

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Would you indicate whether whale meat is fish?

The CHAIRMAN: It has been ruled in some places - if it bothers you - it is fish.

The Chairman counted 32 persons attending the whale lunch.

The SECRETARY: I would like to call attention to two documents which have been laid around the table, Sixth Meeting, Document XV, "Report of the Scientific Committee", Sixth Meeting, Document XVII, "Report of the Technical Committee. The latter has only just been passed by the Technical Committee, but there are a number of corrections to be made which I will take care of. I have also been asked by the Editor of the Asahi Evening News to circulate around the table a copy of last night's paper which contains a considerable account of this Conference. Shall I say that it also contains four rather interesting portraits where our individuals has become somebody else.

The CHAIRMAN: The first point to be considered is the decision of the Commission to either approve or reject the reception of Document XV, this being the report of the Scientific Committee. I don't think it is necessary to poll the Commission on that and I would request a motion from some one to receive the report. Would Dr. Marchand make the motion to receive the report? Is there a second - Terry! Now all in favour, please say "aye". Any opposed? - No. It looks like it being unanimous. We go through the same procedure in the report of the Technical Committee, Document XVII. Do I hear a motion to receive the report? Mr. Anderson moves to receive, who moves to second it? Dr. Lienesch moves to second it. Any comments, if not, all those in favour to say "aye". Those opposed - no. The "ayes" have it.

We

We propose to take up one non-controversial item, Item 9 on the agenda "Whale Marking". It appears as para. 5 in the report of the Technical Committee and as 17 in the report of the Scientific Committee. To expedite consideration of this matter, it is suggested that we hear a statement of the chairman of each of the committees, and I will call on Dr. Mackintosh to make a statement, and the other, Mr. Clark, to follow.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): I don't think I need say very much more on this report since the draft has already been considered ~~by this Group here~~, and there are very little alterations, there two 2 paragraphs added in. I might mention first that there are one or two very small spelling mistakes.

The CHAIRMAN: You are on whale marking.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): I beg your pardon, The main point is, Mr. Chairman, that although the voyage of the Enern was most successful and we were very grateful for the support we had from whaling companies, in order to get various substantial additions to what we know, we really want to mark whales if we can on a very much larger scale. However, we understand that there is a chance of further support in the coming season and that will certainly carry us along the road. It is undoubtedly one of the best and most profitable methods of research. Shall I comment also on what is said in the Technical Committee's report?

The CHAIRMAN: The Technical Committee, Dr. Mackintosh, will comment on that, but if you have any observations on their comments, will you arrange that it be brought up after that?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): Mr. Chairman, there is not very much to add to the points contained in the Technical Committee's report in connection with the matter of whale marking. I think the first paragraph of the report is fairly clear.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been stated - please talk into your microphone.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Is there anything very much more to add in connection with whale marking. The first part of the report is quite clear. The second report might come up for some consideration. In connection with the carry over of the balance in the Commission's funds it is for consideration whether or not the Commission might give some thought, not necessarily in this meeting, but in future years to use some of the balance of the funds as contribution to the marking programme. The Technical Committee feel quite strongly that because of the imponderables and the doubts which have been

raised in

raised in connection with various proposals to be forwarded by the Scientific Committee, there is only one way we are going to get in many of these answers and that is by expanding the marking programme. A second point in the next paragraph with regard to the reference of the Scientific Committee to submit an outlined programme of submitting whale marking is also brought about by the fact that certain countries are doing whale marking on their own. That has particular reference insofar as the North Pacific is concerned. The U.S.S.R. is doing a considerable amount of marking at the present time. Japan is doing the same thing and Canada is now preparing to embark on a marking programme. However, it was felt that if those three countries in that particular area are doing it, it would be most desirable to have some sort of standard system or coordinating programme so that information can be followed through to the Commission and we will gain that much more knowledge. The next point, of course, is the expression of sincere thanks and gratitude on behalf of the Technical Committee to the organisers and the sponsors of the expedition of the Enern in the Antarctic last season, and also for the arrangements apparently for the coming season.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Clark. Does any commissioner or adviser wish to comment on either of these statements?

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Our whaling companies are willing to participate in the whale marking in the Antarctic. They can use their catchers before the season starts. Of course it is more satisfactory to send down to the Antarctic a special boat like the Enern, but it would be useful if each company carry out the whale marking operations even to a limited extent. In order to carry it out, it would be a good thing to get some advice or some material from some institute which has some uniform equipment like prepared marks. I think, Dr. Mackintosh will answer to that. If you could send us some available marks to be used by our whaling companies, we could carry this out.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): Yes, we can arrange for the supply of marks provided we have sufficient notice to do so. The thing that takes time is to get the tubular steel and the material for the marks. Making the marks does not take us long, but, Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment generally on this, it seems to me that insofar as possible, we want to make a more uniform or unified marking scheme for large areas where whales belong more or less to the same stock. In the Northern Hemisphere and the Southern Hemisphere, they can be assumed to be sufficiently distinct, to have quite separate stocks, and we do not expect the whale marks in the Antarctic to turn up in the Arctic, for instance. Therefore, we did not have the same marking scheme for the Northern Hemisphere and the Southern Hemisphere, and one could no doubt have an independent scheme for the North Atlantic and

North Pacific

North Pacific because the stocks are fairly well supported there. But it would be a good thing, I think, for marking in the Antarctic to be coordinated, at least so that, sup-^{separated,} posing a mark was fired by the Japanese Whalers into a whale in Area 5 and recovered in Area 2, we should know how mark-^{is this} was fired and where to turn it, etc. How this could all be done would be rather difficult to say. We can't say off hand, but I wonder if this matter could be considered further by a sub-committee recommended by a scientific committee if appointed, because I think the countries interested in whale marking, at least in the Southern Hemisphere, would be probably represented on that committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other further comments?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): Could I just say one thing, Mr. Chairman. The Technical Committee report suggests an outlined programme, ~~that something general should be done, because so much depends on available personnel and time.~~ ^{but that it would be difficult to draft for a term period}

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that it would be desirable to refer this point to the Special Ad Hoc Committee for study and recommendation. Will that be all right?

Any further discussion?

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, May I bring up again this question, that is in the Technical Committee report in connection with the matter of the Commission doing something towards making a contribution with respect to the marking programme. I should like to make a motion that the Secretary of the Commission be authorized to expend some of the Commission's funds, a sum of £600 which, I understand, will provide about 600 marks, that is, whale marks, for this purpose, as the Commission's contribution towards the overall marking programme.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a second? By Australia? Does Australia second it?

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): No.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a second? Dr. Lienesch seconded it.

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): May I ask a question? What article of the Convention authorises this?

THE SECRETARY: Article IV.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments? Dr. Lienesch has seconded it.

MR. R.G.R. WALL

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wall.

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): I am in favor of the extension of whale marking and I sympathize very much with the idea of this Commission coming in and giving a hand in a financial way. In fact, I think I raised the matter myself a year ago, but I should like to ask you in what way this £500 is proposed to be used. Would it, in fact, extend whale marking or would it be used to aid the present amount of whale marking and to replace in some fashion some of the money that is already being used. I am not very clear what way this is going to be used.

MR. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, as mover of this motion, may I explain? I think I used the word "expand". It is an additional marking to what is already being done.

DR. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): I think it is a little complicated, Mr. Chairman. I don't think it would have the effect of increasing the number of whales marked, not at least as far as the marking done by the National Institute of Oceanography and the Norwegian State Institute for Research are concerned because we can find certain funds to carry us so far as marks are concerned, but the main limitation of whale marking is in finding ships to be engaged in marking for a sufficient period. That is where the heavy expense comes in and, of course, catchers are the best things, but it is not easy to get a catcher except for a limited season. Those are the things that limit marking. ~~and, therefore, I hope we can have some financial contribution.~~

The CHAIRMAN: If I have understood Mr. Kodaki correctly, he has asked whether or not marks could be provided. Is that correct?

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Yes, that is right.

The CHAIRMAN: And if marks were provided they could detail some of their catcher boats to do the job.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): It might add to it in that way, provide extra marks, for example, for Japanese companies.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, you see our marks used for whales in the sea adjacent to Japan are much smaller and they are not fit, or, they are not suitable for marking in the Antarctic and, therefore, if marks are already prepared we should like to have them for our use in Area 5.

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wall.

Mr. R.G.R. WALL

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): I should rather like to suggest, though, that we do this a slightly different way and that we agree to set up this sub-committee and let it to study and recommend on this matter further and it is their proposal which the Commission would be prepared to consider with regard to any extended programme of whale marking. I just have the feeling that if we could see the programme side more clearly we might bring the money side afterwards rather than the other way around.

The CHAIRMAN: Since the proposal has been seconded, that would have to be in the form of an amendment. Would you give a wording to that amendment so that we can take that up first. Then the amendment has to be dealt with before the original proposal.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Clark has proposed, and Dr. Lienesch has seconded, a resolution which I have put into these words: "that with a view to extending the whale marking programme, the Commission's secretariat be authorized to expend £600 during the year 1954-55 on the purchase of whale marks." That, I think, was the intention of Mr. Clark's motion. That has been proposed and seconded. To that Mr. Wall would like to move an amendment in these terms that "the special scientific sub-committee proposed by the Scientific Committee should be asked to consider the extension of whale marking and to prepare a coordinated programme to which the Commission might make a financial contribution." That is Mr. Wall's proposal, I understand, if I have read it right. It will require a seconder.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anderson has seconded it.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): May I make just one comment before we go further?

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Mackintosh.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (U.K.): Mr. Chairman, it takes some months to obtain the steel for marks. ~~We have been rather limited as to what we hope will be done next season. Therefore, I doubt whether we could have a new lot made in time for the next Antarctic season.~~

De Pineda
12/1/55
12/1/55
12/1/55
12/1/55
12/1/55

The SECRETARY: The Chairman desires me to poll the Commission on Mr. Wall's amendment which has been seconded by Mr. Anderson of Australia and which reads as follows: "that the special scientific sub-committee proposed by the Scientific Committee should be asked to consider the extension of whale marking and to prepare a coordinated programme to

which

which the Commission might make a financial contribution." I will now poll the Commission. Those in favor say "aye".

AUSTRALIA:	Yes.
BRAZIL:	Yes.
CANADA:	No.
DENMARK:	I am an observer and I do not participate in the voting.
FRANCE:	Yes.
ICELAND:	Not here.
JAPAN:	Yes.
MEXICO:	Abstain.
NETHERLANDS:	No, Sir.
NEW ZEALAND:	Yes.
NORWAY:	Yes.
PANAMA:	Yes.
SOUTH AFRICA:	Yes.
SWEDEN:	Abstain.
U.S.S.R:	Abstain.
U.K:	Yes.
U.S.A:	Yes.

The SECRETARY: That reveals a vote of 10 in favor, 4 abstentions, and 2 against. That is declared as carried. So we should now put that as a substantive motion. May I take it that the substantive motion is taken without polling the whole Commission. The Chairman says that we will record it as a substantive vote as the same as though it were an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN:

The CHAIRMAN: We will now deal with Item 10, "Statement of Infractions". You have the report of the Technical Committee, paragraph 2. I shall call on Mr. Clark to comment on this.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there is very much to add to the statement which is given in the Technical Committee's report which was prepared by the subcommittee which analyzed data concerning the infractions for the past pelagic whaling season and for the land station season in 1953. I would, however, draw your attention to item 3 on page 2 that is tied up with a study of the infraction records. You will notice that the Technical Committee desire to bring to the attention of the Commission the fact that it seems to be more than a coincidence that so many whales are just on the border line of the legal size limits. It seems that a good many people are using, I should say, quite a stretch of elasticity in the middle of the line because it does not seem normal that these whales should hit around the exact and precise figures of the legal lengths at all times and the Technical Committee wishes to draw attention of the Commission to the necessity for member governments to ensure the strictest enforcement of the measurements which are taken of the whales and the very definite accuracy for reporting of infractions.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Clark. Any further comments?

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Mr. Clark, could you explain how it would work with elastic in the center to measure the whales:

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): May be you have got gum down in Australia to stretch that. I don't know about that.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other observations on Item 10 of the agenda?

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, in this report of the Technical Committee, it says: "that the Commission invite the attention of Member Governments for recording details of infractions". Don't you think that it would be a good suggestion to put down here this sentence: The Delegation will carry on this report and make some specific recommendation in respect of the infraction. After all, this is a committee report.

The CHAIRMAN: It is necessary for someone to make a proposal before we go further than just receive the report.

Dr. A. KODAKI: Mr. Chairman, I should like to request that the Secretary prepare some recommendation in this respect.

The SECRETARY: I gather that what you would like us to do is for this Commission to resolve that the recommendation of the Technical Committee as set forth in paragraph 3 of their report

be

be given effect; that is the Secretary will bring that to the attention of Contracting Governments. That, I think, will cover it. All the Contracting Government will have copies of all papers. We are also having to send our a copy of the Chairman's report of this meeting and it is at that stage subsequently that I shall not this report, for commission to Contracting Governments.

Dr. A. KODAKI: I think that is satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Kodaki and seconded by Mr. Clark that a resolution be made to cover paragraph 3.

The SECRETARY: I will poll the Commission on the proposal that the Commission resolve that the recommendation made by the Technical Committee in paragraph 3 of that report be given effect to.

AUSTRALIA:	Yes.
BRAZIL:	Yes.
CANADA:	Yes.
DENMARK:	Abstain.
FRANCE:	Yes.
ICELAND:	(Not present)
JAPAN:	Yes.
MEXICO:	Yes.
NETHERLANDS:	Yes.
NEW ZEALAND:	Yes.
NORWAY:	Yes.
PANAMA:	Yes.
SOUTH AFRICA:	Yes.
SWEDEN:	Yes.
U.S.S.R:	Yes.
U.K:	Yes.
U.S.A:	Yes.

/That

That is carried unanimously with one abstention.

Mr. W.M. TERRY (U.S.A.): Before we leave this report, in paragraph 2 of the Committee's report there was also a recommendation for action by the Commission which I understand the Technical Committee endorsed. I think there should be a similar resolution: I refer to the second sentence, paragraph 2, on page 2, with the wording: "In this connection, the Sub-committee recommend that the Commission invite the attention of the Member Governments, etc."

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the report of the Technical Committee, paragraph 2, which deals with the report of the Sub-committee for infractions contains at least three recommendations which should be given effect to. I think it is desirable, however, that we should have a formal resolution authorizing and instructing me to take action. Mr. Terry moves that and I will call a seconder. This is paragraph 2 of the Technical Committee's report.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a seconder.

Mr. J.M. MARCHAND (South Africa): I second the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any amendments?

The SECRETARY: I will poll the Commission as regards the recommendations contained in paragraph 2 of the Technical Committee's report that should be given effect:

AUSTRALIA: Yes.
BRAZIL: Yes.
CANADA: Yes.
DENMARK: Abstain.
FRANCE: Yes.
ICELAND: (Not present)
JAPAN: Yes
MEXICO: Yes
NETHERLANDS: Yes
NEW ZEALAND: Yes.
NORWAY: Yes.

PANAMA:

PANAMA: Yes.

SOUTH AFRICA: Yes.

SWEDEN: Yes.

U.S.S.R.: Yes.

U.K.: Yes.

U.S.A: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now take up item 13 of the agenda regarding the use of helicopters and the report of the Technical Committee on that matter, paragraph 6.

Sir Vyvyan Board (U.K.): May I call the attention of the Commission to the word on the sixth line of that paragraph. I think the word should be "their utility and capacity to kill" and not "operate".

The SECRETARY: The Chairman desires me to read to the Commission the said paragraph and may I remind you that this matter was dealt with in Document VI. The Committee suggest that the Commission should make a recommendation under Article VI of the Convention that the control of helicopters and other aircraft for the killing of whales should be brought within the scope of the Convention and that the necessary approach should be made to that end to the Depository Government.

The Chairman wishes you to be reminded that Document VI gives a short explanation of this matter. This will require an amendment to the Convention which does not provide at present for the control of helicopters or other aircraft. We have been advised that the Convention could be amended if we adopt a certain procedure which has to be set in motion by the Depository Government who will presumably call together the Contracting Governments' representatives in Washington to sign a protocol if accepted by all countries. So far as the Commission is concerned we take no part parties at present in the preparation of such a protocol in the State Department, but we have to put them in motion by means of a recommendation that the control of helicopters and other aircraft should be brought within the scope of the Convention. Our action is limited and we are asked to resolve that the recommendation should be made to the Depository Government. I don't think there is any more for us to do.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I move.

Mr. J.T. RUUD (Norway): I second.

The SECRETARY:

The SECRETARY: May I poll the Commission on that?

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I don't think anyone is attempting to use helicopters for the purpose of killing whales. I propose that the matter be kept under observation and if there is any danger at helicopters and other aircraft being used for this purpose that action should then be taken.

The SECRETARY: May I explain to the Australian delegate although it is really a matter for Mr. Clark, that Mr. Clark's committee felt that although this is not a matter of urgency at the moment, it might at any time be serious and the procedure which is visualized in the resolution will take considerable time. A part from that I am afraid the resolution has been moved and seconded and if you want to make an amendment....

Mr. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): That is how I proposed it. If you want to go on, I think it that way.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Anderson, may I take it that your proposal is that the question of the use of helicopters and other aircraft should be kept under observation and that no action should be taken at the moment? Is that your wish? Is there a seconder to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a seconder to this amendment?

The SECRETARY: If there is no seconder, I will poll the original motion which was that the Commission should make a recommendation under Article VI of the Convention that the control of helicopters and other aircraft for the killing of whales should be brought within the scope of the Convention and that the necessary approach should be made to that end by the Depository Government.

I will poll the Commission. Those in favor say "aye."

AUSTRALIA: Yes.
BRAZIL: Abstain.
CANADA: Yes.
DENMARK: Abstain.
FRANCE: Yes.
ICELAND: (Not present)

JAPAN:

JAPAN: Yes.
MEXICO: Abstain.
NETHERLANDS: Yes.
NEW ZEALAND: Yes.
NORWAY: Yes.
PANAMA: Abstain
SOUTH AFRICA: Yes.
SWEDEN: Abstain.
U.S.S.R: Abstain.
U.K: Yes.
U.S.A: Yes.

Then in favor, no one against and six abstentions.

Gentlemen, the Chairman wishes that the present position be made clear. We have now gone through the agenda for the second time and we have really cleared everything, except the item which comes on the last plenary, that is "Date and Place of Next Meeting", and except item 12, which sets out the amendments of the schedule which have been suggested from various sources, the majority of them, of course, having emerged from the Scientific Sub-committee's report which is now incorporated in the report of the Scientific Committee.

As the Chairman sees it, at the final plenary tomorrow which may last all day, we have got to deal with the proposed amendments to the schedule and it will be for the Scientific Committee to take charge of a number of those and in fact to present the case for them. I hope I may, however, be assisting the Commission if I circulate tomorrow a revised statement of the amendments so that you can see whenever each one emanates. I will try to make it clear, because some of the amendments, for instance the first amendment on the paper with which I need not burden you, really gives effect to three of the proposals of the Scientific Committee and I am circulating this paper so that as each amendment comes up you will see who recommended it and why it is recommended. That is all the remaining business of the Commission apart from the "Date and Place of Next Meeting" and the Chairman wishes you to take note. That seems to be the remaining and arduous duty of the Commission for tomorrow.

The Chairman

The Chairman suggests 10 o'clock; 10 o'clock punctually.

The CHAIRMAN: We will begin the plenary session tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock and it is necessary that all of us be here on time because we have a full day.

This session can now stand adjourned.

R.N. Mackintosh
1115

SIXTH MEETING DOCUMENT XIV (D).

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

SIXTH MEETING, THIRD PLENARY

FRIDAY, 23RD JULY, 1954.

In the Chair, Dr. R. Kellogg (U.S.A.).

The CHAIRMAN: Will the Commission please come to order? The Secretary has an announcement to make.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, two or three small points in the first place. I am sure you will be very glad to hear that Brazil has now formally indicated in writing their assent to the re-arranged schedule. Now I want to remind you that round the table are laid the following documents - there are two new sheets to Document XIV(A) which is the report of the First Plenary. Some of the names were omitted when Commissioners got up and announced their names. Then there is Document XVIII, which is a short note, which I hope will help you when we consider the amendments to the schedule in Item 12 of the Agenda. There is also Document XIV(B) which is the verbatim report of the Second Plenary session. That I have already gone through and have made a good many minor corrections. If I may ask you to notify either myself or, personally, Mr. Mori, of any corrections you want, they will ultimately be reissued in respect of the whole verbatim report in the form of an erratum slip. But I hope you will not find many corrections in Document XIV (B). Then, finally, there are two papers circulated, you will recognise them from those two which have not got a conference number on them because they were already copied when they were handed to me late last night by the Japanese representative, and they represent two alternatives to the Japanese amendment which is the last one in Item 12. The Japanese amendment in Item 12 is No.12(J) and I will leave the Japanese representative to speak to them two alternatives when he comes to move the Japanese amendment. And now, Mr. Chairman, those are the only formal secretarial announcements I have to make but may I just go a step further and remind you that when we were considering the report of the Technical Committee, we did not deal, I am afraid para. 7 in which the attention was drawn by the Technical Committee to the question which had been raised with Mr. Clark, the Chairman, with regard to the position of a refrigerated ship which collected whale meat from a factory ship and subsequently treated it for a human or animal consumption. This is a small point as far as the Commission is concerned, but I would call your attention to the words at the bottom of page three of the Technical Committee's report which says that "with a view to clearing up this doubt, the Committee recommend that the Commission through the secretary should obtain a legal opinion as to the application of Article 2 of the Convention and para. 11 of the Schedule to a refrigerated ship collecting whale meat for subsequent treatment for human or animal consumption". Now that is a very simple point but I think, Mr. Chairman, we should have to poll the Commission on it subject to any remarks Mr. Clark, as chairman of the committee, may have to make.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clark.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, the suggestion, I think, is pretty clearly outlined in the Technical Committee's report and if it requires a motion, I would so move that the Commission, through the Secretary, obtain a legal opinion as to the application of Article 2 of the Convention and para. 11 of the Schedule with respect to the use of a refrigerated ship for collecting whale meat for subsequent treatment for human or animal consumption.

The SECRETARY:

The SECRETARY: Is there a seconder to that, Mr. Clark's move? ~~Secndier~~ is Mr. Terry (U.S.A.). May I poll the Commission, and it is suggested that we should now adopt the procedure of reversing the method of polling.

U.S.A.: Yes
U.K.: Yes
U.S.S.R.: Yes
SWEDEN: Abstain
SOUTH AFRICA: Yes
PANAMA: Abstain
NORWAY: Yes
NEW ZEALAND: Yes
NETHERLANDS: Yes
MEXICO: Not present
JAPAN: Yes
ICELAND: Not present
FRANCE: Abstain
DENMARK: Not voting
CANADA: Yes
BRAZIL: Abstain
AUSTRALIA: Yes

The SECRETARY: There are 10 voting in favour, 4 abstentions, and one not voting - Iceland & Mexico absent. That is carried. Mr. Chairman, the only other point I want to call attention to is that I am assuming that you will now proceed to Item 12 of the agenda which is the moving of the various amendments in the Schedule, 90% of the report of the Scientific Committee deals with the amendments to the Schedule for which I am assuming they will make themselves responsible. But may I remind you that there is a para. 20 of the report of the Scientific Committee which perhaps I may read: "The Committee recommend that a Scientific Subcommittee consisting of representatives of Australia, France, the Netherlands, Japan, Norway, U.S.S.R., and U.K., should meet at a convenient time before the next meeting of the Commission. It is suggested that the meeting should be convened by Dr. Mackintosh."

Now the only comment I have to make on that, before it is put to the Commission is in the report of the Technical Committee. There is a suggestion that such a committee should also include technical representatives, and I think therefore that that matter, the paragraph of the Technical Committee's report is No. 10, should be dealt with before we poll the Commission as to the setting up of this committee, you see the committee is to consist of representatives from certain specified countries. I daresay Mr. Clark has something to say on this.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, the purpose of No. 10 in the Technical Committee's report was not particularly recommended on the Scientific Committee as such, but the Technical people should be on that committee when they are dealing with the question of trying to determine separate limits of the catches of individual species. We are very strongly of the opinion that it is necessary to have a commissioner on such a committee when they are dealing with that particular phase in their deliberations.

Mr. Chairman,

Mr. Chairman, if I may then, on half of the Technical Committee, submit to the Commission for its consideration that the country to be represented on the Scientific Committee for this particular purpose on the technical aspect of it, should be Norway.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, it is suggested now that the subcommittee proposed in Para. 20 of the Report of the Scientific Committee should be submitted to the Commission with the addition of Norway to cover the points that a technical man is required. Actually there will be no alteration, but it will be understood that Norway will appoint another member to be present where it is necessary to deal with the technical aspects but it will not affect the wording of the resolution which perhaps I am now put to the Commission. Will you each say yes or no to the setting up of this committee with that modification.

U.S.A.: Yes
U.K.: Yes
U.S.S.R.: Yes
SWEDEN: Yes
SOUTH AFRICA: Yes
PANAMA: Yes
NORWAY: Yes
NEW ZEALAND: ?
NETHERLANDS: Yes
MEXICO: Not present
JAPAN: Yes
ICELAND: Not present
FRANCE: Yes
DENMARK: Not voting
CANADA: Yes
BRAZIL: Yes
AUSTRALIA: Yes

The SECRETARY: That is unanimous. Mr. Chairman, I have no more remarks, and as far as I am concerned, I think you may wish now to turn to Item 12 of the Agenda.

The CHAIRMAN: We will read now a resolution for the whole amendment 12(A), which will involve. For the insertion of a new paragraph, 4(1) and not 4 as indicated in the Agenda.

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman: I am afraid that I have to speak again on this subject. I have already made my position clear on previous occasion but, for the sake of recording, I will make a brief statement on behalf of the Japanese delegation on this question. First of all, we do not deny, as already stated before, the fact that there is a general tendency of depletion both in the Pacific and in the Atlantic, but some difference can be traced in the trend of depletion between the two oceans. Judging from the figures of the catch of blue whales, we consider that the decline of blue whale stocks in the Pacific is not so steady as in the Atlantic. In the North Pacific and in the Behring Sea, our recent expedition has found out that the stock of blue whales there has not so much decreased as generally believed.

Then

Then coming to the question of maturity of animals, we have found out that the average body length of blue whales is about 72 feet for male and 74 feet for female which is a two or three feet shorter compared with that in the Southern Hemisphere, but the present size limit of blue whales is usually 70 feet, both in the Southern Hemisphere and the Northern Hemisphere. Therefore, the stocks in the Northern Hemisphere are better protected than in the Southern Hemisphere but this fact can be endorsed by the comparison of the results of catchers in the Antarctic and in the North Pacific. In the Antarctic, I understand, nearly 40% of the blue whales caught are immature while in the Northern Pacific, less than 5% are immature. Therefore, we can safely say that immature blue whales are protected nearly to the fullest extent in the Pacific. Further, it must be pointed out that we are now carrying out an extensive biological investigation about whale stocks not only in adjacent seas off but in the North Pacific as well, together with whale marking in these areas. We expect, therefore, to be able to collect necessary data before long and to consider the best possible method of conserving blue whales in due course. That is, why we are against the total prohibition of the catch of blue whales in the Northern Hemisphere. However, if you desire to take some provisional method of protection for blue whales, it should not be so drastic as proposed in this Agenda. I am now suggesting, if it is necessary to have provisional measures, to adopt 70 feet size limit for blue whales in the Northern Hemisphere regardless of whether the meat of blue whales caught is to be used for local consumption as human or animal food. That is to strike out the provision for 65 feet size limit for blue whales, the middle of which is meant for local consumption. We feel that this, for the time being, will be sufficient for provisionally protecting blue whales before our final decision is taken because when this proposal is accepted and strictly enforced, the catch of blue whales will be reduced as much as less than 1000 of the present catch in the area outside of the Antarctic, but as we do not know exactly how the situation is in other areas, we may of course change our idea, not insisting on 70 feet size limit but total prohibition in other areas but not in the Pacific. Then, commenting on the technical side of this amendment for lowering the size limit of blue whales, some of you might say that this proposal is not a modification of the original proposal, Item 12(a), of the Agenda but it constitutes a fresh proposal of the amendment prior to a meeting of the Commission, but I cannot agree with such views. The subject is already covered by the item I may mention now in the Agenda. It simply means a modification of the original proposal, substituting for the total prohibition of catching blue whales the enforcement of a lower size limit. For instance, last year, the total limited catches in the Antarctic was to be reduced to 15,000 blue whale units in the original proposal, but we have approved 15,500 blue whale units and that was enforced as a valid amendment to this Schedule. I do not see any difference aspects of the amendment and my present proposal. However, if the majority of opinion is against my proposal and my legal interpretation, I do not intend to insist on my proposal but I am afraid I have to refrain from voting on this matter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kodaki.

The SECRETARY: The Chairman would like to proposer and seconder in the first instance for the whole of the amendment under 12(a). We have not had the amendment yet proposed. We must wait until somebody moves the adoption of 12(a). We would have to ask Mr. Kodaki if he wishes to move the amendment.

Mr. A. KODAKI

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that most of the Commissioners do not seem to agree with me in this matter. I shall not propose an amendment formally. I simply express the views of the delegation.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, we can get a vote on it.

The SECRETARY: Let us take the vote on the whole amendment subject to inserting the following as a new amendment.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): I believe that the situation is a little bit doubtful at this moment. Not only do we want someone to move this amendment 12 (A) but we wish to open a discussion on it?

The CHAIRMAN: What we need is the discussion but order after someone has moved the resolution and second and, following the parliamentary procedure. The resolution should be moved, it is not up for discussion yet, and no one has seconded.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): If you are ready for action, I would like to move to save time.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded, the resolution covering amendment of 12(A) is now subject to vote.

The SECRETARY: The Chairman wishes me to read the amendment before it is submitted to the Commission. The amendment reads: "Insert the following as a new para. 4(1), re-numbering the existing para. 4 as 4(2)."

"4(1) - It is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales and humpback whales in the foreign areas:

(a) in the Northern Hemisphere.

(b) In the waters south of 40 degrees south longitude between north degrees longitude and 70 degrees".

"It is forbidden to kill outside the Antarctic."

That is the amendment on the order paper, the only alternation being in the light of the Scientific Committee's report that in (b) 50° becomes 40°.

The CHAIRMAN: The resolution is now open for discussion by the Commissioners before we take a vote.

Mr. ROR WALL (U.K.): May I ask, Sir, are we dealing with (a) and (b) together then, because they are quite different matters.

The SECRETARY: The amendment I have just read to you covers four scientific recommendations put together. It applies to the same article of the Schedule but it is dealing with 4 different matters.

Mr. ROR WALL (U.K.): In my country, the view may be different on these four matters and I cannot possibly vote on all four together.

The CHAIRMAN:

The CHAIRMAN: Then you vote separately.

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): I vote that we do move (a) first. That is 4(1) (a).

The SECRETARY: May I poll on that proposal to the Commission before it is put up for resolution?

Mr. R.G.R. WALL: May I just ask one question? Was Mr. Kodaki talking to you about blue whales or humpback whales?

The CHAIRMAN: He was talking about blue whales, if I understand his statement.

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Because (a) includes blue whales and humpback whales.

Mr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, I simply spoke on the subject of blue whales, total catch, total prohibition.

The CHAIRMAN: In order that we may proceed more expeditiously, I will ask if Dr. Lienesch will withdraw his motion and Professor RUMD his second.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): I will withdraw.

Prof. J.T. RUMD (Norway): I withdraw as seconder.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, it is now necessary to take this amendment in several operations as I understand Mr. Wall suggested to break it down. If we break it down, we have got to meet the point by Mr. Wall, and the first resolution would be, "it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales in the Northern Hemisphere"; then when we have done with that, "it is forbidden to kill in the waters south of 40 degrees; then when we have done with that, "it is forbidden to kill in the waters of the South Atlantic. Those three will be taken separately. Then we take the same three in respect of humpbacks.

Mr. J.M. MARCHAND (SOUTH AFRICA): Not the last one.

The SECRETARY: That is correct, thank you, Dr. Marchand. If this is agreeable, we want a proposer and seconder for it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales in the Northern Hemisphere.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (NETHERLANDS): Can I move an amendment to that?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): That we take the two areas North Pacific and the North Atlantic separately.

The CHAIRMAN:

The CHAIRMAN: That we vote separately in the two areas, the North Atlantic and the North Pacific. Dr. Lienesch, is there a second?

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): I will second, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Dr. Lienesch and seconded by Mr. Wall that we vote separately for The North Atlantic and The North Pacific.

Mr. J. T. RUUD (Norway): Then we vote separately?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, we must have a move to vote separately.

Mr. J. T. RUUD (Norway): I will move.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a seconder to Dr. Ruud?

Mr. A. KODAKI: I will second.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): I meant we are to cast two different votes, one for the North Atlantic and the other the North Pacific.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Ruud would like to do these two separately. The Secretary will now read.

The SECRETARY: You are now asked to vote on the amendment; the proposition which I am asking the Commission to poll on as the amendment is that we should split the Northern Hemisphere into two areas, the North Atlantic and the North Pacific. Before we vote, I think, to this, we should ask the permission of the Commissioners to split the area for voting purposes. All those in favour of splitting the order between the North Atlantic and the North Pacific, before we take a voting on this, would they say yes or no?

U.S.A.: Yes

U.K.: Yes

U.S.S.R.: Abstain

SWEDEN: Abstain

SOUTH AFRICA: Yes

PANAMA: Yes

NORWAY: Yes

NEW ZEALAND: Yes

NETHERLANDS: Yes

MEXICO: Abstain

JAPAN: Yes

ICELAND: Not present

FRANCE: Abstain

DENMARK: Not voting

CANADA: Yes

BRASIL: Not present

AUSTRALIA: Yes

This

This is carried with four abstentions by ten votes. Now, gentlemen, the next poll is that it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales in the North Atlantic. I will poll the Commission.

U.S.A.: Yes
U.K.: Abstain
U.S.S.R.: Yes
SWEDEN: Abstain
SOUTH AFRICA: Abstain
PANAMA: Abstain
NORWAY: Yes
NEW ZEALAND: Abstain
NETHERLANDS: Yes
MEXICO: Abstain
JAPAN: Yes
ICELAND: Not present
FRANCE: Abstain
DENMARK: Not voting
CANADA: No, Mr. Chairman, but I should like to move an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: We will have one later when we get through the voting.

BRAZIL: Not present
AUSTRALIA: Yes.

The SECRETARY: That is carried by 6 in favour, one against and 7 abstentions. Therefore it is carried by a majority of votes that blue whales shall not be taken in the North Atlantic.

I shall now ask the Commission to say yes or not as to whether or not blue whales in the North Pacific shall be taken.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I desire to enter a very strong protest at this procedure. I wanted to move an amendment to the resolution that was just carried by this Commission but was not given the opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN: It should be done before the voting started.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): How can that be done before the voting started when you polled the delegates? That was the only opportunity I had and so far as Canada is concerned, we completely disagree with this procedure. All I can say at this stage of the game is that Canada will protest.

The CHAIRMAN: You are technically right. We can wash this voting out and go back to the amendment again.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, technically we have made a mistake as Mr. Clark pointed out. We passed by a majority of votes that the area, Northern Hemisphere, should be split into two, the North Atlantic and the North Pacific, but before putting up this specific resolution, we should have asked for a proposer and seconder, and we did not do so, Mr. Clark was this denied his right to move the amendment. I think, under the circumstances, the Chairman wishes to regard the poll we have just taken as void and we now ask for a proper proposer and seconder to the North Atlantic.

Dr. J.T. RUUD (Norway): I move that the North Atlantic is closed to the killing of blue whales.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): I second.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): In that case, since you have washed it all up and started all over again, I should like to move an amendment insofar as the proposal of total prohibition to the taking of blue whales in the North Atlantic. I am not convinced by the explanations of the scientists regarding the necessity for prohibiting blue whales by the very arguments they have put forward in documents, from the scientific sub-committee meetings, and subsequently since we have been here at these conferences this week. So far, on the east side or the west side, so far as we are concerned, there has been no whaling for about three years. The whales there have had a rest. As to what is happening in the North Atlantic I am prepared to accept the information of the scientists, but I am not convinced that there be a total prohibition in the North Atlantic and my amendment is along these lines. While Canada is not convinced of the information by scientists, we are concerned, nevertheless, and we cannot totally disregard the warnings which they have given and in connection with the prohibition of the taking of blue whales in the North Atlantic. I propose to say that Canada would agree to it but that there will be a prohibition for 5 years.

The CHAIRMAN: Second?

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

Dr. J.T. RUUD (Norway): Can I second that proposal?

The CHAIRMAN: No, it has already been seconded by Mr. Anderson of Australia.

The SECRETARY: It has been moved and seconded that the blue whales shall not be taken in the North Atlantic. To that there has been an amendment moved by Mr. Clark and seconded by Mr. Anderson that it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales in the North Atlantic for a period of five years. May I put that amendment to the Commission, prohibition of blue whales in the Northern Hemisphere of the North Atlantic for a period of five years.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): When does the five years start?

The SECRETARY: I think, Dr. Lienesch, if I may venture an opinion, the five years would run from the date after 90 days deposit when the amendment becomes effective. I think that should be understood without trying to write it in.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): That would be October sometime.

The SECRETARY: Five years starting from, say, October 30th. We do not want to write it in because there may be a delay.

U.S.A.:	Yes
U.K.:	Abstain
U.S.S.R.:	Yes
SWEDEN:	Abstain
SOUTH AFRICA:	Yes
PANAMA:	Yes
NORWAY:	Yes
NEW ZEALAND:	Yes
NETHERLANDS:	Abstain
MEXICO:	Abstain
JAPAN:	Yes
ICELAND:	Not present
FRANCE:	Abstain
DENMARK:	Not voting
CANADA:	Yes
BRAZIL:	Not present
AUSTRALIA:	Yes

That is carried by 9 votes in favour and 5 abstentions. Now, gentlemen, we must not forget we want a proposer and seconder for the second leg to this amendment. It is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales in the North Pacific. Is there a proposer and seconder to that resolution?

Dr. J.T. RUUD (Norway): Mr. Chairman, I propose the resolution.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): I would like to second.

The SECRETARY: This is moved by Dr. Ruud and seconded by Dr. Lienesch. Are there any amendments? I hear no amendments, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I find this most difficult to understand so far as the proposal to totally prohibit the taking of blue whales in the North Pacific. So far as Canada is concerned, I think I have attempted to make quite clear to this Commission in times past our position that we believe in conservation of fish stocks generally and of course whales.

So far

So far as Canada is concerned and our land station in the North Pacific, we are making full utilization of the whales which are being taken. I think in other parts of the world, not necessarily land stations but certainly in the Antarctic, as far as I can understand, there is not full utilization. Canada, in addition, is managing its fisheries and has done so for many years by regulations and by scientific investigations. Two years ago in London, Mr. Chairman, I brought this very subject up. We were concerned then, even with the very meagre information we had at that time, about stocks, generally, of whales in the North Pacific. You will recall at that time, Mr. Chairman, it was said there was no scientific information available. I find it most difficult to understand that two years later, the biologists say that there must be immediate action taken in the North Pacific. Generally Canada is prepared to follow the advice of biologists in fisheries matters, but in this case it is impossible for me to understand why this sudden reversal and the sudden necessity that immediate action should be taken. That is why I must disagree with the proposal to totally prohibit the taking of whales, and I should like to move an amendment to the proposal i.e. that a line be drawn in the North Pacific east of which pelagic whaling with net be permitted, and if that is agreed to, Canada will on the eastern side of that line, prohibit the taking of blue whales for a period of five years or 8 years or 10 years.

The CHAIRMAN: Can you give us the line? International dateline or what?

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Taking of whales east of that line refers to the fact that factory ships or killer boats will not be allowed to operate east of that line.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Clark has moved an amendment to the closure of the North Pacific in the following terms.

As I understand he does not apply his amendment only to the killing of blue whales but his amendment is that the pelagic whaling should be prohibited for five years, that a line should be drawn in the North Pacific following generally the International Dateline, and east of that line, it would be forbidden to.....

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): No, Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to put it like this. It is be forbidden to use a whale catcher attached to a factory ship for the purpose of killing or attempting to kill blue whales in that area, in other moves the use of a factory ship or catcher attached to a factory ship in the area east of that line would be prohibited.

The SECRETARY: Are you prepared to apply that to blue whales?

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Blue whales only. That is what we are dealing with at the moment.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, it has been moved by Dr. Ruud and seconded by Dr. Lienesch that the killing of blue whales in the North Pacific shall be prohibited. To that an amendment has been moved by Mr. Clark. Is there a seconder to that amendment?

Mr. Clark proposes and Mr. Anderson seconds.

The CHAIRMAN:

The CHAIRMAN: I have just been informed that coffee is ready, suppose we take a coffee break and by that time, we should be able to settle this question.

(Adjourned temporarily at 11.30 p.m.).

The CHAIRMAN: Will the Commission please come to order. The Secretary will now read the resolutions:

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, it has been moved by Dr. Rund and seconded by Dr. Lienesch that it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales in the North Pacific. To that an amendment has been moved by Mr. Clark and seconded by Mr. Anderson which now reads as follows: "It is forbidden to use any whale catcher attached to a factory ship or to a land station for the purpose of killing or attempting to kill blue whales in the North Pacific east of the International Dateline for a period of five years." It will be understood in putting this resolution to the Commission that we shall have in brackets after "International Dateline" to spell out that line in terms of latitude and longitude, and that was done two years ago, and I am trying to look up Mr. Clark's definition. We can't get it in time to put it in this resolution. For that matter it will be put in brackets. I will read the amendment again:

"It is forbidden to use any whale catcher attached to a factory ship or to a land station for the purpose of killing or attempting to kill blue whales in the North Pacific east of the International Dateline for a period of five years." That has been moved and seconded.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections by any Commissioner?

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, if the prohibition of catches of blue whales both by catchers belonging to the land station and catchers attached to factory ships, it will not be necessary to say about catchers. We can go ahead in the same way as we did up to now. We can say it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales in such and such area. Don't you agree, Mr. Clark?

The SECRETARY: Mr. Kodaki, I think you are perfectly right in suggesting that the wording of this could follow exactly the wording of the previous one that simply it is forbidden to kill blue whales. But I understand Mr. Clark prefers this wording and that is why I put the amendment in his terms.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, is it necessary to say that "catchers attached to factory ships or to land stations", etc.? It is only a matter of wording.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I might point out to Mr. Kodaki, Mr. Chairman, that the wording that is used as read by Mr. Dobson is really following the wording of the present Schedule, and there is no question about what is meant.

CAPT. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Captain Solyanik.

CAPT. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Mr. Chairman, you agree to spell out International Dateline but in principle there is no foundation from the whaling point of view.

The CHAIRMAN:

The CHAIRMAN: Any further comments? If not, the Secretary will put the resolution to a vote.

The SECRETARY: Those in favor say "yes".

U.S.A.:	Yes
U.K.:	Yes
U.S.S.R.:	What resolution, Dr. Ruid's or Mr. Clark's?
The CHAIRMAN:	The amendment comes up first.
U.S.S.R.:	Abstain
SOUTH AFRICA:	Yes
PANAMA:	Abstain
NORWAY:	Yes
NEW ZEALAND:	Yes
NETHERLANDS:	Abstain
MEXICO:	Abstain

JAPAN: (Kodaki): Mr. Chairman, I think this is the only occasion that I can make comment on this subject. As we already stated two years ago, the International Dateline is an artificial and arbitrary line. Up to now we have only tried to base our decision upon some scientific ground and we do not see scientific basis for this International Dateline as proposed. We are waiting for further data to come in, so I must say "no" to this proposal.

The SECRETARY:	No or yes?
JAPAN:	No
ICELAND:	Not present
FRANCE:	Abstain
DENMARK:	Not voting
CANADA:	Yes
BRAZIL:	Not present
AUSTRALIA:	Yes

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, that resolution is carried by 7 votes to 2. I just wanted to remind the Commission the delay that occurred just now was due to the fact that I was looking at the Rules of Procedure. We have to have a three-fourths majority of those casting an affirmative or negative vote. I just want to remind you of that because "abstentions" and "not voting" don't count. We have 7 votes to 2 out of a total of 9, so that is carried.

Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, that amendment having been carried it should, strictly speaking, according to the Rules, be put to the Commission as a substantive vote. Otherwise it might be queried.

U.S.A.: Yes

U.K. Yes

U.S.S.R.:

The SECRETARY: We are putting it as a substantive motion in order to keep it in the rules.

U.S.S.R.: No

SWEDEN: Abstain

SOUTH AFRICA: Yes

PANAMA: Abstain

NORWAY: Yes

NEW ZEALAND: Yes

NETHERLANDS: Abstain

MEXICO: Abstain

JAPAN: No

ICELAND: Not present

FRANCE: Abstain

DENMARK: Not voting

CANADA: Yes

BRAZIL: Not present

AUSTRALIA: Yes

The SECRETARY: That is carried the same as above by 7 votes to 2. Mr. Chairman, if you are going to pass on to the next item of 12 (A), the resolution which requires a proposer and a seconder, is that "it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales in the waters south of 40° South Latitude between 0° Longitude and 70° West Longitude.

DR. J.T. RUUD (Norway) We are taking humpback whales in a similar way now?

The SECRETARY: We are taking blue whales first.

The CHAIRMAN: We are taking blue whales now and then humpback whales. We are waiting for someone to move this.

The SECRETARY:

The SECRETARY: Blue whales in the Area as stated under 4(b).

MR. J.T. RUUD (Norway): I move that it be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Moved by Dr. Ruud and seconded by Dr. Liensch. Does any Commissioner wish to comment now on this resolution before the Secretary polls the delegations?

The SECRETARY: There being no comments I will poll the Commission on the resolution, "it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales in the waters south of 40° South Latitude between 0° Longitude and 70° West Longitude." That is 12(A) (b) in the Agenda.

U.S.A.: Yes

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): May I just explain very briefly now that we are not against protection of blue whales in the Antarctic, but do not consider that this is the best means of achieving that object, bearing all considerations in mind, including the needs of the industry as well as scientific considerations.

U.K.:	No
U.S.S.R.:	Yes
SWEDEN:	Abstain
SOUTH AFRICA:	Abstain
PANAMA:	No
NORWAY:	Yes
NEW ZEALAND:	Abstain
NETHERLANDS:	No
MEXICO:	Abstain
JAPAN:	Abstain
ICELAND:	Not present
FRANCE:	No
DENMARK:	Not voting
CANADA:	Abstain
BRAZIL:	Not present
AUSTRALIA:	Abstain

The SECRETARY: That is a substantive motion. It has attracted 3 ye's and 4 no's. I declare that motion is not carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Lost

The SECRETARY:

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the next matter on the paper is, "It is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales in the waters of the South Atlantic outside the Antarctic." That is as it is written on the order paper. Is there a proposer of that resolution?

The CHAIRMAN: Since there is no proposer, it drops to the ground apparently.

The SECRETARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, we now go back to these two resolutions in terms of humpbacks and the resolution I put to you is: "it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill humpback whales in the Northern Hemisphere." That is as it is in the order paper, but we are taking it separately in respect of humpbacks.

DR. J.T. RUUD (Norway): Mr. Chairman, I think the motion I made sometime ago which was adopted by the Commission was that we should treat each species in each area separately, so as far as I understand it we should consider humpbacks in the North Atlantic and in the North Pacific separately.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, Dr. Ruud points out that we did agree by a vote to split the Northern Hemisphere into two areas, and I think that may be taken as applying both to blue whales and humpbacks. Then it comes to this. The resolution is: "it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill humpback whales in the North Atlantic." Could we have a proposer and seconder to that resolution?

DR. J.T. RUUD

DR. J.T. RUUD (Norway): I move.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a second?

CAPT. A.M. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): I second it.

The CHAIRMAN: Captain Solyanik seconds it.

MR. G.R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make an amendment to that resolution. Prohibition in the North Atlantic on humpback whales for a period of five years.

MR. F.F. ANDERSON: I second it.

The SECRETARY: Amendment for five years by Mr. Clark and seconded by Mr. Anderson. If there are no comments, Mr. Chairman, may I put the amendment which is, "it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill humpback whales in the North Atlantic for a period of five years." I will poll the Commission.

U.S.A.:	Yes
U.K.:	Abstain
U.S.S.R.:	Yes
SWEDEN:	Abstain
SOUTH AFRICA:	Yes
PANAMA:	Yes
NORWAY:	Yes
NEW ZEALAND:	Yes
NETHERLANDS:	Abstain
MEXICO:	Abstain
JAPAN:	Abstain
ICELAND:	Not present
FRANCE:	Abstain
DENMARK:	Not voting.
CANADA:	Yes
BRAZIL:	Not present
AUSTRALIA:	Yes

The SECRETARY: That amendment is carried by 8 and that is all the people voting. That is carried. Now I must put that as a substantive resolution.

U.S.A.

U.S.A.:	Yes
U.K.:	Abstain
U.S.S.R.:	Yes
SWEDEN:	Abstain
SOUTH AFRICA:	Yes
PANAMA:	Yes
NORWAY:	Yes
NEW ZEALAND:	Yes
NETHERLANDS:	Abstain
MEXICO:	Abstain
JAPAN:	Abstain
ICELAND:	Not present
FRANCE:	Abstain
DENMARK:	Not voting
CANADA:	Yes
BRAZIL:	Not present
AUSTRALIA:	Yes

The SECRETARY: That is carried by the same number of votes. Now, Mr. Chairman, we pass to the second leg of the humpback problem. "It is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill humpback whales in the North Pacific." Is there a proposer?

DR. J.T. RUUD (Norway): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption.

The CHAIRMAN: Professor Ruud moves. Is there a second?

MR. W.M. TERRY (U.S.A.): I second it.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Terry of the U.S.A. seconds it. Is there an amendment?

MR. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I should like to move an amendment to that resolution. Canada cannot accept the total prohibition insofar as humpback whales are concerned in the North Pacific, and I propose the following amendment: "It is forbidden to use any whale catcher attached to a factory ship for the purpose of killing or attempting to kill humpback whales in the North Pacific Ocean and its dependent waters between 20° N. Latitude and 66° N. Latitude Eastward to a line running South from 66° N. Latitude along the meridian 168° 58' 22.69" West Longitude to 65° 15' N. Latitude; thence Southwest-ward along a great

circle

circle course to the intersection of 51° N. Latitude and 167° E. Longitude; thence Southeast-ward along a great circle course to the intersection of 48° N. Latitude and 180° Longitude; thence South along the meridian 180° Longitude to 20° N. Latitude; that for land stations East of the above line the minimum size limit for humpback whales be increased to 40 feet, which will, therefore, give some adequate protection.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Clark, could you give us your beginning? Is it "it is forbidden to use any whale catcher?"

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

CAPT. A.M. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Mr. Chairman, I have a question for Mr. Clark. Why can't we leave this question to the Scientific Committee who can study this proposal? I don't understand the position of Mr. Clark. He is chairman of our committee.

MR. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the U.S.S.R. Commissioner that we were only dealing in the Technical Committee with the matters which were placed before us. The question of whether an amendment is moved during a plenary session of this Commission is quite in order.

CAPT. A.M. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Mr. Chairman, the size limit is not dealt with in the agenda.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, it has been moved by Dr. Ruud and seconded by Mr. Terry that it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill humpback whales in the North Pacific. To that an amendment has been moved by Mr. Clark in the following terms, seconded by Mr. Anderson:

"It is forbidden to use any whale catcher attached to a factory ship for the purpose of killing or attempting to kill humpback whales in the waters of the Pacific Ocean and its dependent waters between 20° N. Latitude and 66° N. Latitude Eastward to a line running South from 66° N. Latitude along the meridian 168° 58' 22.69" West Longitude to 65° 15' N. Latitude; thence Southwest-ward along a great circle course to the intersection of 51° N. Latitude and 167° E. Longitude; thence Southeast-ward along a great circle course to the intersection of 48° N. Latitude and 180° Longitude; thence South along the meridian 180° Longitude to 20° N. Latitude; that for land stations East of the above line the minimum size limit for humpback whales be increased to 40 feet."

MR. G.R. CLARK(Canada): Mr. Chairman, that was not a resolution. There are three words at the very start which I did not put in my resolution. Will you read it?

The SECRETARY: "It is forbidden to use any whale catcher..."

MR. G.R. CLARK (Canada): That's right. Thank you.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I may mention that this description is the description which will go into the resolution which we now have been able to get from last year's proceedings, that is, the International date line.

The CHAIRMAN: Captain Solyanik, did you have a comment to make?

CAPT. A.M. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): In principle I am against the proposal which Mr. Clark put out, which was supposed to have been discussed in the Technical Committee and the Scientific Committee. Being the Chairman of the Technical Committee, he should have raised this question before and not now.

The CHAIRMAN: Does Captain Solyanik wish to move the deletion of 40 feet as an amendment?

CAPT. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): In principle, in the whole. In everything, the whole question.

The CHAIRMAN: I don't get it.

CAPT. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): The whole amendment which Mr. Clark put out just now. I am against that.

DR. A. KODAKI (Japan): I think, Mr. Chairman, what he says is that they are against it as a whole so they would not enter into details like the size limit.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I have read the amendment which has been proposed by Mr. Clark and seconded by Mr. Anderson. Captain Solyanik points out, and I think it is a matter for the Commission to decide in its own way, whether that portion of the amendment which relates to an increase in the minimum size limit ought to be properly dealt with in this resolution because in fact it is another matter and has not had 60 days' notice. Subject to that, Mr. Chairman, may I put the resolution?

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Before you do so, it would be very difficult to follow it from this wording, the purpose of this resolution. I am not sure which area of the Pacific it applies and I am not sure why the proposal for minimum size limit of 40 feet, why that particular figure has been introduced. Will it be possible just to have a short explanation for the reasons for the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clark, will you reply to Mr. Wall?

MR. G.R. CLARK (Canada): The purpose, Mr. Chairman, is quite simple. I think the Scientific Committee has told us that there is need for some protection for the humpback whales in the North Pacific. What Canada is proposing is not to go all the way with the recommendation of the Scientific Committee, but to go at least part of the way to give it added protection. If there is objection to the question raised by Capt. Solyanik about the increase in the length, it is quite all right for me to leave out of my resolution, subject to my seconder, of any reference to an increase in the minimum size length. That would just leave it at the present 35 feet. The reason for suggesting an increase in the length was to give a little additional protection to the stock of humpback whales.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to withdraw your second?

MR. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I agree to that.

The SECRETARY:

The SECRETARY: That means that the words "the land stations east of the above line the minimum size limit for humpback whales be increased to 40 feet" would come out. Therefore, the resolution simply reads: "It is forbidden to use any whale catcher attached to a factory ship... for the purpose of killing". In view of the omission of that we don't want to put "land stations" back there.

MR. G.R. CLARK (Canada): No.

The SECRETARY: All right.

CAPT. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.) I would like to know why Mr. Clark chose only this line, the eastern line? To the east? Why not close the whole area?

MR. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I have made the position of Canada quite clear in the past couple of years. As far as Canada is concerned, we consider that those countries interested in the Western half ~~must~~ do what they want. If they wish to follow suit we would be very happy to have them go along with us to exclude the operation of factory ships in the whole of the North Pacific.

CAPT. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Mr. Chairman, I propose to vote for Dr. Ruud's motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, you see, by parliamentary rules we must take up and dispose of the amendment first and then if that is defeated we go back to the original motion. The original motion is the whole Pacific. Then there was an amendment by Mr. Clark for the east part. Since it is an amendment we must take it first. If that is defeated then we go back to the original motion for a vote. Is it clear now?

The SECRETARY: I will poll the Commission now on Mr. Clark's amendment as seconded by Mr. Anderson:

U.S.A.:	No.
U.K.:	Abstain
U.S.S.R.:	No
SWEDEN:	Abstain
SOUTH AFRICA:	Yes
PANAMA:	Abstain
NORWAY:	Yes
NEW ZEALAND:	Yes
NETHERLANDS:	Abstain
MEXICO:	Abstain

JAPAN:

JAPAN: (Kodaki): Japan will abstain on the same ground as stated previously in respect of the total prohibition of catching blue whales in the North Pacific.

The SECRETARY: That is no.

JAPAN: I will abstain.

ICELAND: Not present.

FRANCE: Abstain.

DENMARK: Not voting.

BRAZIL: Not present

AUSTRALIA: Yes.

The SECRETARY: There are 5 in favor and there are 2 against. That makes a total voting either "yes" or "no" of 7 and that does not command a three-fourths majority so that that amendment falls to the ground, and I will not put Dr. Raud's original proposition as a substantive motion: "It is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill pumpback whales in the North Pacific."

U.S.A.:	Yes.
U.K.:	Abstain.
U.S.S.R.:	Yes.
SWEDEN:	Abstain.
SOUTH AFRICA:	Abstain.
PANAMA:	Abstain.
NORWAY:	Yes.
NEW ZEALAND:	Abstain.
NETHERLANDS:	Abstain.
MEXICO:	Not present.
JAPAN:	Abstain.
ICELAND:	Not present.
FRANCE:	Abstain.
DENMARK:	Not voting.
CANADA:	No.
BRAZIL:	Not present.
AUSTRALIA:	No.

The SECRETARY:

The SECRETARY: I declare that motion lost. There are 3 in favor and 2 against, so it is not a three-fourths majority.

Mr. Chairman, the next amendment to the Schedule applies to 12(A) in 4(1) (b). "It is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill humpback whales in the waters south of 40° South Latitude between 0° Longitude and 70° West Longitude." That is as it stands on the paper, with 50° altered to 40°. Is there a proposer to that?

Dr. J.T. RUUD (Norway): I move that the proposal is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Professor Ruud has proposed and Dr. Lienesch has seconded it.

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wall.

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): I would like to say that there are two particular connections to this proposal from the standpoint of the United Kingdom. First is that this proposal 12 to take humpbacks in what we call Area II of the Antarctic is not limited by time. And I would suggest if this proposal is to be put forward there should be, say, a five-year limit, in any case, that is as in the case of blue whales a little earlier. My second point which makes this particularly difficult is that I understand the humpbacks in this area are found at other times of the year in the South Atlantic where there appear to be three countries which fish for this stock of humpbacks. I think the countries are Brazil and France—I believe France is not operating at the moment—and Portugal, a country not being one of our members. I am afraid unless we have full assurance that humpbacks are going to be equally protected in the South Atlantic in the one period of the year we do not feel that there is real virtue in the proposal to prohibit their catching in the Antarctic.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further comments?

MR. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anderson.

MR. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I think without being a scientist I must say a word. We have a clear instance here of humpbacks being absolutely over-exploited in the past, particularly by the South Georgia stations, and there are practically no humpbacks left. This would mean that land stations down there would abstain taking humpbacks. In the year 1909-10 3,391 were caught. Next year 6,197, then, 4,247, then 1,916, and then decreasing gradually till the last '51 season recorded here there were 10. The previous year was 8. It wouldn't harm those stations. We know that the SALDANHA Bay is not working and also that Gekoon is out of commission. I think that excuse hardly bears any reputation at all. I think it is a big mistake not to support this.

The CHAIRMAN: May we have your attention, please.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, it has been moved by Professor Ruud and seconded by Dr. Lienesch that it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill humpback whales in the waters south of 40° South Latitude between

0° Longitude

0° Longitude and 70° West Longitude." If there are no further observations on that point and no amendments I will now poll the Commission for "yes" or "no".

U.S.A.:	Yes
U.K.:	No
U.S.S.R.:	Yes
SWEDEN:	Abstain
SOUTH AFRICA:	Abstain
PANAMA:	Abstain
NORWAY:	Yes
NEW ZEALAND:	Yes
NETHERLANDS:	Yes
MEXICO:	Not present
JAPAN:	Yes
ICELAND:	Not present
FRANCE:	No
DENMARK:	Not voting
CANADA:	Abstain
BRAZIL:	Not present
AUSTRALIA:	Yes

The SECRETARY: The results of that poll is 7 "yes" and 2 "no" out of 9 and that gives a majority of three-fourths and that is carried.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that disposes of

The CHAIRMAN: No, we must go back.

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): I wonder if you would tell me I should be in order if I move the supplementary resolution, the gist of which would be that the decision which the Commission has just taken to prohibit catching of humpback whales in this particular area should be limited to a period of five years.

The CHAIRMAN: If you so make that motion.

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): I would make that motion, if it is in order.

That

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a second?

MR. F. TOUSSAINT: (France): I second it.

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): I wonder, Sir, if I may just add that I have in mind that in two previous decisions relating to blues and humpbacks in the North Atlantic, the Commission has in fact--if I remember correctly--adopted a period of five years. And my purpose is to make a corresponding arrangement.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded. Are there any comments?

MR. R.R. ALEMAN (Panama): Will the Secretary please read the motion.

The SECRETARY: The motion is the motion that has just been carried. "It is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill humpback whales in the waters south of 40° South Latitude between 0° Longitude and 70° West Longitude." And it is proposed to add "for a period of five years" to bring it into line with the other one. May I poll the Commission on "for a period of five years" to be added to the last resolution.

U.S.A.: Yes.

U.K.: Yes.

U.S.S.R.: Yes.

SWEDEN: Abstain.

SOUTH AFRICA: Yes.

PANAMA: Yes.

NORWAY: Abstain.

NEW ZEALAND: Yes.

NETHERLANDS: Yes.

MEXICO: Not present.

JAPAN: Yes.

ICELAND: Not present.

FRANCE: Yes.

CANADA: Abstain.

BRAZIL: Not present.

AUSTRALIA: Yes.

That

That is carried by 10 votes and no negatives. Mr. Chairman, that disposes of 12(A) on Agenda because the last item in (A) does not apply to humpback whales. That, I suggest, disposes of the whole of 12(A), and we come to 12(B) and may I explain there are two amendments here with regard to Paragraph 6 of the Schedule. Mr. Chairman, paragraph 6, 12(B) on the agenda. Mr. Anderson?

MR. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): I wonder what happened to 4 1(b).

The SECRETARY: We have just taken it. It is only in respect of blue whales. If we pass to paragraph 6, the effect of paragraph 6 is to allow humpback whales to be taken on the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th of February. This amendment on the paper is merely a verbal one. If you don't pass it, the position is exactly as before. You delete the words "provided that in any pelagic whaling season for baleen whales the killing of humpback whales shall be permitted" and insert the word "except", and after February 4th you insert the words "in any year."

The CHAIRMAN: It is just improvement of the words.

The SECRETARY: I can't remember who suggested that. I think Mr. Wall did.

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): May I briefly explain this amendment by the United Kingdom. We had two points in mind. Firstly, we were really thinking in terms of the re-arranged schedule and we were wanting to get the wording in the rearranged schedule just exactly right. And the second point is that in the present wording there does appear the word "pelagic" and I think the context is not quite correct. We really mean the "Antarctic" because the limitation of humpbacks to four days of the year applies to Antarctic and not to pelagic whaling which will include the North Pacific. This is a purely drafting amendment as Mr. Chairman says, and that was our purpose in putting this down.

The CHAIRMAN: Would it be necessary to take a formal vote on this since it does not involve any substantive change, just merely a change in the words?

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, may I poll the Commission on this paragraph 6 of the preliminary amendment. Perhaps you will say "yes" or "no".

AUSTRALIA:	Yes.
BRAZIL:	Not present.
CANADA:	Yes.
DENMARK:	Not voting.
FRANCE:	Abstain.
ICELAND:	Not present.
JAPAN:	Yes.
MEXICO:	Abstain.

NETHERLANDS:

NETHERLANDS: Yes.
NEW ZEALAND: Yes.
NORWAY: Yes.
PANAMA: Yes.
SOUTH AFRICA: Yes.
SWEDEN: Abstain.
U.S.S.R.: Yes.
U.K.: Yes.
U.S.A.: Yes.

The SECRETARY: Carried with no dissensions.

The CHAIRMAN: I have been advised that the dinner is laid on the table downstairs and that we will now adjourn until 2:30.

(Adjourned until 2:30)

The CHAIRMAN: Will the Commission please come to order. The Secretary has an announcement to make.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I am asked to say a word about the Kabuki performances to which Mr. Kiyoe, the Director of the Fisheries Agency, has invited you to attend. The performances begin at 4:30 p.m. tomorrow afternoon. There will be served a buffet supper between 5:50 and 6:40 in the dining room on the third floor of the theatre. Those who wish to see the remaining plays after that which begins at 4:30 are quite welcome to return to their original seats. The performances are expected to end about 9:30. 4:30, the play, and the buffet supper between 5:50 and 6:40 in the dining room on the third floor.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission I want to remind the Commission that they have made a number of amendments to the Schedule under Item 12(A) in relation to paragraph 4 of the Schedule. I think that as we have now separated blue whales from humpback whales the amendments in respect of humpback whales ought more properly to appear in paragraph 6. I think Mr. Wall would like to say a word about this.

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): I should like to draw your attention, Sir, with reference to the Secretary's remark, to the next amendment we are to consider, which is 12 (C), inserting certain words at the end of paragraph 6 of the Schedule which deals with humpbacks. This next amendment appears to me to be precisely the same amendment as that which we have already carried in the Commission, and which appears under paragraph 4 of the Schedule so, first of all, I would imagine that this next amendment is redundant, but I do feel, as the Secretary is saying, that the amendment properly belongs to paragraph 6 rather than 4; amendments about humpbacks belong to 6 rather than 4, and if it is not too difficult an operation I suggest that we put those amendments into 6 in these appropriate place and keep them out of paragraph 4.

The CHAIRMAN: You would so move?

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): I would so move.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a second?

DR. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): Second.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Liensch has seconded it.

The SECRETARY: The Chairman suggests that he would like me to pool the Commission that when we come to set out the amendments for communication to Contracting Governments we should put the humpback proposals in their proper place, in paragraph 6, and not in paragraph 4. I will poll the Commission. Australia:

MR. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, let us know what we are going to vote on.

MR. F.F. ANDERSON (Australia): Is it the older schedule or the new one?

The

The SECRETARY: We are not talking about the re-arranged schedule. Paragraph 6 which deals with humpbacks.

The CHAIRMAN: They are in the wrong place because they were there tied in with the blue whales.

MR. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I will agree then, Sir.

The SECRETARY: I think there was the North Atlantic humpbacks and the North Pacific humpbacks and there was this other area. It is only a question of proper order in the Schedule. I am not asking anything more.

MR. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I just wanted to be sure what we were talking about.

AUSTRALIA:	Yes.
BRAZIL:	Not present.
CANADA:	Yes.
DENMARK:	Not voting.
FRANCE:	Yes.
ICELAND:	Not voting.
JAPAN:	Yes.
MEXICO:	Abstain.
NETHERLANDS:	Yes.
NEW ZEALAND:	Yes.
NORWAY:	Yes.
PANAMA:	Yes.
SOUTH AFRICA:	Yes.
SWEDEN:	Abstain.
U.S.S.R:	Yes.
U.K.:	Yes.
U.S.A.:	Yes.

The SECRETARY: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we now turn to the second page of the agenda, and we have 12 (C), amendment 12(C), in which certain words are to be added at the end of paragraph 6: "but not in any waters South of 40° South Latitude between 0° Longitude and 70° West Longitude." As Mr. Wall has remarked, and I had already come to the same conclusion, and I gather some of the other Commissioners have too, that is redundant in view of the amendment we have made in regard to humpbacks. 4(1) (b) on the previous page. This is redundant, perhaps would like to pass over that and go on to the next amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection?

MR. A. KODAKI (Japan): No objections.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the next amendment is 12 (D) and you will see it applies to paragraph 7 of the Schedule I think you must take with it 12 (E) and 12 (G). They all apply to paragraph 7 (A). As regards the first amendment 12 (D) this was a form of words which was submitted by the British Delegation. If those words are accepted, amendment 12(E), which is only a verbal alteration, falls to the ground, as it is not necessary. But with regard to 12 (G) I understand that there is going to be a proposal that the 2nd of January should be omitted and the date "7th of January" should be substituted. It is a simple amendment, namely, in paragraph 7 (A) for the "2nd of January" substitute it with "7th of January." If I have spoken rightly we would like a proposal to that end. It is the opening of the season.

DR. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, I move.

The CHAIRMAN: You move that the 7th January be substituted. Is there a second. Dr. Marchand has seconded it.

The SECRETARY: It has been proposed by Mr. Kodaki, seconded by Dr. Marchand that in paragraph 7 (a) "7th of January" should be substituted for "2nd of January." That is amendment 12 (G).

The CHAIRMAN: Does any Commissioner wish to comment on this motion?

DR. J.T. RUUD (Norway): Mr. Chairman, the third amendment as is now proposed reads then, "the 7th of January" and delete the proviso at the end, which means that you will delete the — last year's Schedule. I move an amendment which should read, "the 7th January to the 7th April provided that no blue whales are taken before the 21st of January in any year." So it will mean in the present Schedule you substitute 2nd January for 7th and 16th of January with the 21st. I move the amendment, Mr. Chairman, because it has always been the intention of the Scientific Committee that if we do not close area II in the Antarctic to blue whales we must at least give them the same degree of protection as we did last season, and we hope that is taken care of by allowing them this protection in the first weeks of the season.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a second to that?

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Before Mr. Chairman wants a second I wonder if Dr. Ruud would consider a purely drafting amendment in terms of 12(D) on this paper. In his proposed amendment, I think he has the wording, "No blue whales should be taken" whereas the language of the Schedule now uses the phrase "kill or attempt to kill" and that is the purpose of the wording on 12(D), to bring the language into general lines so that we do not get confused later. Would Professor Ruud be prepared to make that small change?

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might explain. If Amendment (D) is accepted for the 7th of January, I was going to ask you to deal with Paragraph 12 (D) and accept that amendment, but with the 16th of January altered to the 21st of January.

That

That covers Mr. Ruud's point. We want to take them together. But we don't want to have this wording in the Schedule as it is.

Dr. J.T. RUUD (Norway): Then that is all right with me. Only I want to tie together these two dates to be sure that they are carried. I do not like to risk it. You carry the 7th and you don't carry the 21st for blue whales.

DR. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, I should like to make comment on Item 12 (D) before we vote on Item 12 (G). Professor Ruud says that no such whale catchers be used for the purpose of killing or attempting to kill blue whales before the 21st January. I want to be quite sure whether Dr. Ruud means that on the 21st of January no blue whales should be caught or we can start operation on the 21st of January.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kodaki, just a moment. Could you delay your comments until we get a second on this motion?

DR. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, the reason why I raised this question at this moment is that Professor Ruud seems to make it conditional to accept 21st in order to carry this amendment (G). That is why I wanted to make this point clear before we vote on the 7th January.

The CHAIRMAN: Professor Ruud?

DR. J.T. RUUD (Norway): Shall I answer to that question, Mr. Chairman? Mr. Kodaki, I guess you are right to the 7th of January, but add 5 days to the 16 which brings you up to the 21st. You should be able to start on the 21st, at midnight as you did on the 16th last season.

DR. A. KODAKI (Japan): Thank you, Dr. Ruud.

The CHAIRMAN: You will agree? Is there a second to Dr. Ruud's amendment?

CAPT. A.N. SOLYANIK: (U.S.S.R.): I second it.

The SECRETARY: It has been proposed by Professor Ruud and seconded by Captain Solyanik that we deal first with paragraph 12 (D) and we take out the last proviso in paragraph 7 and substitute for it "no such whale catcher shall be used for the purpose of killing or attempting to kill blue whales before the 21st of January in any year." I have got to poll the Commission whether that amendment has to be taken first all by itself. That is all you are voting on now.

U.S.A.: Yes.

U.K.: I would like to abstain for the present.

U.S.S.R.: Yes.

SWEDEN: Abstain.

SOUTH AFRICA:

SOUTH AFRICA: Yes.
PANAMA: Yes.
NORWAY: Yes.
NEW ZEALAND: Yes.
NETHERLANDS: Yes.
MEXICO: Abstain.
JAPAN: I will abstain for the moment.
ICELAND: Not present.
FRANCE: Abstain
DENMARK: Not voting.
CANADA: Abstain.
BRAZIL: Abstain.
AUSTRALIA: Yes.

The SECRETARY: Take 12 (D) first. That has been carried. No "no's". Now, gentlemen, we can proceed. Dr. Ruud has moved an amendment to Dr. Kodaki's original proposition that we should adopt 12 (D) in the words in the paper viz. "no such whale catcher shall be used for the purpose of killing or attempting to kill blue whales before the 21st of January in any year." That has been moved by Dr. Ruud and seconded by Capt. Solyanik. We will take that and poll the Commission.

MR. R.R. ALEMAN (Panama): 21st or 23rd?

DR. A. KODAKI (Japan): 21st.

The SECRETARY:

U.S.A.: Yes.
U.K.: Yes.
U.S.S.R.: Yes.
SWEDEN: Abstain
SOUTH AFRICA: Yes.
PANAMA: Yes.
NORWAY: Yes.
NEW ZEALAND: Yes.

NETHERLANDS:

NETHERLANDS: Yes.
MEXICO: Not present.
JAPAN: Abstain.
ICELAND: Not present.
FRANCE: Yes.
DENMARK: Not voting.
CANADA: Yes.
BRAZIL: Abstain.
AUSTRALIA: Yes.

The SECRETARY: That is carried. That is 12 (D). Now, Gentlemen, we come back to Mr. Kodaki's proposition, seconded by Dr. Marehand, which stands in your order paper in 12 (G), paragraph 7. 2nd of January reads 7th of January. That has been proposed and seconded, and there are no amendments to that, I gather, so may I poll the Commission on that amendment? The 2nd of January becomes the 7th of January.

U.S.A.: Yes.
U.K.: Yes.
U.S.S.R.: Yes.
SWEDEN: Abstain
SOUTH AFRICA: Yes.
PANAMA: Yes.
NORWAY: Yes.
NEW ZEALAND: Yes.
NETHERLANDS: Yes.
MEXICO: Not present.
JAPAN: Yes.
ICELAND: Not present.
FRANCE: Yes.
DENMARK: Not voting.
CANADA: Yes.
BRAZIL: Abstain
AUSTRALIA: Yes.

The SECRETARY:

The SECRETARY: That is 12 (G) carried unanimously with 2 objections. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think it will be agreed that paragraph 12 (E), which is a very slight amendment, is not necessary because it is already covered in paragraph 12 (D), so I think we can pass on now, if that is agreed, to 12 (F), and that, I think, is the United Kingdom's suggestions. I am not quite sure.

Mr. E.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Mr. Chairman, I think that is so and it is a purely drafting amendment, the intention of which again is to make sure that we use the new language for the purposes of the re-arranged schedule.

The SECRETARY: This is 12 (F).

The CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to so move?

MR. E.G.R. WALL (U.K.): I would, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a second? Any comments by any other Commissioner?

The SECRETARY: May I read the amendment. This is 12 (F). Insert a new sub-paragraph 7 (b) as follows: "It is forbidden to use a whale catcher attached to a factory ship for the purpose of killing or attempting to kill sperm or minke whales except as permitted by Contracting Governments in accordance with sub-paragraphs (c), (d) and (e) of this paragraph." If that is passed sub-paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) will then become (c), (d), and (e) respectively. That is what Mr. Wall has put forward, is a drafting amendment to clarify the language. Is it the pleasure of the Commission that I should poll them on this amendment?

U.S.A.: Yes.

U.K.: Yes.

U.S.S.R.: Yes.

SWEDEN: Abstain

SOUTH AFRICA: Yes.

PANAMA: Yes.

NORWAY: Yes.

NEW ZEALAND: Yes.

NETHERLANDS: Yes.

MEXICO: Not present

JAPAN: Yes.

ICELAND: Not present

FRANCE: Yes.

DENMARK: Not voting

CANADA

CANADA: Yes.

BRAZIL: Abstain.

AUSTRALIA: Yes.

The SECRETARY: That is carried with only two abstentions. Mr. Chairman, we have already dealt with (G) and we only have now (H) (I) and (J). The amendment standing under the heading 12 (H) is an amendment of paragraph 8 (A) in which the words "15,500 blue whale units" appear and you delete the words "500" so that it will read "shall not exceed 15,000 blue whale units." Is there a proposer? That is a simple amendment. Omit the words "500."

DR. J.T. RUUD (Norway): I move that the proposal be adopted, and I think it has been discussed so extensively in both the Scientific and the Technical Committees that there is no use for me to explain further, and that is why I move this proposal.

CAPT. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): I second it.

The SECRETARY: Proposed by Dr. Ruud and seconded by Capt. Solyanik.

The CHAIRMAN: Any comments or amendments?

The SECRETARY: Is it the pleasure of the Commission I should poll the Commission on this? Omit the words "500" in paragraph 8 (A) of the Schedule which now will read "15,000" and not "15,500".

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Mr. Chairman, may I make one little comment in advance of voting? The United Kingdom does not care for this proposal but if and when I vote "no" I should like to say that we are certainly not against additional protection of whales if the necessity is proved, and we welcome, for example, the warning given in paragraph 18 in the Scientific Committee's report affecting the future, and I may have a proposal to make about that paragraph in due time, but a particular reason why we do not welcome this proposal is that it relates to a season which is almost upon us and a season in which there will be more expeditions in the Antarctic than the last and I should like just to make this point that we do have a feeling that if and when reductions in the overall permitted catch comes to be necessary, it is desirable to give the industry a longer notice than this proposal will give them.

The CHAIRMAN: You wish to offer that as an amendment.

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): I think it does not require to be an amendment. I give it by way of an explanation.

The CHAIRMAN: Professor Ruud.

MR. J.T. RUUD (Norway): Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me to comment on that. I should like to remind the Commission that this is the same proposal given to the Commission last year. Further, when Mr. Wall thinks that it is desirable to the industry to have a longer notice. I will also call attention to the fact that our industry expects to run next season and have all agreed to the proposal of a cut of 500.

The

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Lienesh.

Mr. G.J. LIENESH (Netherlands): As it seems, Mr. Chairman, more or less necessary to give some comment when we are voting on this paragraph, I should like to say that we are of the opinion that we have to stick to the 15,500 for the next season anyway owing to the fact that in our crew a good many of the figures we are handling now are arbitrary. So, we don't have yet sufficient data in hand in scientific research to convince us of another opinion than we have just now. It is my only commentary and has nothing to do with any amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: You wish to move an amendment to the effect that this restriction shall not apply until 1956?

Mr. G.J. LIENESH (Netherlands): No, not even that, Sir.

The SECRETARY: The Chairman wishes me now to poll the Commission on the proposal 12 (H), deletion of the word "500", which has been moved by Dr. Ruud and seconded by Capt. Solyanik.

U.S.A.: Yes.
U.K.: No.
U.S.S.R.: Yes.
Sweden: Abstain
South Africa: No.
Panama: No
Norway: Yes
New Zealand: Abstain
Netherlands: No.
Mexico: Not present
Japan: No.
Iceland: Not present
France: Abstain
Denmark: Not voting
Canada: Yes.
Brazil: Abstain
Australia: Yes.

Five assents and five nos. That is 12 (H) is declared lost.

The Chairman desires me to call your attention to amendment to 12 (I) that is the amendment to Paragraph 9(b). This follows the report of the Subcommittee of the Scientific Committee who suggested various amendments inside that paragraph. If you will look on page 3 of Document XVIII, you will notice what Paragraph 9(b) looks like as amended.

Dr. A. KODAKI: Mr. Chairman, I should like to remind the Secretary here on page 3 of Document XVIII. If we adopt the proposal as it stands now, I think Paragraph 9(b) will now read: "provided in this case"; the third line from the bottom: "provided in each case". We should take out "provided in each case" because this applied only to the Northern Hemisphere.

Mr. G.R.G. WALL (U.K.): On this same point, may I ask whether some words may have inadvertently been omitted from this draft? In the paragraphing schedule, there are some words which relate firstly to the Southern Hemisphere and secondly to the Northern Hemisphere in regard to the meat being used for local consumption. Is it deliberate that the Southern Hemisphere has been left out? Or is that an accident?

The SECRETARY: It was in the Subcommittee's report, you see on the old paper. In the first line delete the words "fin whales of not less than 55 feet (16.8 meters) may be taken for delivery to land stations in the Southern Hemisphere and". Those were the words which the Subcommittee suggested should be omitted.

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Would this not now mean that fin whales could not be taken in the Southern Hemisphere for use as local consumption?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Below 55 feet.

Mr. J.M. MARCHAND (South Africa): Mr. Chairman:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Marchand.

Mr. J.M. MARCHAND (South Africa): There has been no proposal of this amendment or a seconder.

The CHAIRMAN: well, that is right.

Mr. J.M. MARCHAND (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, I propose that this amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a seconder?

Mr. W.M. TERRY (U.S.A.): I second it.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, it is open for discussion. Dr. Lienesch?

Mr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, we also discussed between each other the question of decreasing the size limit in this Paragraph 9(b). We feel that the switch of 60 feet down to 55 feet is weighing rather heavily on the interests of the industry and although the Commission, of course, has the duty of making recommendations in the first place, we also have to keep in mind that there is some money invested in the industry and on top of that we are in favor of making the minimum limit 57 feet instead of 55 feet.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you move that as an amendment?

Mr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): I should like to move that as an amendment.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kodaki. We had better get a seconder first if we move that as an amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN: You will second it. All right, Mr. Kodaki.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): I should like to propose that the words on the second line after "and" should be deleted.

The CHAIRMAN: On the second line?

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): You see, in the original proposal it says that in the fourth line delete the words "fin whales of not less than 55 feet (16.8 metres) may be taken for delivery to land stations in the Southern Hemisphere". I should like to take away the whole of that proposal.

Mr. J.L. MARCHAND (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, do I understand Mr. Kodaki to say that the words to be deleted in the original amendment - should be replaced?

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): No. The original one in this schedule should start as it is.

Mr. J.M. MARCHAND (South Africa): I agree.

Dr. A. KODAKI: You see the original of this new proposal. This would be taken away from the original schedule so I wanted to keep that in this schedule. That is what I propose.

Mr. J.M. MARCHAND (South Africa): I don't know whether this should be an amendment but I would to simplify the addition as far as Dr. Lieness's proposal is concerned; that is, simply to propose the amendment in this way: that the existing Paragraph 9(b) should read - where you have 60 feet you are to put in 55 feet and where you have 16.8 metres you put in 17.4 metres. The remaining part of the paragraph remains exactly as it is.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a second Marchand and Clark. There is an amendment to an amendment, now.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, that covers my point. I am quite happy about it.

The SECRETARY: A further amendment has been moved by Dr. Marchand and seconded by Mr. Clark that Paragraph 9(b) should read exactly as it is in the schedule, except that 60 feet (18.3 metres) in the first line will read 57 feet (17.4 metres). That is all, no change in the existing Paragraph 9(b) except that 57 feet (17.4 metres) should replace 60 feet (18.3 metres) in the first line. Otherwise you take no notice of what is in the original Agenda.

Mr. J.T. RUUD (Norway): Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Prof. Ruud.

Mr. J.T. RUUD (Norway): May I make a few comments before you poll the Commission? If you will remember, the papers sent out by the Scientific Committee, I think we understood that as a matter of fact we thought that from a purely scientific point of view, we might reduce the size limit of fin whales but we thought it was best to keep up some very low limit, not to drop the industry too much by reducing the original value of the limits. I admit that the industry might be concerned about reduction of the original limit and I said in a joint meeting that it would amount to about 1.8 values of oil approximately. Now I am positive that the whaling industry would prefer 55 feet but I admit also that by reducing the length to 57 we take about, I should guess, four fifths or so of the small waste that would be accessible to the industry. So, there is no reason to leave this for a scientist to recommend too strongly those two remaining feet.

With regard to the position of the land stations in the Southern Hemisphere, the Scientific Subcommittee had the intention that it should remain at 55 because there is no limitation of numbers and they shouldn't be given profit on having a five feet lower limit than they had in the Antarctic where the industry is limited by a certain number. Then it is now recommended 57 for the industry. I took it as reasonable to stick to the old limit 55 also for the land stations in the Southern Hemisphere, and I am prepared when this amendment is put up to a vote, to say yes.

The

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Prof. Baud. Are there any other further comments? Then we will take first the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the amendment which we will now ask the Commission to vote on is the simple amendment of Article 9(b) of the schedule by altering in the first line of 60 feet (18.3 metres) to 57 feet (17.4 metres).

The Chairman asks me to read clause 9(b) as it appears in the schedule. Leave out anything else on the Agenda Paragraph 9(b) reads:

"It is forbidden to take or kill fin whales below 60 feet (18.3 metres) in length for delivery to factory ships or land stations in the Southern Hemisphere; and it is forbidden to take or kill fin whales below 55 feet (16.8 metres) for delivery to factory ships or land stations in the Northern Hemisphere; except that fin whales of not less than 55 feet (16.8 metres) may be taken for delivery to land stations in the Southern Hemisphere and fin whales of not less than 50 feet (15.2 metres) may be taken for delivery to land stations in the Northern Hemisphere provided in each case that the meat of such whales is to be used for local consumption as human or animal food."

I understand that the only correction in that Paragraph 9(b) is that in the first line you alter 60 feet (18.3 metres) to 57 feet (17.4 metres)--that is the only amendment.

That amendment has been moved by Mr. Marchand and seconded by Mr. Clark. Are you ready that I should poll the Commission on this:

U.S.A.: Yes.
U.K.: Yes
U.S.S.R.: Yes
Sweden: Abstain
South Africa: Yes
Panama: Yes
Norway: Yes
New Zealand: Yes
Netherlands: Yes
Mexico: Not present
Japan: Yes
Iceland: Not present
France: Yes
Denmark: Not voting
Canada: Yes
Brazil: Abstain
Australia: Yes

That is carried with two abstentions.

Gentlemen, we now come to the last amendment to the schedule on the agenda and that is Paragraph 12 (J) and the articles of the schedule is Paragraph 10(d) and at the end it is proposed by the Japanese Delegation that you should add the words on the agenda. I wouldn't read those at the moment because late last night, I received from the Japanese Delegation two alternatives of this amendment. They are on the paper you have before you. Since then, Dr. Kodaki has kindly circulated charts which you have before you.

Dr.

Dr. A. KODAKI: Mr. Chairman, with regard to an amendment about the open season for minke whaling, I feel sorry to do so because I myself agreed on the present regulation at the Third Meeting of the Commission in Capetown with the spirit of cooperation and with an expectation that it would be good for conservation purpose. At that time, when this question was discussed in Capetown, I thought that the sacrifices to be borne by the whaling interests and the consumers in accepting it would not be so great as I have found out after its enforcement in this country. But our experience in the last three years have proved it necessary to amend the present regulation in order to give fair chance to the whalers of poor means and consumers at large, both in the northern and southern parts of Japan.

I shall now briefly explain the actual situation in Japan.

At present about 40 vessels are permitted to be engaged in minke whaling which harvest about 400 animals each year. The principal areas wherein minke whales are caught are: first, Hokkaido, that is to say, the Ohotak Sea and the northeastern Pacific coast of Hokkaido; second, the northeast of Japan on the Pacific side; third, central Japan on the side of the Japan Sea; and then the northwest coast of Kyushu.

Due to Japan's peculiar topography which runs narrow and long from north down to south, an extreme difference exists in weather between north and south. Also, the currents along the coasts and other oceanic conditions differ from one area to another.

Consequently, the minke whaling season differs according to each area. For instance, in Hokkaido, the period between April and October is the best for catching minke whales, while in the northeast and central Japan the period from January to the end of June is the best season for minke whaling. Further, in Kyushu, the best season falls in the period from December to the end of May.

Therefore, if the Government declares one open season of six months to be uniformly applied to all parts of Japan, the actual operation of minke whaling cannot be carried out for more than four months, either in Hokkaido or Kyushu, which is shown in our chart; that is to say, if one open season is to be chosen to cover the best minke whaling period in one area, it will mean that in some other areas catchers cannot operate even for three months. That is why we chose the period of six months extending from February to the end of July, taking into consideration the interests of different areas, which was a kind of compromise between the different interests.

Under the present Japanese regulation, as I mentioned above, no operation can take place in Hokkaido from February to the beginning of April due to the freezing of the sea. On the other hand, as the open season ends at the end of July, whalers in Hokkaido cannot catch minke whales in August, September and October, in spite of the fact that these three months are a very good season for the catch of minke whales. In this way, we have repeated complaints from the people in Hokkaido.

In the same way, we receive complaints from the people in Kyushu because the actual period of minke whaling is limited there as in Hokkaido due to the present Government regulations. In the particular case of Kyushu, it must be mentioned that minke whale meat is best appreciated in the beginning of the year because in winter the catch of fish is poor and the price of fish and ordinary meat tends to rise. Therefore, if we can have the open season a little earlier in the southern districts, it would be good not only for the interest of whalers but also for the economy of the consumers in that area.

What we desire is to have a separate open season for a certain area during which our catchers can operate without staying idle because of freezing or because of the off-season for the catch of minke whales. As I have already explained, it is impossible for Japan to choose a period of six months as the open season which can be applied uniformly to all areas and which can be fully utilized by whalers in all areas. That is why we have proposed to have one separate season for a certain area where oceanographic conditions are clearly distinguishable from those of other areas. Yet we try not to have a whole year covered by two different seasons, and we have proposed to have three months overlapping; that is to say, the period of time covering the open seasons will not exceed nine months in a year. If this proposal is accepted, the Japanese Government will more probably declare a separate season for Hokkaido, which will start in April and end in October.

Statistically, it may be said that the catch of minke whales after the enforcement of the present regulation in Japan has not decreased so much as to endorse my present plea. But the fact is that the local whalers are carrying out a more intensive whaling during the shorter period of operation due to their economic necessity. This is indeed worse for the conservation of this species than having a longer period of actual whaling operation, particularly when there is not size limit enforced.

As to the wording of the amendment we are proposing, we are ready to leave it to a drafting committee. So far as the main point of our proposal is accepted, it is all right for us how the wording will be altered.

We have prepared here two alternative drafts. Draft I is the same in substance as the draft originally proposed and as put down in the agenda. We merely altered the wording because there seems to have been some telegraphic error when we communicated our proposal to the Secretariat through the Embassy in London, which made our original proposal ambiguous in its meaning.

In Draft II.

In Draft II, the usual regulation for a separate season for a land station located at a distance of over a thousand miles from the nearest land station is omitted because we know that this particular regulation does not serve any practical purpose, at least in the case of minke whaling. As you know very well, the only countries which are vitally interested in minke whales are actually limited to Norway and Japan alone. These two countries do not have any land stations which are located over a thousand miles away on the mainland. Therefore, we thought that such impractical regulation could be eliminated and replaced by the amendment now put forward. But perhaps the elimination of such proviso about a separate season for a land station a thousand miles away may be criticized at from the legal point of view because we did not forward the elimination of the proviso from the schedule. So I do hope that you would give sympathetic consideration to Draft I as the Japanese formal proposal. Thank you.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Kodaki, could you number these two alternatives; one is a double page amendment, may we call that A, and the single page amendment B?

Dr. A. KODAKI: Mr. Chairman, I should like the Commission to consider the double page amendment. The actual amendment is on the second page.

The SECRETARY: We call that "A".

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): I second Mr. Kodaki's proposal.

The SECRETARY: Dr. Kodaki, the Chairman would like to be quite clear about your amendment. If we are talking in terms of the double sheet of the amendment which I marked "A", what it comes to is Paragraph 10(d) stands exactly as it is, with the article provided that in the seventh line you put a small (i) and then you add a completely new paragraph which is underlined on page 2, which is marked (ii).

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): That is correct.

The SECRETARY: That has been moved by Dr. Kodaki and seconded by Mr. Clark.

Mr. J.T. RUUD (Norway): Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ruud.

Mr. J.T. RUUD (Norway): Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment on that proposal. As mentioned by Dr. Kodaki, in Norway we also have substantial minke whaling and I very well can understand the difficulties which they run into when they were committed to six months and I think that proposal is reasonable since you may claim that the freezing of the northern seas, sea of Okhotsk, is reasonable; that you have a different oceanographic condition that you have to take into consideration when you decide to have an open season. So, I have no objection to that amended proposal, but I should like to abstain when it comes to voting because I shouldn't like to run into similar trouble with our own whalers asking for similar allowances in our

own waters where you found it necessary to limit the open season to more than six months. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Prof. Ruud.

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): May I ask one more point for information? I am sorry if Mr. Kodaki has commented upon it and I missed it. If the amendment speaks of areas having oceanographic conditions clearly distinguishable from those areas in which other land stations are located, all I want to know is who determines whether the oceanographic conditions are different or not. Will that be within the discretion of the Contracting Government and will the Commission agree to that?

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kodaki.

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, when any Contracting Government should use discretion the Government will use discretion, so when we have such a special area, our Government should make decision.

Mr. R. G. WALL (U.K.): I missed you on the matter, Sir, but I just want to get the point quite clear.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Mr. Chairman, may I say something which will probably clarify that. It seems to me that it should, as Mr. Kodaki has pointed out, be left to the contracting government for the same reason that the Governments have the discretion of declaring the seasons in other whaling.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Clark. Any further comment?

Dr. A. KODAKI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, to make this amendment without touching the existing wording, I should strike out (i) on the first page, Provided that, (i) in bracket I will strike that out and on the second page without using (ii) in bracket we will say "except that a separate open season, etc." and then in the middle of the second page, instead of using "however", we will use the word "but".

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kodaki.

The SECRETARY: The Chairman wishes that the Commission should be polled now in respect of Dr. Kodaki's amendment to Paragraph 10(d) which is set out on the double page up to A. On the front page we omit the small (i), and on the second page which contains Dr. Kodaki's actual amendment being underlined and therefore, new words, we strike out the initial (ii) and put "except that " and on the eighth line nearer down we substitute the word "but" for "however". Subject to those two amendments, Dr. Kodaki's amendment, moved by him and second by Mr. Clark are the underlined words on page 2. May I poll the Commission on that?

Mr. Jaha

Mr. J.M. MARCHAND (South Africa): Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Marchand.

Mr. J.M. MARCHAND (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, will it not be necessary now to delete the words relating to the provisions of subparagraph . If you renumber or cut out the numbers that Dr. Kodaki has suggested?

The SECRETARY: May I poll the Commission on that proposed amendment, which is 12 (J) on the agenda.

U.S.A.: Yes
U.K.: Abstain
U.S.S.R.: Abstain
Sweden: Abstain
South Africa: Yes
Panama: Yes
Norway: Abstain
New Zealand: Yes
Netherlands: Abstain
Mexico: Not here present.
Japan: Yes
Iceland: Not here present.
France: Abstain
Denmark: Not voting
Canada: Yes
Brazil: Abstain
Australia: Abstain

Six in favor and no objections. That is carried.

Gentlemen, that completes the amendment under Item 12 of the agenda. We have dealt with Items 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. There is an item under "Other Business".

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Have we entirely dealt with items 15 and 16. There are certain other items in the report of the Scientific Committee which I think we have to consider.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wall, please advise the Chairman what we have lacking.

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): If I may take the Scientific Committee report, Sir, and ask whether we have entirely dealt with Paragraph 6, there is a recommendation about the existing sanctuary and the question of dealing with it in the next meeting. Will that automatically happen or does the Commission need to take any action about it? This is a recommendation of the Scientific Committee.

The SECRETARY: With regard to Mr. Wall's query on paragraph 6 of the Scientific Committee's report with regard to its recommendation, would Mr. Wall be content if we take note of his observations and then it is left to the Secretary to see that it is carried out without moving a formal voting of the Commission?

Mr. R.G.R. WALL

MR. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Yes, I think so, Sir. If I may just record my feeling that this question of sanctuaries ought to be looked at by the Scientific Committee and we in the United Kingdom would be very glad if they would do so.

Mr. N.A. Mackintosh (U.K.): Are we, Mr. Chairman, to have any terms of reference to the Scientific Committee or can we have ~~some freedom~~ to discuss relevant matters. We have whale marking, ~~the question of separate species~~, the sanctuary, limitation of catch in separate species, paragraph 16 if possible "pelagic whaling in the North Pacific".

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

and possibly

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clark.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): May I suggest to Dr. Mackintosh that in my opinion the Scientific Subcommittee should deal with any matters which come up that they consider necessary to bring to the attention of the Commission from a scientific and biological point of view. There are a number of questions arising out of this meeting that have been specifically suggested and no doubt they will be picked up by the Scientific Subcommittee, but I would recommend, Mr. Chairman, that the rest be left to them as to what they decide that they should discuss without any tying them in to any particular terms of reference.

The CHAIRMAN: I would prefer that myself, but if Dr. Mackintosh wants specific instructions.

Mr. N.A. Mackintosh (U.K.): No, Mr. Chairman, I think we might find our hands tied very much if we were restricted to certain specified subjects. ~~The only thing~~ It might be useful just to mention subjects which had been particularly referred to us. but to give us freedom to discuss others as well.

The SECRETARY: The Chairman asked me to ascertain from the Commission whether they would be agreeable to Dr. Mackintosh preparing the agenda and including every subject which he thinks of value to the Commission and notifying the Secretary in due course of that agenda.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

(All say Aye)

The CHAIRMAN: Any objection. I hear none.

Mr. R. G. R. WALL (U.K.): The remaining point in the report of the Committees to which I should like to draw your attention is Paragraph 18 of the Scientific Committee's report which embodies a sort of a general warning for the future which they have agreed upon. It seems to me that this question of warning for the future, if it is well established the future situation is going to be difficult, is a matter which the Commission ought to take note of and which we should not leave just buried in the record, and if there is substance in this, as we are advised there is, I would suggest that we ought to embody it in a resolution of this Commission so that it

can be properly drawn to the attention of Contracting Governments and through them to the attention of their whaling industries so that they may be conscious as to where or what may be in store for them in future years.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you propose a resolution please?

Mr. R.G.R. WALL (U.K.): Well, I would propose a resolution on these terms, Sir, using as near as possible the wording of this draft report but putting a preamble to it. Having regard to the scientific advice at their disposal and to the catch statistics covering whaling operations in the Antarctic, the Commission is of the opinion that it may be necessary or it may soon become necessary to restrict more severely the Antarctic catch of blue whales while guarding at the same time against the corresponding increase in the catch of fin whales. This alone would involve a reduction in the total permitted catch in the Antarctic. If there should be clear signs of depletion of the fin whale stock also, the Commission believes that a further and very substantial reduction in the total permitted catch should be made at once. Thank you, Sir.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Wall has put forward this resolution. Having regard to the scientific advice at their disposal and to the catch statistics covering whaling operations in the Antarctic, the Commission is of the opinion that it may soon become necessary to restrict more severely the Antarctic catch of blue whales while guarding at the same time against a corresponding increase in the catch of fin whales. This alone would involve a reduction in the total permitted catch in the Antarctic. If there should be clear signs of a depletion of fin whale stock also, the Commission believes that a further and very substantial reduction in the total permitted catch should be made at once.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you all in favor? Those in favor please say "aye".

(All say aye.)

The CHAIRMAN: Those opposed:

The SECRETARY: Carried. Just one more item before we have tea. It is usual for the Commission to issue a short press release at the end of each conference. That is usually left to the Secretary subject to the approval of the Chairman and the Chairman would like to know whether that is agreed. You will understand, of course, we can't give out to the press the amendments to the schedule which we have proposed because they have to be on deposit with the Depository Governments before they become effective, and there might be a delay.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now have a short tea break.

(Tea break)

The CHAIRMAN: The Commission will please come to order.

The Secretary will take the next item.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned one other item under "Other Business". I don't know whether there is any other question under that heading which is Item 18 of the Agenda. If any one wishes to raise. Otherwise, we are ready to deal with Item 19 of the agenda, "Date and place of next meeting."

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

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clark.

Mr. G.R. CLARK (Canada): Under Item 18, this is probably I think in the experience of the International Whaling Commission, the first year that His Excellency Birger Bergersen of Norway has not been with us. He was one of the original members, of course, long before there was a formal Commission. And Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a motion that the Commission extend its thanks to his Excellency for his valuable and unending contributions over many years to whale conservation throughout the world and the work of the International Whaling Commission and to extend to him through the Secretary the text of this resolution of the Commission and the Commission's best wishes.

The CHAIRMAN: I don't think it is necessary to take a poll on that, but all those in favor please say "aye."

(All say "aye")

and I am quite sure that it would be unanimous.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, we had a proposal at the first plenary session from Capt. Solyanik who conveyed to us an invitation from the Government of the U.S.S.R. to meet next year about this time in Moscow. That is the proposal which is now before us and which is subject to any discussion. We may now poll the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: How about the date?

The SECRETARY: Well, the date, I think Capt. Solyanik contemplated about this time. If it is Monday next year it would be July 20. Could we have, Mr. Chairman, any observations as to whether the 19th or 20th of July or say the second half of July is for any reason inconvenient to any of the Commissioners. I gather, Mr. Chairman, it is highly inconvenient to you yourself.

Gentlemen, the proposal is that the next meeting shall be held on July 18, 1955, at Moscow. I will now poll the Commission on that proposal.

U.S.A.:

U.S.A.: Yes.
U.K.: Yes, I am happy for us to meet in Moscow.
U.S.S.R.: Yes.
Sweden: Yes.
South Africa: Yes.
Panama: Yes.
Norway: Yes.
New Zealand: Abstain.
Netherlands: Yes.
Mexico: Not present.
Japan: I am happy to accept subject to approval of my Government.
Iceland: Not present.
France: Yes, subject to approval of my Government.
Denmark: Not voting.
Brazil: Abstain.
Canada: Yes.
Australia: Mr. Chairman, I have been assured by the Commissioner for U.S.S.R. that the usual diplomatic immunity and facilities will be made available to Commissioners and representatives from countries not at present diplomatically represented in U.S.S.R. On such assurance, I have pleasure in voting in favor of Moscow.

Only two abstentions, none against and three countries not present so that is carried.

Capt. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my deepest appreciation of your acceptance of the Government of the U.S.S.R.'s invitation as extended. The Russian delegation hopes to meet you all in Moscow next year. We will do our best to make your stay in Moscow successful. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Capt. Solyanik.

The SECRETARY: I wonder if you would help me on this matter. You yourself are one to go to the Antarctic. Who may I communicate with because there will be a good many arrangements from time to time. Do I communicate with you as I always do as the Commissioner, or shall I communicate with your Foreign Office or with who?

Capt. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): Minister of Fisheries.

The SECRETARY: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Commission, may I express our appreciation of the arrangements made for this meeting by the Japanese Government, for the hospitality shown to the Delegations by the Japanese Whaling Association and others and for the facilities made available to us. I wish also to express our appreciation in particular to Dr. Kodaki who I have known since 1937. As in previous years, the Commission is indebted to the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics for the data necessary for the proper functioning of this Commission. And in that regard, I think we should all express our appreciation in particular to Mr. Vangstein. We commend also the services of the stenographic and clerical staff and to Mr. Mori for providing the papers necessary for the proper functioning of the Commission. I am certain that everyone has enjoyed this visit to Tokyo and I, for one, am rather reluctant to depart so soon without seeing more of Japan. Some of the

more

more fortunate ones intend to do so. For whatever mistakes I may have made as your Chairman, I ask your indulgence. I gratefully acknowledge the wholehearted cooperation I have received as your Chairman from the Delegations. I thank you.

Dr. A. KODAKI: Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kodaki.

Dr. A. KODAKI: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my Government and my Delegation, Japanese Whaling Association and our Japanese staff and myself, I would like to express our deep appreciation of the kind words expressed to us. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that the conference has now come to a successful end upon which I present you all my hearty congratulations. I presume that many of you would stay more in this country, at least a few days more, although the Chairman said that he has to go back, and hope that you will enjoy yourselves sightseeing and some other recreations, forgetting worried programmes for a while. If you wish to have any help from us during your further stay please don't hesitate to call us on the telephone. I am myself always in the Foreign Office and you can find me any time there and I think all the others will try to help you as much as they can. Although I will try to see you again before you go, I may miss the chance, so I wish you here in advance bon voyage and the best of luck. Also, I do hope that you will carry away a happy memory of this country. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Kodaki. Now before we close, I will ask Mr. Miles first to say something on behalf of F.A.O.

Mr. C. MILES (F.A.O.): I have been asked by the Director of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Dr. T.V. CARDON, to convey to this Commission the appreciation of his highest esteem and his appreciation of the Commission's action in continuing to invite the Organization to be represented by an observer in this most successful and well organized meeting. My Organization heartily congratulates the member governments of the Commission on the progress made with whale marking and believes that this constitutes the soundest way of appraising the stocks not only of whales but also of many of the species of commercial fishes. My Organization does not wish to comment on the measures taken by this Commission for the conservation of the whale stocks because it believes that the Commission is a competent body to arrive at conclusions in this respect, taking into account the views of the biologists and the practical requirements of the industry. We would not wish, therefore, to use the argument that whales constitute the source of human nutrition to influence the Commission either to increase the whale catch or to increase conservation measures. At the same time, the Food and Agriculture Organization wishes to place on record its vital concern that the maximum use be made of the carcasses of all whales killed but for human and animal food and eventually perhaps for agricultural fertilizer.

His Excellency, the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, has expressed in his opening address the dependence of the Japanese people on the whaling industry as a source of food and his surprise that whale meat is not more widely eaten in other countries. While I realize that the complicated question of consumer taste enters very largely into this

problem,

problem, it would seem that the resource is not at present ~~perhaps fully~~ utilized in other countries. The Minister also called attention to the fact that Japan's rather complete utilization of all parts of the animal came about as a result of a large population living in a rather small geographical area with only 14% of arable land. It would appear that the time is fast approaching when the world population, which is increasing in geometric progression as a result of recent advances in the fields of medicine and hygiene would outrun the capacity of the land areas to produce food. It may well be, therefore, that other countries and Japan will before long be forced to have recourse to the fuller exploitation of the sea as the last unexplored frontier.

At this meeting, the status of a refrigerated vessel for collecting whale meat has been referred for legal opinion. I believe that it may be safely assumed that the world's food requirements will receive full and sympathetic consideration in any discussion or decision which may involve measures such as the working of refrigerated vessels for the transportation of whale meat, which will affect the availability of this kind of food which might otherwise be wasted. As an extension of this concept, we also believe that all possible measures should be encouraged to reduce the period which elapses between the striking and the bringing ashore or aboard the factory ship of the whale both as regards to the time necessary for actual killing which might conceivably be reduced through the perfection of an electric harpoon or other methods and delays in processing. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank you. Will the representative from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea care to comment? Dr. Lienesch.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, it is also on behalf of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea that I would like to thank you for the opportunity you have given us to attend this very interesting conference. Thank you so much.

The CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Commission, may I also express hope that the countries here represented by observers will find it possible to adhere to the 1946 Convention.

The SECRETARY: You asked me to remind the Commission that there is a cocktail party this evening at 5 o'clock at the Argentine Embassy. May I just once again ask you to let me or Mr. Mori know, of any mistakes that we can put right on the documents. You will understand, of course, that with regard to the verbatim notes, if you will let me know what mistakes are even after this conference is over, we will circulate as we usually do an erratum slip putting there what is right. Mr. Chairman, may I just add one word, you have yourself thanked Mr. Mori and the stenographers, but I am in a unique position to know how very hard the staff under Mr. Mori worked and how they have produced the documents in almost record time. I personally am very grateful to Mr. Mori and his staff--all of them, for the way they have run this conference so expeditiously.

(Clapping of hands)

The CHAIRMAN: Well, if there is no further business before the Commission, this meeting of the Commission is now ended.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

- - - - -