

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSIONFOURTEENTH MEETINGSession of Monday, 2nd July, 1962In the Chair: Mr. G.R. Clark (Canada)

The CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen, I should like to call to order the Fourteenth Meeting of the International Whaling Commission.

First of all, I should like to welcome all of the Commissioners and the Delegations from the Member countries, and also a special welcome to Dr. Lienesch and his colleagues from the Netherlands. The Commission is particularly gratified at the action of the Government of the Netherlands in re-adhering to the Convention and we are very happy indeed to see them at this Fourteenth Annual Meeting.

There are some representatives who are perhaps here for the first time at our Commission Meeting, and I should like to extend to them a most cordial welcome. We also have some representatives here as observers from Italy, Chile, FAO and ICES, and we are very happy to have you present with us on this occasion.

Gentlemen, we are again very highly honoured to have with us this morning Mr. Vane, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food in the United Kingdom, and you will recall we had the pleasure and honour last year of Mr. Vane addressing our opening Plenary Session. His words of welcome and his message to the Commission regarding our work were certainly extremely well received last year, and it is a great privilege again for us to have Mr. Vane here today to attend and address the opening plenary session of the Fourteenth Meeting. I think with that, Gentlemen, I should call upon Mr. Vane to address the Commission this morning.

Mr. W.M.F. VANE (Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you, Sir, for your kind words. May I say I am honoured to be asked a second time to address this Meeting of the International Whaling Commission, and it is with great pleasure that I extend to you all on behalf of Her Majesty's Government a warm welcome to London - I hope the weather will remain as good as it is today during your stay.

It gives me particular pleasure, as I am sure it does to all of us here, to see the Netherlands again represented by a Delegation as a result of their re-accession to the Convention since our last Meeting. All countries that engage in Antarctic whaling are now parties to the Convention once again, and I feel sure this can only benefit the Commission's work in every way. The return of the Netherlands coincides with another most welcome development, an agreement by the five countries concerned on arrangements for sharing the pelagic catch in the Antarctic. This agreement is technically outside the scope of the Commission's terms of reference, but it is of such importance that I hope I may be forgiven for having referred to it. As long as there was no division of the catch between individual countries expeditions were encouraged if not obliged to engage in a wasteful race to catch as many whales as they could before the global catch limit was reached. Now as a result of the new agreement each country should benefit economically from being able to rationalise its operations. Important as it is to have reached agreement on the division of the catch, it is no less important to ensure that the total

- 2 -

catch is limited to the level which the stocks are able to bear, and here may I say with all sincerity that I do hope this age of ours will not go down to history as one which used its ever-advancing technical efficiency to exploit and waste the resources of nature, which are not inexhaustible, but to prevent waste and harvest a fair share of what nature has given us to eat for our needs and to leave a fair share for those who follow.

The special investigations which you are undertaking into the conditions of the stocks shows that you are well aware of the vital importance of this question to the future of your industry, and here I would like to say a word in recognition of the work of the scientists under the Commission. It attracts little public notice but it is the essential basis of any sound conservation policy and it is truly international for the majority of countries represented here **take part in it.**

There is too the important question of the International Observers Scheme, which I see is on the Agenda for this Meeting of the Commission. Now that all five Antarctic Whaling countries are once more members of the Convention, I hope it will not be long before agreement is reached on the practical details of such a scheme, the principle of which is, I understand, acceptable to all countries.

I will not keep you any longer from your main business, but just on behalf of Her Majesty's Government once more say we wish you here a successful Meeting and hope you will enjoy your stay in this country. (Applause)

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vane, on behalf of the Commission, it is certainly a great pleasure for me to offer our sincere thanks for your words of welcome and also for the remarks about the work of this Commission. I think we are all agreed that in the past couple of years we have made a good deal of progress in this very complicated work, particularly in the scientific studies. As you have mentioned, now that all the countries are full members again of the Convention I think that a good deal more progress will be made, particularly this week and in the years to come. We are indeed most grateful to you for coming this morning and addressing the Commission. Thank you on behalf of the Commission.

I wonder, Gentlemen, if I may, I have rather a sad note to introduce. As most of you probably know, Mr. Dobson, who was Secretary of this Commission for a period of something like ten years, passed away in May. I think all of you who have been associated for many years with the Commission knew and loved Mr. Dobson, he was a great worker on behalf of this Commission and certainly gave us wonderful service. Prior to that, as you know, he was with the British Ministry as a civil servant and carried on on behalf of this Commission after retiring from the British Civil Service. He carried with him the experience and knowledge to do very great service for this Commission, and it was with sincere regret I, personally, learned of his death a little over a month ago. In view of that I wonder, Gentlemen, if you would stand and perhaps have a moment of silence in tribute to the late Mr. Dobson.

(The Meeting stood in silence in tribute to the late Mr. Dobson)

I think it is the custom, Gentlemen, for us to have a few moments break. Mr. Vane has other duties to perform and I think he is anxious to get away.

(The Minister then withdrew from the Meeting.)

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should proceed with our Meeting. If there are any Press representatives present, as is the usual custom of this Commission, I must ask them to leave because the business sessions of the Commission are held in camera. At the close of this week's Annual Meeting there will, as usual, be a Press Release which will be distributed.

You have before you the Agenda which was circulated by the Secretary in the required period of time, and I think we should proceed with the items on the Agenda.

We come to the second Item of the Agenda, Arrangements for meeting and adoption of Agenda.

We will start first of all with the roll call.

The SECRETARY: I am now going to call the roll in alphabetical order. I would ask those of you who have deputies to let me know.

(The roll call was taken, the names of the Commissioners and their experts being recorded in a conference document)

(The Secretary then made announcements regarding the distribution of documents, accommodation and general Conference arrangements)

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should proceed to the adoption of the Agenda which was circulated more than 60 days in advance of the Meeting in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. You have all had copies of the Agenda. If the Agenda is in order, perhaps we could have a motion for its adoption, and then we could go through the Agenda Item by Item.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I wonder if before the Agenda is adopted I could ask the Commission to consider including an item under 21, Any other business, to deal with a review of the Convention and the Schedule to the Convention to clarify points of definition and interpretation. Our legal advisers in Canada have pointed out that certain inconsistencies occur between sections of the Schedule, and these create some difficulties when attempting to enforce this Schedule in our country. For this reason we consider that it would be desirable to give some preliminary consideration to this matter during the course of this Meeting. I would ask the Commission if it would consider including such an item under any other business.

Dr. A. Remington KELLOGG (U.S.A.): I would say that we can consider anything but we cannot take definite action. I move the adoption of the Agenda.

The CHAIRMAN: Under Item 21, Any other business, Dr. Sprules wants to raise this item to see whether or not the Commission feels this action should or should not be taken in the future. Is that agreed? (Agreed) With that understanding of an extra item under Item 21, it has been moved by Dr. Remington Kellogg that the Agenda as circulated be adopted. Is there a seconder? It is seconded by Dr. Lienesch of the Netherlands. Is it agreed that the Agenda be adopted? (Agreed)

The next Item on the Agenda is Item 3, Appointment to Committees. The first one is the Scientific Committee. I will call on the Secretary to determine the membership of the Scientific Committee.

The SECRETARY: I will call the countries out in alphabetical order.

Argentina	No member
Australia	Mr. Setter
Brazil	Not present.
Canada	Dr. Sprules.
Denmark	No member
France	Dr. Budker.
Iceland	No member
Japan	Dr. Omura
Mexico	No member
Netherlands	Dr. E.J. Slijper
New Zealand	No member
Norway	No member
Panama	Not present.
South Africa	No member
Sweden	No member
UK	Dr. Mackintosh.
	Dr. Clarke.
	Mr. Brown.
USA	Dr. Kellogg
	Mr. Rice
USSR	Dr. Tverianovitch
	Dr. Arseniev
	Dr. Fedorov

/The CHAIRMAN: That will constitute.....

The CHAIRMAN: That will constitute the Scientific Committee.

Can we now have a poll for the membership of the Technical Committee.

The SECRETARY:

Argentina:	No member.
Australia:	Mr. R. Crichton-Brown
	Mr. S. M. Reilly
	Mr. W.J. Saleeba
Brazil:	No member.
Canada:	Mr. G.R. Clark
Denmark:	Mr. J. Hertoft
France:	No member.
Iceland:	No member.
Japan:	Mr. I. Fujita and advisers
Mexico:	No member.
Netherlands:	Mr. S.G. de Wit
New Zealand:	Mr. R.L. Jermyn
Norway:	Mr. G. Sjaastad
	Mr. E. Vangstein
	Mr. E. Haugen
	Mr. E. Moc
Panama:	Not present.
South Africa:	No member.
Sweden:	No member.
United Kingdom:	Mr. B.C. Engholm
	Mr. A.J. Aglen
	Mr. J. Graham
United States	Dr. J.L. McHugh
	Mr. Wm. C. Herrington
	Lt.-Cdr. Fugaro.
U.S.S.R.	Mr. M. Sukhoruchenko
	Capt. A.N. Solyank
	Mr. A. Sharov

The CHAIRMAN: Those are the members of the Technical Committee.

It falls to the Chairman to appoint the next Committee which has to be appointed, that is the Finance Committee. Five Commissioners have to be members of the Finance and Administration Committee. We seem to change this each year, but I would like to suggest for the Commission's consideration that the following representatives should be the members of the Finance and Administration Committee for this year's Annual Meeting: Mr. J.V. Moroney of Australia, and if he is not available Mr. C.G. Setter; Dr. A. Remington Kellogg of the United States; Mr. M. Sukhoruchenko of the Soviet Union; Dr. G.J. Lienesch of the Netherlands; Mr. B.C. Engholm of the United Kingdom. (Agreed)

That completes Item 3. Item 4 on the Agenda, which deals with the Commission's budget and financial position, should be referred to the Finance and Administration Committee for consideration, and they will make a Report to the Plenary Session. (Agreed)

Item 5, Review of extra-Convention discussions on the regulations of Antarctic pelagic whaling and possible consequential action. The information on this subject was circulated in advance of the Meeting.

As was mentioned by Mr. Vane, it is most gratifying that the arrangements - which admittedly are outside the Commission - for the division of the total quota for the five Antarctic countries have now been concluded. The Secretary has advised all the members of the Commission of these arrangements in a circular dated 13th June.

I wonder if at this point anyone who took part in those discussions for the formulation of the arrangements would care to make a comment for the benefit of the Commission.

Mr. Engholm, would you care to say anything at this time?

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): I do not think there is very much for me to add to the documents which have already been circulated. It is, as you have said, Mr. Chairman, very gratifying that after this long period it has at last become possible for the five Antarctic whaling countries to reach agreement on the quotas for the different nations. Although it has not been possible to get an agreement for longer than a four year period, nevertheless I hope that it should put the arrangements for Antarctic whaling on a more satisfactory footing during that period.

The details are, I think, clearly set out in the documents. They consist of a main agreement between the five Antarctic whaling countries, and then a supplementary quota agreement between Norway, Japan, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands.

Unless there are any particular points which any Commissioner wishes to make, I do not think I need say anything more and waste the time of the Commission by going over what is already in the document.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Engholm. Are there any comments or questions by anyone on the arrangements for the Antarctic quota division which Mr. Engholm has just remarked on?

I would like to say for the record, to the five Antarctic whaling countries - and particularly to those who worked so hard on working out the arrangements for this Agreement - that it is particularly gratifying to the Commission, I am sure, that this problem seems to have been resolved. It is going to help the Commission's work in the future very materially, so we are indeed grateful to those who did work so hard in making the arrangements and the agreement in their final form.

Item 6, Notice of withdrawal from the Convention. Although this Item is on the Agenda, the Notice of Withdrawal by the Government of Norway has been cancelled as has been reported to the Commission. Therefore, there is nothing really to do on Item 6.

Item 7, the International Observers Scheme. As the Commission knows, this matter has been discussed at considerable length during the past three or four Annual Meetings of the Commission, and last year you will recall that we re-affirmed the arrangement in principle, that there should be an International Observers Scheme, particularly for Antarctic whaling. It seems to me that this matter is now available for discussion at this Annual Meeting, and in order to make some progress I would like to see some definite action during this week at the 14th Annual Meeting to be taken on the proposal for the International Observers Scheme.

Norway have submitted some proposals and these appear on the Agenda. What I would like to suggest is that I personally do not think that the details of an Observers Scheme can be worked out in a large meeting like the one we have this morning, at a Plenary Session. Therefore, in order to make some definite progress in connection with the details of an International Observers Scheme, I suggest that there should be an Ad Hoc Committee formed this morning, and that that Ad Hoc Committee should meet this week as a committee to work out the details of a scheme and to report later this week to the Commission, so that some definite action can be taken during the period of the 14th Annual Meeting.

If the Commission feels that this suggestion has merit - and I submit it for consideration - I should like to propose that the Ad Hoc Committee to discuss Item 7 should also consider Item 18(a), which is the proposal by Norway. The Ad Hoc Committee should consider this and report back to the Commission later this week on Items 7 and 18(a).

On that Ad Hoc Committee, if the idea appeals to you, should serve, I would suggest, representatives from the five Antarctic countries: Norway, Japan, the United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R., and the Netherlands. I should also like to add a member from Australia to serve on that Committee, because although Australia is not an Antarctic whaling country they are probably on the borderline of the Antarctic and have a very definite interest.

Therefore, an Ad Hoc Committee, composed of representatives from the five Antarctic whaling countries, plus the representative from Australia, should work out the details of an International Observers Scheme this week and report later to the Commission at a Plenary Session.

Mr. M. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R): (Interpretation from Russian)  
The conservation of whale stocks and the maintenance of international co-operation on whaling matters are of great interest to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union signed the International Convention in 1946 and the Arrangements in 1962 for the regulation of Antarctic pelagic whaling. The Soviet Delegation believes that since the five countries engaged in Antarctic whaling have again become parties to the Convention, there is a good opportunity for them to come to some agreement on the establishment of an international system of inspection on whaling.

However, I should like to express the opinion that it is not convenient to consider the International Observers Scheme at this present meeting of the Commission without a preliminary discussion of this matter at a Conference of the representatives of the five countries engaged in this whaling.

Therefore, we cannot agree to discuss this problem without preliminary consideration. We think it is necessary for the present meeting to recommend to the Governments of the five countries that there should be a discussion of this question at a special Conference of representatives from the five countries who would submit their recommendations to the Commission.

As was stated by the Soviet Minister for Foreign Affairs in a speech in June, we are ready now, during this Meeting, to exchange opinions with the representatives of the other countries engaged in Antarctic pelagic whaling, and to come to some preliminary agreement about the date of such a Conference, and the procedure to be adopted.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): As far as the United Kingdom is concerned, we would have seen a good deal of merit in the suggestion from the Chairman that this was a matter which could be handled during this week through a special Ad Hoc Committee. It does seem to us that since there is a specific item down on the Agenda under Item 18(a), which has been put down by Norway, it is necessary for the Commission to take cognisance of that and to consider it with a view to the Commission making up its mind on what action should be taken. I would have hoped, therefore, that it would have been possible for a substantive discussion to have taken place during the course of this week, on the working out of the practical details of an International Observers Scheme. I feel too that it is perhaps appropriate for the Commission to undertake this task during the course of its business this week, since Commissioners will recall the Convention was specifically amended by a protocol some years ago in order to add to the Convention the question of methods of inspection. Therefore, this does bring the matter within the aegis of the Commission, and it does seem to me that for that reason it would be appropriate for the Commission to consider it during the course of this Session.

I also feel, as the Chairman has suggested, that there may be some advantage in associating with the consideration of this matter one or two of the other non-Antarctic whaling countries, and the Chairman's suggestion that Australia might take part seems to me to be a good one because she has, after all, got very considerable whaling interests which would be affected by any International Observers Scheme.

For this reason, as far as the United Kingdom is concerned, we should be perfectly prepared to take part in an Ad Hoc Committee such as the Chairman has suggested. I recognise the statement which has been made by the Commission of the Soviet Union, that they are ready to take part in a discussion now that all five Antarctic whaling countries are once more members of the Convention, but I would hope that it would be possible for the Soviet Union Commissioner to be able to take part in a substantive discussion in an Ad Hoc Committee such as has been suggested. I have no doubt that the representatives from the Soviet Union have been considering this matter, particularly in the light of the proposed amendment which has been put down on the Agenda under Item 18(a), and I would therefore very much hope that it might be possible for them to go further than they have suggested and, in fact, to take part in a substantive discussion during the course of this week. It may well be that it will not be possible to reach final agreement during the course of this week, but if a substantive discussion has taken place it will mean that a serious start has been made, and this will enhance the possibility of getting an International Observers Scheme into operation before next season, which I am sure all member-countries would wish to see. If we postpone it, there is the danger that this may not be possible.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan): (Interpretation from Japanese) The Japanese Delegation would like to state their views concerning the Observers Scheme.

We felt that basically there was agreement on the Observers Scheme among the five Antarctic countries, although there might be some differences as regards the details, and these may be discussed. However, as a matter of principle we felt that there was an understanding among the five countries concerned.

With regard to the detailed proposals, several members have had suggestions since the last session of this Commission, and there has also been the suggestion submitted by the Norwegian Delegation on the Observers Scheme. We feel, therefore, that all five countries concerned have had background information on the question of the Observers Scheme, and that they have had enough time to study that. Therefore, we subscribe to the view of the British Delegation that not only should the timing of this special meeting be discussed but also that this problem should be decided by the Commission, as well as the substance of the proposals which will be discussed at the Meeting.



It might be difficult to have a separate meeting dealing with this problem, and we think that there would be the best chance to discuss this matter during this Meeting when all the countries are represented.

In conclusion, the Japanese Delegation would like to state that we favour the idea of having an Ad Hoc Committee, as proposed by the Chairman of the Commission, and agree to discuss the matter in the way suggested by Mr. Engholm of the United Kingdom Delegation.

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway): (Interpretation from Norwegian)  
We are in agreement with the proposal made by the Chairman that an Ad Hoc Committee be established. We feel that we should make certain efforts to try and obtain further decisions in this direction. It is quite possible that the proposal made by the Soviet Union is one suitable approach - namely, to try and obtain agreement between the five countries taking part in the Antarctic catches - but there are other approaches, and in an Ad Hoc Committee all possibilities should be considered.

For that reason, we are supporting the proposals made by the Chairman, and would like to discuss all possible approaches in order to find the correct solution.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): I would like to take this opportunity first of all to thank you for welcoming us back to the Commission. I believe there is no more logical way to do that than to support the proposal made by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Whilst I think that the Commission for the Soviet Union did make some points, Mr. Engholm and the other speakers did suggest that the details are perhaps complicated, and a start has to be made. I gathered from the Soviet Union Commissioner's last remarks that they were ready at this Annual Meeting to exchange opinions and views on some of the proposals which have been made. It does seem to me that this is the opportunity when everyone who is engaged on and interested in this problem is present and could take advantage of being in London to have a meeting of this Ad Hoc Committee and explore the various possibilities. Advantage would be lost if this opportunity were allowed to pass whilst the interested parties are this week gathered in London. I would hope that Mr. Sukhoruchenko could agree to take part in the discussions of an Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. M. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation from Russian)  
The Soviet Delegation cannot agree to discuss this problem at the present Meeting, as we have already stated, without a preliminary discussion of the problem at a special conference of representatives from the five countries. If other members of the present Meeting consider our proposal unacceptable, we are ready to take part in a discussion of this problem at the present Meeting, but in principle we do not consider it convenient. In this case, a discussion of this problem must take place only on a preliminary basis. On the substance and detail of this question, we consider it necessary that details of it should be discussed at a preliminary or special meeting of representatives of the five countries, as we stated before. It is well known that the Soviet Delegation made proposals on this at the 12th Meeting,

and it is not our fault that such a special meeting of representatives of the five countries has not taken place between the 12th and 13th Meetings.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the position is quite clear. I understand that the Soviet Delegation would be agreeable - as the other countries have expressed themselves agreeable on this matter - at least to discuss this matter in a preliminary way at this Annual Meeting during this week.

Mr. M. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation from Russian)  
We agree to a preliminary discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: You can then talk to each other!

I think it is agreed that there should be an Ad Hoc Committee, as outlined, to discuss and explore in a preliminary way the possibilities of an International Observers Scheme. Is it agreed that the type of Committee I outlined, that is, consisting of representatives from the five Antarctic pelagic whaling countries and Australia, be the Ad Hoc Committee to examine this problem, and also to deal in a preliminary way, if that is what is wanted, with the proposal under Item 18(a) on the Agenda? (Agreed)

(The Meeting adjourned at 11.10 a.m. and reconvened at 11.35 a.m.)

The CHAIRMAN: We are on Item 8. I would like just to defer that Item for a moment and proceed with the other Items on the Agenda to have them assigned to the various Committees.

Item 9, Report of the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee, which as the Secretary announced earlier will be distributed very soon, I suggest should be referred to the Scientific Committee and also to the Technical Committee for study and guidance in their deliberations. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Item 10, Special scientific investigation of the whale stocks, deals, as you probably know, with the Committee of Three which was appointed by the Commission about two years ago. They have done a good deal of preliminary work but have not been able to proceed with their meetings and investigations under their terms of reference from the Commission because the Commission was awaiting the payment of the special funds to the Commission's budget.

Have we a report, Mr. Secretary, on the status of the provision of the special funds for this purpose?

The SECRETARY: I can only say that immediately the news was received that the last of the objections to contributions to this fund had been removed, I sent out a letter authorising Dr. Chapman to begin spending money under this head. Up to now we have only had contributions to the fund from Japan and the United Kingdom. I am in a somewhat delicate position having authorised the expenditure of this money, and I do hope that the remaining contributions will be rapidly forthcoming.

The CHAIRMAN: The work of the Committee can only proceed if the funds, which I think were agreed to by all our countries, are paid. I wonder if we could hear comments from some of the countries.

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): I can tell you that the request for the extra contribution to the Commission from the Netherlands has been approved by the Government. I am a little puzzled that this money is not yet in the hands of the Secretariat. However, it is on its way and I will find out where it is. I am sorry but I do not have it with me!

Mr. M. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation from Russian) The Soviet Delegation would like to repeat its statement made at the Thirteenth Meeting of the Commission that the special scientific investigation of the conditions of the Whale Stocks is of great importance with regard to the determination of the prospects for the Antarctic whaling. The Soviet Union is ready to pay the contribution according to the decisions of the Thirteenth Meeting provided that the other countries engaged in pelagic whaling in the Antarctic also pay their relative contributions.

The Soviet Delegation states that the Soviet representatives will participate in the Joint Meeting of the Committee of Three and the special Scientific Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: When will you pay the money?

Mr. M. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation from Russian)  
If the other countries agree to pay their contributions, the Soviet Union declare that they will pay immediately.

The CHAIRMAN: Two have already paid.

Mr. M. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation from Russian)  
We will also pay.

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway): There is slight confusion here on the Norwegian side with regard to this contribution because we thought it had already been paid, but the explanation might be that it is on its way. I will certainly check that it is.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems as though everyone is going to pay. It appears as though the funds for this special investigation by the Committee of Three will certainly be paid by the five countries; I do not think there is any doubt about that. It is a question of getting the funds into the Secretary's hands so that he can authorise the work to go ahead, and this is quite important. Anything which can be done by the Commissioners to expedite the payment of this money will be most helpful.

We have with us Mr. Sidney Holt who is a member of the Committee of Three. I wonder if Mr. Holt at this time has anything to report on its work and what has developed since we last met.

Mr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): As you have said, Mr. Chairman, there has been no substantive work done during this year although the time has not entirely been wasted. The members of the Committee have exchanged some correspondence on methods of handling data, and we are in a better position to contribute now than we were a year ago. I speak for myself and for the other two members when I say that we are ready, as soon as the Commission has solved its problems, to go ahead working with the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee to produce a report as you have asked.

I had the opportunity last week, which I was very pleased to have, to work again with the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee, and I think that Committee has made some proposals for work to be done in the next few months which will help the special Scientific Committee very much in its task. We look forward to our Joint Meeting with the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee which I hope it will be possible to have later this year or early next year.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that that probably disposes for the time being of Item 10. I have no doubt that, as Mr. Holt has mentioned, the Scientific Committee will have some comments and views on the workshop arrangements so that when we do get Dr. Mackintosh's report there will be some reference to those arrangements.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): We will be glad to do what we can.

The CHAIRMAN: That disposes of Item 10. I would suggest that Item 11, size limits for sperm whales, be referred to the Scientific Committee and also to the Technical Committee for consideration and reported later to a Plenary Session. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

On Item 12, North Pacific whale stocks, I think there is something to be said on this. You will recall that some special investigations and studies on the North Pacific whale stocks were discussed at the Thirteenth Meeting. Dr. Sprules, have you anything to report on that?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I would like to remind the Commissioners that last year at the Annual Meeting, following consideration of a Canadian proposal which had been presented, the Canadian Delegation stated that if whaling began again from our West Coast station in the Pacific Ocean we would report annually to the Commission with regard to this particular matter. If it is the wish of the Commission at this time I will present a very short report with reference to this particular matter as it affects Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I would ask you to present that report.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): As a result of the revisions to Paragraphs 9 (a) and 9 (b) of the Schedule, which followed a decision reached by the Commission at its last Meeting, the Canadian Whaling station located at Coal Harbour in British Columbia was re-opened this season after having been closed during the 1960 and 1961 seasons.

A new company has been formed called the Western Canada Whaling Company Limited, and this has been organised to carry out whaling operations within about a 150-mile radius of Coal Harbour located on the North West coast of Vancouver Island. A fleet of six catchers is presently operating and up to 21st June of this season 215 whales had been taken. The facilities at the whaling plant have been modified and extended to provide better refrigeration and storage in order to produce whalemeat for human consumption.

A complete report of the 1962 whaling operations will be submitted to the Commission at its next Annual Meeting, and it will contain an analysis of the data which are being obtained on a daily basis by a scientist from the Fisheries Research Board of Canada and an enforcement officer of the Department of Fisheries. Both these men are located at the shore plant and are obtaining a good deal of interesting information from the catch as it comes in for processing. However, the season has only just got under way at this point, and the full report and analysis cannot be made until next year.

The CHAIRMAN: This Item, therefore, will be referred to the Scientific Committee.

I suggest that Item 13 be referred to the Technical Committee. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

I suggest that Items 14, 15, 16 and 17 be deferred until a later Plenary Session. (Agreed)

We have already referred Item 18 (a) to the Ad Hoc Committee which we established a short time ago, and that Committee I hope will bring forward

some kind of report to the Commission later on this week. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

I suggest that Item 18 (b) be referred to the Technical Committee. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

I suggest that Item 18 (c) be referred to both the Scientific Committee and the Technical Committee for consideration and reported later to a Plenary Session. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

I suggest that Item 18 (d) and Item 18 (e) be referred both to the Scientific Committee and to the Technical Committee for consideration and reported later to a Plenary Session. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Item 19 I suggest be referred to the Finance and Administration Committee for subsequent reporting to the Plenary Session. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

I suggest that we leave in abeyance Items 20 and 21 until a later Plenary Session. Is that agreed? (Agreed) The reference which the Canadian Deputy Commissioner referred to under Item 21 - any other business - the question of a review of the definitions and interpretation of the Convention and the Schedule - should, I think, be referred to the Technical Committee for consideration and reported to a later Plenary Session. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Those are the assignments of the Agenda to various Committees for later reporting.

I should now like to return to Item 8 on the Agenda, review of previous seasons's catches, and we are most grateful again to have with us Mr. Vangstein from Norway who has been kind enough in all these Annual Meetings to give us a review of the previous season's catches. I wonder if we could now hear from Mr. Vangstein.

/Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): Mr. Chairman,.....

- 15 -

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): Mr. Chairman, as will be remembered, International Whaling Statistics did not succeed in preparing complete statistics of the catch in the Antarctic season 1960/61, in time for the Commission's Meeting in 1961. The reason for this was the late closing date for the pelagic expeditions, and the fact that the returns from the whaling companies reached International Whaling Statistics too late. In order to obtain complete statistics, the Commission decided therefore at its Meeting last year to postpone the Meeting for a week and to request the member states to send us the necessary statements as quickly as possible. The Secretary of the Commission sent the member states such a request, and I am glad to be able to say that we received the returns from all the whaling companies rather early this year.

I may also mention that several of the expeditions sent the report from the first port of call after the close of the season. We have, therefore, been able this year to present a complete statistics of the Antarctic catch last season. The usual tables have been drawn up, and a limited number of copies are at the disposal of the delegations of the different countries.

A summary of the catch in fields outside the Antarctic is given in the provisional edition of International Whaling Statistics, No. 49. This is not complete, as the necessary information from two stations which operate from Chile is lacking. With some few exceptions whaling outside the Antarctic in 1961 was carried on in the same fields and by the same companies as in 1960. A good 24,000 whales were taken, or approximately the same number as in the previous years.

Last season in the Antarctic 21 pelagic expeditions were in activity, this being the same number as in the foregoing season. The Soviet Union increased its whaling fleet by one expedition. On the other hand Japan withdrew from the operations one expedition, and instead put in a factory ship bought from Norway in 1961.

The maximum catch was suspended last season also, but the individual countries fixed instead voluntary quotas which amounted to 17,780 blue whale units.

With the exception of Japan and the Soviet Union, the expeditions of the other countries did not obtain their quota. The total catch was 15,253 blue whale units, that is a catch above the maximum limit of 15,000 units adopted by the Commission, which limit, unless otherwise decided at this Meeting, will automatically be in force for the coming season.

The maximum catch has been suspended during three seasons, as Norway and the Netherlands stood outside the Convention in the season 1959/60, and the maximum catch had therefore no practical significance for the other countries in that season.

In these three seasons there were taken on an average approximately 15,700 units. The three seasons are remarkable in several respects. The catch results alone do not tell much, but must be appraised in relation to the catching material employed and the length of the season. In the three seasons before 1959/60 20 expeditions captured about 15,000 units in 69 days. In the season 1961/62 21 expeditions spent about 115 days in capturing approximately the same number of units. In the said three seasons the average catch per catching boat per day amounted to 0.93 blue whale units, as compared with 0.51 last season, that is to say a decline of about 45 per cent in about three years. One must, of course, be cautious in using the catch per catching boat's day's work as an expression for the size of the stocks or for the extent of the decline in the stocks. I will only remark that the said figures are not encouraging, but otherwise I leave it to the Scientific

Committee to examine and appraise the figures more closely. The decline in the catch per catcher day has been somewhat different for the different groups of expeditions, but for all the groups the catch has fallen considerably.

A number of the Norwegian expeditions reported poor catching weather last season. An examination of the catch logs shows that also the average wind force and sea, measured according to Beaufort's scale, were somewhat higher last season in comparison with the previous season. The reason is that the expeditions operated farther north than in earlier seasons. The farther north one gets in the Antarctic, the more unfavourable are the weather conditions.

In the first season of pelagic whaling the expeditions operated in the ice fields. In course of time they moved out into the open sea, and the largest catch was taken between 60° and 70° south. In recent seasons the expeditions have moved still northwards, and last season about 10,000 of the 15,000 units were taken between 50° and 60° south. North of 50° there were captured about 360 blue whales and 1,163 fin whales, but this catch is recorded as being made between 50° and 60° south. The reason for this is that on technical grounds it is difficult to extend the tables.

About 10,200 blue whale units were taken in Areas II and III, and this is approximately 67 per cent of the total catch. Of the total catch since season 1931/32 60 per cent has come from the same areas. In the areas near the Ross Sea there was little activity last season. In Area I, on the other hand, about 1,800 units were taken, equivalent to 12 per cent of the total catch. In the so-called sanctuary there have been caught - in the seven seasons this sector has been open for baleen whaling - altogether some 19,000 blue whale units, representing about 18 per cent of the whole pelagic catch in the said season.

There were no substantial changes in the average size of the captured whales in comparison with the nearest foregoing season. 1,100 blue whales were taken, which is a decline of 600 whales relative to the last season.

One shore station operated from South Georgia and had a total catch of about 400 blue whale units. For other details attention is drawn to the information contained in the statistics distributed.

Regarding the statistics for the 1963 Meeting of the Commission, I do hope that the whaling companies will send us the returns as soon as possible after the close of the season 1962/63. But even if they do so, with the present closing date it is not possible to have the statistics completed before the last week of June. Consequently, if the Commission prefers to have complete statistics the Meeting of the Commission cannot be held earlier than this year.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Vangstein, for your usual very comprehensive coverage of the statistics of the previous season. Are there any questions or comments, Gentlemen, on Mr. Vangstein's report?

As Mr. Vangstein has pointed out, one significant thing is that it is essential the information be given to him as early as possible. Certainly, the Commission is not able to have its Meeting earlier than we are now having it if indeed we wish to have the information compiled by Mr. Vangstein. I think this point should be taken into consideration when the Finance and Administration Committee is recommending the date for the 1963 Annual Meeting of the Commission.



- 17 -

The information which has been given by Mr. Vangstein will be particularly useful to the Scientific Committee. If there are no comments or questions on the report given by our friend, Mr. Vangstein, then on behalf of the Commission I should again like to express our most sincere appreciation for the work that he has done in preparing and compiling the statistical information, thank you very much indeed. (Applause)

Gentlemen, it is now the noon hour, I think we have for the time being disposed of our Agenda for the Plenary Session. I should like to obtain your views about the meetings of the various Committees. I think they should meet this afternoon and discuss the assignments which have been given to them from the main Agenda. I propose that the Scientific and Technical Committees meet at 2 o'clock. (Agreed)

I would suggest that we leave the Secretary to convene and arrange the meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee, as some people are on other committees and it will have to be fitted in.

I would suggest also that the meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on the items which we were discussing before the Observers Scheme, be arranged between you and I would ask Mr. Setter initially to act as convenor of the Ad Hoc Committee and in consultation with the other five members to arrange a suitable time to meet. Is that acceptable? (Agreed)

As there is no further business for this Plenary Session we will adjourn.

(The Meeting adjourned at 12.05 p.m.)

- 18 -

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSIONFOURTEENTH MEETINGSession of Thursday, 5th July, 1962.In the Chair: Mr. G. R. Clark (Canada)

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should get under way on our Plenary Session for 5th July.

First of all, I should like to welcome Mr. Gribelin of the French Delegation, who has just arrived. We are very happy to see him again.

I would draw your attention to the verbatim report of the Plenary Session held on Monday, 2nd July, and I would ask that any corrections to this report should be sent in to the Secretary. There will probably be a number of editorial corrections to be made to the verbatim report and these will be taken care of by the Secretary in due course.

Mr. M. SUKHOROCHENKO (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation from Russian)  
As to the report of the first Plenary Session, the Soviet Delegation has only one remark.

We found that the Soviet Delegation contributions were not always correctly reported. We talked about this to the Secretary of the Commission and he said this will be taken into consideration in the final draft of this document.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Sukhorochoenko. These will be sent in to the Secretary -- I gather he already has them -- thank you very much.

Are there any other comments on the verbatim report of the Plenary Session of Monday, 2nd July?

I think you all understand that if there are any corrections of substance these should be sent in to the Secretary who will incorporate them in the final version to be distributed to the Commissioners under a correction sheet.  
(Agreed)

I have one other item which I should like to submit to you for your consideration. It could perhaps be considered and then some action taken, maybe at the final plenary session of the Commission, which may be tomorrow. I have unfortunately to report to you a letter which I have received from Mr. Engholm who is the Vice Chairman of the Commission, and I should like to read this into the record. It is dated London, 1962 and goes on:-

"Dear Mr. Clark, I am writing to inform you that as a result of a reorganisation in the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food I am being transferred from my present post as Fisheries Secretary as from 1st September. In view of this I shall cease to be the United Kingdom Commissioner on the Whaling Commission; and with great regret I must tender my resignation as Vice Chairman of the Commission.

- 19 -

I should like to take this opportunity of thanking you and all the other Commissioners for the kindness and understanding that have been shown to me during the last three years, and to say how sorry I am to be leaving the whaling discussions. I should, however, like to wish the Commission every success in the future. Yours sincerely, Basil Engholm."

It is with very considerable regret that I have received this letter and, in discussing the situation with Mr. Engholm, of course he had no choice in the matter. He is being posted as his letter explains to another division or branch of the Ministry, and so therefore he will no longer be the British Commissioner. I raise this now so that the Commissioners may be able to give some consideration as to the procedure which should be followed. Perhaps we could take up this question at the final plenary session of the Commission's Fourteenth Annual Meeting, so that we may take the appropriate action required for the appointment of a Vice-Chairman to finish off Mr. Engholm's term.

As you know, at the end of the 1963 Annual Meeting of the Commission, there will be an election of officers, including the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, for the ensuing years, but I think it would be desirable for the Commission to take some action before the end of this Annual Meeting to appoint a Vice-Chairman to finish off the coming year.

Mr. Engholm, would you like to add anything, Sir?

Mr. B. C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): I do not think that I have anything to add to my letter, except to repeat that I shall be very, very sorry indeed to leave the Commission and to leave the various discussions and problems on the whaling front, and perhaps even more sorry that in future I shall not have the contacts which I have valued so much with the other Commissioners. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: It is with very sincere regret I am sure that the Commission will see you leave this organisation.

I wonder, is it agreed that we will consider this and take some appropriate action about the Vice-Chairman at the final Plenary Session. (Agreed)

I should now like to run down our agenda for the Plenary Sessions. We have disposed, of course, of Items 1, 2 and 3 on the main Agenda. Item 4 was referred to the Finance and Administration Committee, and I think that we may dispose of Item 4 because it will come up under Item 16 when we hear the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee. Is it agreed that we dispose of Item 4? (Agreed) Item 5 was dealt with at the last Plenary Session. Item 6 was dealt with at the last Plenary Session. Item 7 - The International Observers Scheme - you will recall that this was referred to an Ad Hoc Committee which I understand is now ready to report on its deliberations. I understand that Mr. Moroney of Australia was the Chairman, but unfortunately he had to leave and his place was taken on the Ad Hoc Committee by Mr. Setter of the Australian Delegation who was appointed Chairman following Mr. Moroney. May we hear from you, Mr. Setter on the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee?

- 20 -

Mr. C. G. SETTER (Australia): On behalf of Mr. Moroney and myself, I would report to the Commission with some regret that I cannot report a great deal of progress, but I think that the Commissioners will have seen the recommendation which has been circulated around the table, which is the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on this question of observers.

The summary reports of the first two meetings of the Committee have been circulated, and there will be a further summary report covering the meeting this morning but, as the Chairman of the Committee, I should like to submit to the Commission the recommendation made by the Committee this morning and for the record I will read it out:-

"The Ad Hoc Committee recommends to the Commission that

- (1) A special meeting be convened by the Commission to work out details of the observer scheme.
- (2) That this meeting be held as soon as possible, preferably before the end of August.
- (3) That the basis for discussion at that meeting be the proposals submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee by the U.S.S.R. and U.K. representatives.

I should like to submit to the Commission the adoption of this as a recommendation of the Commission itself.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Setter.

You have heard the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee as presented by Mr. Setter. It is perhaps unfortunate that more progress could not have been made in setting out the details of an observers scheme which this Commission has been discussing in principal at least for quite a few years. However, there is now a recommendation from the Ad Hoc Committee to the Commission as announced by Mr. Setter. Are there any comments on this Item 7 of our Agenda, and the Report by the Ad Hoc Committee?

Mr. M. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation from Russian)  
The Soviet Delegation has some comments on the recommendations submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee to the Commission.

We suggest that in clause 1 of this recommendation it should state, instead of "A special meeting be convened by the Commission to work out details of the observer scheme", it should state, "A special meeting be convened by the five Governments concerned to work out details of the observer scheme."

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the Soviet Commissioner is suggesting an amendment to paragraph (1) in the Ad Hoc Committee's Report and Recommendation. As I understand it, the Soviet Commissioner would like the wording to be changed to read: "A special meeting be convened by the five Governments" -- which presumably are the Antarctic whaling countries -- "to work out the details of an observer scheme." This is quite different from the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee. The Ad Hoc Committee says, "A special meeting be convened by the Commission to work out details of the observer scheme".

- 21 -

Mr. M. SUKHOROCHENKO (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation from Russian) As far as we understood from the past meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee what I have just said was the meaning of the recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments from members of the Committee?

Mr. R. L. JERMYN (New Zealand): In the light of the comments made by the Soviet Delegation, could I ask the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee to clarify for me, and perhaps for the other members of the Commission, what composition would be envisaged for the special meeting? Was the meeting of a composition comparable to that of the Ad Hoc Committee, for example, in mind? Or was it a wider body, or a body limited only to the five?

The CHAIRMAN: Could you inform us, Mr. Setter, on that point? Was it envisaged by the Ad Hoc Committee that the composition of the representatives at such a meeting be just the five representatives from the five Antarctic whaling countries, or were there to be other member countries at such a meeting?

Mr. C. G. SETTER (Australia): My understanding of the meeting was that there was no recommendation about the constitution of this special meeting, that it was a matter that would be decided by the Commission itself as to who should be represented at that meeting. But I should like to hear the views of any other member of the Committee on this point.

The CHAIRMAN: What was the understanding of the other members of the Ad Hoc Committee, may I ask?

Dr. G. J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): Of the same order as the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: In other words, the composition might be the same as the Ad Hoc Committee?

Dr. G. J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): No, it is up to the Commission to set up the special meeting, and it is up to the Commissioners if they like to take part. In my view they have the right to do so; they can also indicate to the Commission that they can stick to the five pelagic whaling countries, the five Governments concerned, but it is not a necessity to my mind.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fujita, have you any comments on this point?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan): (Interpretation from Japanese): I think that the special meeting would be a meeting which is convened by the Commission, and therefore the composition of the countries participating in this meeting would be decided by the Commission. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fujita. Mr. Sjaastad?

- 22 -

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway): (Interpretation from Norwegian)  
My understanding of the proposal was that this should be a meeting between the five pelagic countries, the five countries taking part in the Antarctic pelagic whaling, in the same manner in which the meetings were held on the quota arrangements.

May I add that to my mind the Commission should be responsible for convening the meeting but that the five countries only should take part.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Sjaastad. Mr. Engholm?

Mr. B. C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): I think that the first paragraph does represent the conclusion reached at the Ad Hoc Committee, and that we did not specifically consider what the composition of the special meeting should be, but that it should be decided by the Commission. On the other hand, however, I would also agree with Mr. Sukhruchenko and Mr. Sjaastad that it was clearly contemplated by the Ad Hoc Committee that at least the representatives of the five Antarctic whaling countries should be included in the special meeting.

/The CHAIRMAN: There seems to be some....

- 23 -

The CHAIRMAN: There seems to be some difference of opinion here. I think I should, as Chairman of the Commission, point out that the question of an observer scheme is the Commission's business, and it is within the framework of the Commission that the details should be worked out because this has to be ratified by the Commission itself at some stage. It would seem that if the Commission is agreeable this recommendation should remain as it is, a special meeting convened by the Commission. In other words, the Commission would act as the convener of this proposed meeting. You could also, if the Commission so desired, confine the representation to the five Antarctic whaling countries.

Mr. M. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R): (Interpretation from Russian) The reservation of the Soviet Union to this paragraph was based on the decision taken by the Ad Hoc Committee, which decided that the representatives of the five Antarctic Pelagic countries would be responsible for organising this special meeting, and the Chairman's proposal is contradictory to the decisions which were taken at the Ad Hoc Committee Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not attend the meeting, and I am only going by what is in the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee, and what the other members of that Committee have stated. It seems clear to me that certainly the majority view is that the special meeting was to be convened by the Commission. It is up to the Commission as to what they decide.

Mr. M. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R): (Interpretation from Russian) We understand that the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Norway spoke about the representatives of the five countries, and we think that lends support to our point of view. That is why we say this clause must be written so that the five countries concerned are responsible.

The CHAIRMAN: It is up to the Commission to decide the way in which they wish to handle this.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): Might I make a suggestion which perhaps would meet both points of view. Could we amend the first paragraph to read: "A special meeting of the **five** member governments engaged in Antarctic pelagic whaling be convened by the Commission to work out the details of the Observers Scheme." That would mean inserting after "a special meeting" the words "of the five member governments engaged in Antarctic pelagic whaling."

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan): (Interpretation from Japanese) We support the proposal by Mr. Engholm with respect to a meeting of the five pelagic whaling countries being convened by the Commission.

- 24 -

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway): I agree.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ingholm has suggested an amendment to paragraph (1) which would read: "A special meeting of the five member countries" - or representatives, presumably, of the five member governments - "engaged in Antarctic pelagic whaling be convened by the Commission to work out details of the observers scheme.

You have heard this proposal by Mr. Ingholm, is this acceptable?  
(Agreed)

Is paragraph 2 satisfactory? "That this meeting be held as soon as possible preferably before the end of August." Is that agreed?

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): 1962.

The CHAIRMAN: It might be a good idea to say what year!  
(Paragraph 2 Agreed)

"That the basis for discussion at that meeting be the proposals submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee by the USSR and UK representatives."  
(Agreed)

Do you agree to the amended version of the Ad Hoc Committee Report?  
(Agreed)

(The Report was adopted)

That disposes for the time-being, at least, of Item 7. Before we dispose of Item 7 on the Agenda, are there any views as to where this meeting might be held, to give some guidance to the Secretary? Would London be satisfactory to everybody? That is just a suggestion.  
(Agreed)

Item 9 on the Agenda was referred to the Scientific and Technical Committees. I think we can dispose of Item 9 because no doubt reference will be made in the Reports to be submitted under Items 14 and 15. (Agreed)

Item 11 on the Agenda was referred to the Scientific and Technical Committees. I think we can dispose of Item 11 because the subject matter will be dealt with in the Reports to be submitted under Items 14 and 15. (Agreed)

Item 12 was referred to the Scientific Committee. Here again we can dispose of Item 12 because the subject matter will be covered in the Report to be submitted under Item 15. (Agreed)

Item 13 was referred to the Technical Committee. I think we can dispose of Item 13 because this matter will be covered in the Report to be submitted under Item 14. (Agreed)

Item 14 is the Report of the Technical Committee. I think we should defer this for a short time because the Report in its final form is not yet ready for distribution. It may be available to us before we adjourn this Plenary Session, but I would suggest that we should hold this Item on the Agenda in abeyance for the time being. (Agreed)



Item 15, the Report of the Scientific Committee is available and has been distributed. You all should have a copy of this. It is Document IWC/14/13. I wonder if I might call on Dr. Mackintosh, the Chairman of the Scientific Committee, to review the Report of his Committee.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): In this Report, there is not very much which is not in the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee's Report. There are the items which were remitted to this Committee at Monday's Plenary Session, and the rest deals with other points in the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee's Report and a few extra points which came up under Other Business.

I do not know whether the Chairman would like me to go through the whole Report now, or to take it point by point. Possibly that would be better and then there could be discussion on each point.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that would expedite matters.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I would just like to say that we felt that this was not a very effective Committee because to a large extent we were dealing with the same subjects which were dealt within the Ad Hoc Committee's Report. Indeed, we had almost all the same people. It is partly for that reason, and partly because we are getting rather a lot of Committee work looming up in the future, that we ask at the end whether the Commission really feels that the present arrangements are satisfactory. We see that the same point has been raised in the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee.

I think that is all I have to say in a general way about the Report, and I wonder whether you would like to take particular points as they arise.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that would be helpful.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I might say that the review of the previous season's catches was not considered separately from the other Items on the Agenda, because that comes into several of them, especially in connection with the catch limit in the Antarctic, and the remarks on the condition of specified species mainly on page 3 of the Scientific Committee's report.

On the special scientific investigation of the Whale Stock, there is not much progress to report because the progress was held up by the money required for the computation and carding data which was rather a large operation, and involved a certain amount of expense. At the Scientific Committee Meeting, and at the Meeting of the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee, last week, the main thing was to find what date would be most convenient to everybody concerned whilst they were here together for the next joint meeting of the Special Ad Hoc Committee and Committee of Three. We found, by talking to everybody - including representatives of the Special Committee of Three - that the middle of December would be the most suitable date for everybody concerned.

S /  
for /

An alternative might be February if it would not be December, but we understand that Dr. Chapman can probably manage the middle of December. He is, of course, a key man because all the material has been sent to him and he is arranging for the machining of the biological data. We believe that Mr. Vangstein too is preparing the catch material and has had some difficulty in getting under way immediately. Altogether, it would be difficult to arrange the meeting earlier than December. *But*

The only other point of substance we discussed was the preparation of data. All the biological data on age distribution and the material relating to the recruitment of stock were all sent to Dr. Chapman, but there are a few odds and ends still to be sent in. We are urging those who have not done so to do so as soon as they can. I think that is all we have to say about that.

Size limits for sperm whales was the next thing specially remitted to us. Size limits for sperm whales were discussed in very much detail in the Ad Hoc Committee's report. I do not think any of us are altogether happy about a reduction in the size limits, and we really want to know rather more about the stocks of sperm whales than we do now before any general modification of the existing size limits, especially about whether the stocks of sperm whales are separated into distinct stocks, separately breeding stocks, in different parts of the Oceans, and how much interchange there may be, as well as about the breeding and all the biological problems which one wants to study in connection with the population of whales. However, we had the Japanese paper on sperm whales before us, and it seems from that that at least a local reduction of the minimum length would be reasonable with a catch limit which would have the effect of keeping the total catch of females to something not more than were taken in the last year before the limit on the catches was introduced at these Japanese land stations. We did have rather little to work on except this material in the Japanese paper, and it gives more information about the north-west Pacific stocks than about the stocks elsewhere. There is some evidence that in the field of the Japanese land stations there is something like a distinct stock which one could look at and come to some judgment about by looking at the previous catches and so on. *are used*

We say that any reduction of the minimum length should be confined to an experimental period of three years, but at a committee meeting one cannot very well carry out a large research project into the problems of ~~the~~ effective changing of the limits in other parts of the world. For that reason we recommend that further studies of sperm whales should be referred to the workshop and to a joint meeting of the Special Ad Hoc Committee and the Special Committee of Three before we could say whether this relaxation would be safe to apply in other regions. It does not apply to factory ships because that raises rather a different problem. Factory ships can move about, and they can draw on different stocks, and one is not sure what is the effect of the catches they take (... (inaudible) ...). I think the Scientific Committee did reexamine the whole question, and we found that it did involve a lot of rather difficult and complicated technical problems, the application of reduced size limits in certain places, and we thought that was becoming a little too difficult for us. Therefore, we simply said that we thought the principle of a reduction of the minimum length, provided the catch be kept down so that there should be no appreciable increase in the number of females taken, was a reasonable idea, but we would not care to go very much further than just agreeing to the principle of it. *x*  
*x*  
*x*

*if they are not from a discrete stock  
where the results can be watched.*

The next point was the North Pacific whale stocks. On page 3 of the Ad Hoc Committee's Report there is a group of people nominated representing Canada, Japan, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. Work has already been started, but the Scientific Committee suggested that to set the ball rolling for further steps to be taken it might be a good thing if the Secretary could be asked to write to the people concerned, to draw their attention to the programme outlined on pages 3 to 4 of the Ad Hoc Committee's Report. That would perhaps get things started, and establish contact between the people concerned. Again referring to the Ad Hoc Committee's Report, we recommend that a meeting of the group should be held some time before the next meeting of the Commission, perhaps at the same time as the annual Ad Hoc Committee meeting.

Going on with the Scientific Committee's report, the next point was- remitted to us was the ~~position~~ of the Sanctuary. ~~We~~ have no very strong opinions about that, and I think we had no reason to expect that the scientific point of view would ask for the closing of the Sanctuary again in the near future, but we thought that a Sanctuary is a recognised method of conservation and it might be that the special investigations will indicate a need for some sanctuary which might not necessarily be in the same area as has been used as a sanctuary before. Therefore, of the two alternatives put before the Commission, we should rather prefer the option of closing the Sanctuary if necessary without having to wait for three years. That is to say, we would rather have the Sanctuary open until the Commission decides otherwise than to have it open for three years at a time. X  
question

On the opening date and length of the Antarctic pelagic baleen whaling season, all we have to say is that the evidence is that stocks are in a bad way. The longer the season the more whales will be caught, and therefore we would prefer no extension of the open whaling season. On the opening date, we can only say that we have no further evidence beyond that which we had last year.

The next point is the blue whale catch limit in the Antarctic. Here, of course, we await the results of the special investigations, but as I said before the catch figures taken in preceding years indicate that the Antarctic stock is in a bad way.

In the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee's Report, it was suggested that if the proper level of catching - which was suggested some six or seven years ago - was more likely to be ~~4,000~~ units for blue whales, the appropriate level now would seem to be considerably lower than that because the corresponding portion of existing stocks would be smaller, and although 11,000 units might not have been a reliable estimate of what the stock could have stood at at that stage, the principle is that if it were something like that it would be still less now. 11,000/20,000

We also remark again on the importance of setting up separate catch limits for separate species. We know that that is a difficult thing to operate, but from a biological point of view that is what is wanted.

That brings us to paragraph 11 on page 2 of the Scientific Committee's Report, and perhaps I should skip the next one or two items for the moment and go on to blue whales. The condition of the blue whale stock is very serious indeed. There is no doubt that if the catching goes on as it is now the stock of blue whales in the Antarctic will be reduced almost to nothing.

IWC/14/10

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom) Continued

There are notes on the ~~several~~ pigmy whales which have been taken in appreciable numbers in recent years. They seem to be a distinct race or sub-species but their inclusion in the catch figures does make it a little difficult to interpret the figures for the blue whale catches. It makes it look as though the main stocks ~~will be~~ a little more plentiful than in fact they are. 9

Fin whales; this is <sup>largely</sup> covered in the points made about the over-all catch limit. ~~For that species the fin whale is taken separately.~~ <sup>← Taking fin whales separately we see</sup> We see that catch per unit has gone down rather steeply and rather more immature whales have been included in the catches, although the average lengths do not show any very definite trend.

Paragraphs 21 and 22 and several paragraphs in the Ad Hoc Scientific's report deal with humpbacks. The main thing here is that the stock of humpbacks taken in what we call group V, that is the stock which migrates between the Eastern Australian waters and New Zealand and the corresponding part of the Antarctic, has gone the same way as the depleted stocks in group IV taken off Western Australia and the corresponding parts of the Antarctic.

Sei and sperm whales; at the foot of page 3 of the Scientific Committee's report, we see in both reports that we do not really know enough about the species. There is not positive evidence of these ~~stock~~ species, although the reduced sizes of the sperm whales, especially in the Antarctic suggest that the stocks are being affected by the catches which, of course, have been considerably increased in the years since the war. X

Having covered the species perhaps I should go back to whale marking, — paragraphs 14-18 in the Scientific Committee's report. The main thing here is that we should like to see more marking done in such places as the waters of South Africa and South America. However, the extension of whale marking, which is very much needed for a number of scientific purposes, is liable to be a very expensive business and <sup>you</sup> really need an over-all view of what is being done and what is wanted in the future not only in the Antarctic and southern waters but everywhere in the world. We hope to include that before the Meeting next year.

I do not think I have covered the minimum length on the top of page 4, stocks of whales in the Northern Hemisphere, but there is nothing much to say there. The Ad Hoc Scientific Committee had little to say about it and there was nothing which required special action.

Minimum length of baleen whales as distinct from sperm whales, — again no special recommendations or actions were requested to be taken.

Other Business; <sup>there are points</sup> ~~this was~~ taken up by the Scientific Committee but not included in the Ad Hoc report. There are several paragraphs about the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission. I do not think I need to trouble the Commission very much with the facts. It was simply to say that it does seem worthwhile that the Commission should be represented there by someone who can explain how useful observations could be made in the Indian Ocean. All this part of the report is really in the form of a preliminary brief for anyone who might be interested. <sup>detail</sup> ~~submitted~~

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom) Continued IWC/14/10

Then there is the Permanent Commission of the South Pacific. Here we recommend contacting <sup>and exchange of information</sup> ~~other countries~~ on research which is going on in South America, ~~as well as ourselves~~. I suppose it is a matter of establishing contact at an official level. *on under the same lines as ours.*

Paragraph 36. just means that population studies undertaken by the joint meeting of the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee and special committees are ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> mainly on baleen whales but ~~on~~ sperm whales and are becoming increasingly important, <sup>and</sup> We should like them to be included, if possible, subject to priorities, in the population studies which are going on, and indeed in due course we would like to see all species of economic importance included in these special investigations.

The final paragraphs on 37 and onwards have really been mentioned already. We ~~have~~ a rather heavy programme of meetings for the future and this raises the question of the future of the Scientific Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Dr. Mackintosh.

I think perhaps before we ask for comments or questions we should adjourn for tea.

(The Meeting adjourned at 3.40 p.m. and reconvened at 4.05 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN: Before we broke for tea, we were dealing with Item 15 of the Agenda, Report by the Scientific Committee which was reviewed by Dr. Mackintosh, the Chairman of the Scientific Committee.

I should now like to ask if there are any comments or questions on the Report of the Scientific Committee.

Before I do that, I should point out that it has occurred to me that the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee's Report should be read with and form part of the Scientific Committee's Report because there are a number of references in the Scientific Committee's Report to the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee's Report. Therefore, I think that these two documents must be taken together and become one. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Are there any comments or questions on the Report of the Scientific Committee?

Capt. A.M. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): I should like to put a question to Dr. Mackintosh. The question is whether we have sufficient scientific data on Item 6 of the Scientific Committee's Report, Size limits for Sperm Whales. The last sentence says, "... that a small reduction in the minimum length at land stations in the North West Pacific, say to 33 ft., for an experimental period of not more than 3 years, is acceptable from the biological point of view provided arrangements are enforced which have the effect of ensuring that the total catch of females is not increased as a result of the lower size limit." We are not scientific people but commercial whaling people, and as such we can see that a reduction in the minimum size of sperm whale would result in an increasing number of female catches, but would affect very greatly the sperm whale stock in the North West Pacific.

The CHAIRMAN: I gather that Captain Solyanik would like to know if there is sufficient evidence from the scientific point of view to make the statement contained in the Scientific Committee's Report, the last sentence of Item 6.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I think there is reasonable scientific evidence for what we said as far as it goes. That is to say, where we have a fair amount of information on the stocks and the recent catches, if the minimum length is reduced a little and the catch of sperm whales is also limited - and this implies either a reduction to be made or already made - such that the number of females taken is not increased as a result of the limits to the catch, then we can see no particular objection to it from the biological point of view. It is certainly a point in which purely scientific and technical questions are inevitably mixed because the protection of the females is a scientific question and the limitation of the catch and its effect is a technical question. It is one of those things where it is very difficult to separate the two, but I think we felt there were reasonable grounds for what we said, as far as it goes.

The CHAIRMAN: My understanding of this particular paragraph 6 is that the Scientific Committee are not making any definite recommendations as to what should or should not be done. I was going to suggest in any event, that after we had heard comments or questions on the Scientific Committee's Report, we should not adopt it at this time until we had reviewed the Technical Committee's Report because a number of matters in both Reports are related. Incidentally, the Report of the Technical Committee has now been distributed and is available to the Delegations.

Are there any further questions or comments on the Scientific Report?

Senor V.G. ARNAUD (Argentina): In connection with the Report of the Scientific Committee as regards Item 11 of the Agenda, I should like to state that my Government considers it to be convenient to keep the present size-limits for the sperm whales for the conservation of the species.

The CHAIRMAN: Senor Arnaud from Argentina has made it clear that his Government would prefer to see no change in the Size-limit of sperm whales.

If there are no further comments or questions on the Scientific Report, on behalf of the Commission I should like to thank Dr. Mackintosh and his colleagues for providing the Commission with the Reports, not only of the Scientific Committee but also of the more detailed one, the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee's Report. These two Reports have been most useful to the work of the Commission at this Annual Meeting. Thank you very much, Dr. Mackintosh.

With your permission, I think we should defer the adoption of the Scientific Committee's Report until we have reviewed the Report of the Technical Committee, so we will now revert to Item 14 of the Agenda, Report by the Technical Committee. This Report has been distributed, and I would ask Mr. Engholm, Chairman of the Technical Committee, to review it.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): The Report of the Technical Committee covers a wide variety of topics, the majority of which were referred to the Technical Committee by the last Plenary Session together with one or two additional items on which the Technical Committee thought that they should make some comments and recommendations to the Commission.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, what I would like to suggest is that instead of reviewing the document as a whole we might take each of the subjects one by one together with the recommendations relating to each subject so that, perhaps, the discussion does not become confused between the different topics. If you agree, I would then deal, seriatim, with each point allowing time for discussion and conclusions by the Commission on the individual recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is a very good procedure.

Mr. B.E. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): The first Item is the Report of the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee. There is no recommendation from the Technical Committee. We took their views into account when considering the various items dealt with later on in the Report, and I do not, therefore, think, that there is any action which the Commission need take on this particular item.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): The next Item is that of Infractions. We set up a sub-committee in the usual way, of which Mr. Blaney acted as the Chairman. I am sure that the Technical Committee would like me to say on their behalf how much we are indebted to him and his colleagues for their Report.

We have drawn attention to two things in connection with infractions. First of all, we have noted that the general percentage of infractions has decreased and stated that we hoped this downward trend will continue. We then go on to draw attention in the paragraph at the top of page 2 to two points, one relating to artificial fenders and another relating to the use of radio beacons on which the Soviet and Japanese Delegates respectively have been good enough to say they would let the Commission have some material as to what was happening.

At the end of that paragraph, you will see that the Committee suggest that the Commission should draw the attention of contracting governments to the availability of this information in case they should wish to have it for their whaling companies. This is the first of the recommendations or suggestions on this point which the Committee has put forward. The second is that contained in the last paragraph where the Committee, again, would like the Commission to remind contracting governments of the importance of infractions reports reaching the Secretary early and in sufficient time for the necessary summary to be made.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no comments on paragraphs 4 of the Technical Committee's Report, is it agreed? (Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): The next Item is the question of the word 'aboriginies' which is the Plenary Agenda Item 18(b). Here, after discussion, the Committee felt that it would be advisable for no decision to be taken amending paragraph 2 until the next Annual Meeting. However, as you will see, at the end of the paragraph, they recommend three things: first, that Denmark and any other interested countries should be asked to provide the Commission with an estimate of the effect on gray and right whales if the species were taken for consumption locally as human and animal food rather than being confined to local consumption by aborigines; secondly, we have suggested the Scientific Committee should be asked to consider the effect if the use of the product of these whales were to be widened in this way; and, thirdly, we have suggested that in the light of this information the Secretary should be asked to draft a suitable amendment to paragraph 2 for the consideration of the Commission at its next Meeting in 1963.



The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments or questions on paragraph 5 of the Technical Committee's Report?

Dr. A. REMINGTON KELLOG (U.S.A.): As Chairman of the International Conference which drafted the 1946 Convention, I would say that the term 'aborigines' used in that Report did not cover any other type of people except the original inhabitants, eskimos, the Northern Indians and the Chukatas. That was the original intention.

The CHAIRMAN: Of course, this proposal of the Technical Committee is merely to look into this question and to study it. There will then be a Report, presumably, at the next Annual Meeting of the Commission. As Mr. Engholm has pointed out, there is no definitive action to be taken at this Annual Meeting other than on the suggestions contained in paragraph 5 of the Technical Committee's Report. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): The next paragraph deals with the question of the sanctuary, which is plenary Agenda Item, item 18(c). Here the Committee considered that the sanctuary should remain open and recommended accordingly. They felt that of the two amendments which have been put on the Schedule, the first - which suggests that paragraph 5 of the Schedule should be rendered inoperative until the Commission decides otherwise - was the preferable one since this would enable the Commission to revise its view at an earlier date than 1965 if, as a result of the Committee of Three, it was decided that the sanctuary ought to be closed next year.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments on paragraph 6? You have a specific recommendation in this connection, that the sanctuary remain open until otherwise decided by the Commission. In other words, there is flexibility in this proposal in that the Commission can review this again next year. This will require a consequential resolution to amend the Schedule. In other words, the sanctuary should remain open until the Commission decides otherwise.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): As the United Kingdom Commissioner in this case, could I move that the words in the square brackets at the end of paragraph 5 of the Schedule - "This article, as the result of the seventh meeting at Moscow, was rendered inoperative for a period of three years from 8th November, 1955, and as a result of the ninth meeting in London was rendered inoperative for a further period from 8th November, 1958, and again as a result of the eleventh meeting in London was rendered inoperative for a period of three years from 8th November, 1959" - should be added to in this way, "and again as a result of the fourteenth meeting was rendered inoperative until the Commission otherwise decides."

- 34 -

The CHAIRMAN: This is the effective action moved by Mr. Engholm in his capacity as the United Kingdom Commissioner. Is there a seconder to this Motion to amend paragraph 5 of the Schedule as outlined by Mr. Engholm? (Seconded by Mr. Setter.) (Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): The next item was that relating to the opening date and length of the Antarctic baleen whaling Season. After discussion, the Commission recommend that the present dates for the season, namely from 12th December to 7th April, should remain unchanged.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the view of the Technical Committee on paragraph 7, the opening date and length of the Antarctic baleen whaling season. It is proposed by the Technical Committee that there be no change from the present dates listed in the Schedule 12th December to 7th April. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): The next item deals with the Blue whale unit catch limit in the Antarctic. The Committee, after full discussion, recommend that there should be no change in the limit of 15,000 blue whale units, which will automatically come into force for this coming season as a result of the termination of the period of suspension on which the Commission agreed earlier. This recommendation was made by the Committee with a reservation by the New Zealand Delegation. The Committee also stressed in this connection the importance of the Report of the Special Scientific Committee which should be completed before the Commission's Meeting in 1963, so that this matter could then be taken up again. In this connection they also stress that they hope the Antarctic whaling countries who have not yet paid their contributions to the Extra-Ordinary Budget should do so very soon so that the Committee of Three can get on with their work.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments or observations on paragraph 8 of the Technical Committee's Report relating to the fact that the total blue whale catch limit in the Antarctic will now automatically revert to 15,000?

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): On behalf of our Delegation, I should like to express in this Plenary Session our regret that the Commission has not yet found the courage to grasp the nettle of taking the action which is required in this connection, but notes the action which the majority of the Commission wishes to take.

The CHAIRMAN: That will be a matter of record.

- 35 -

May I then ask if the Commission is in agreement with the proposal of the Technical Committee as outlined in paragraph 8 with the reservation proposed by the New Zealand Delegation which will go into the record?  
(Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): The next item deals with the protection of blue and humpback whales and covers two points. The first paragraph deals with the suggestion that further protection should be given to blue whales, but the majority of the Committee considered that it would be undesirable to make any change at this Meeting, and that it would be better to wait until the results of the special studies by the Committee of Three are available. The Committee therefore recommends that on this point no action should be taken at this Meeting, although this was subject to a reservation by the United States Delegate.

The second point which is dealt with is that in the last three paragraphs of this particular item. It deals with the position which has arisen in connection with the objections which have been made by Japan, Norway, the United Kingdom and the USSR to the amendments made by the Commission at its Twelfth Meeting to paragraphs 6(2) (b), 6(3) (a) and 7(a) of the Schedule, which are the ones that had the effect of shortening the blue whale season by advancing the date from 1st February to 14th February and in the case of humpbacks of shortening the season in Antarctic Area V from four to three days and prohibiting the taking of humpbacks altogether in Area IV. It was not possible to secure agreement on the withdrawal of the objection and, therefore, after a full discussion the Committee made two recommendations which are contained in the paragraph at the top of page 4. The first of the recommendations which was made unanimously was that, "the Commission should request the Antarctic whaling countries which have lodged objections to the blue whale and humpback amendments to reconsider their position". The second of the recommendations was, "the Commission should pass a resolution agreeing to permit the Netherlands Government to lodge, within 90 days from the date of their re-accession to the Convention on 4th May, 1962, objections, if they so desire, to the amendments on the blue whale season and on humpbacks made to Paragraphs 6(2) (b), 6(3) (a) and 7 (a) of the Schedule by the Commission at the Twelfth Meeting." On this second recommendation, the Australian, New Zealand and United States Delegates reserved their position.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments on paragraph 9 of the Technical Committee's Report?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I should like to raise a point in connection with part 2 of the third paragraph of that section, dealing with the Resolution which would permit the Netherlands to lodge an objection to those amendments to the Schedule. Have we as yet received any legal advice on this matter?

Mr. J. GRAHAM (United Kingdom): Perhaps I could speak in my capacity as assistant to the Vice-Chairman rather than a member of the United Kingdom Delegation. When I spoke to the Commission's legal adviser on this question, his view was that if the Commission as a whole were agreed on a course of action which involved some amendment

- 36 -

to the Schedule, then a certain lack of formality would not matter, as in the case of some of the amendments which have been made and, such as the one we have just had today with regard to suspending the operation of the sanctuary for a few more years. On the other hand, he was bound to say that if a government chose to insist that it would not recognise an amendment which was not formally made in accordance with the Rules of Procedure and in accordance with the formal provisions of the Convention, then that government would be entitled to object to such a procedure. The matter is, therefore, left in the hands of the Commission.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): In view of that advice, I would like to state on behalf of Australia that if the Commission decides to accept this proposal we will go along with it.

Dr. A. REMINGTON KELLOGG (U.S.A.): I think the United States would have to reserve their position on that.

The CHAIRMAN: This will require a formal Motion, a Resolution. On the basis of the Report of the Technical Committee, perhaps I could frame a Resolution for presentation to the Commission. "The Commission resolved at its 14th Annual Meeting to agree to permit the Netherlands Government to lodge, within 90 days from the date of their re-accession to the Convention on 4th May 1962, objections, if they so desire, to the amendments on the blue whale season and on humpbacks made to paragraphs 6(2)(b) 6(3)(a) and 7(a) of the Schedule by the Commission at the 12th Meeting." That would be the sort of Resolution we could have. May I have a Mover? (Moved by Dr. Sprules, Canada, and seconded by Mr. Fujita, Japan) We will take a poll on this Resolution.

The SECRETARY: In taking the poll, I will ask for the answer 'yes' from those who approve the Resolution, 'no' from those who do not, and 'abstain' from those who do not wish to vote. I shall go round in alphabetical order.

Argentina	Yes.
Australia	Yes.
Brazil	Not present.
Canada	Yes.
Denmark	Yes.
France	Abstain.
Iceland	Not present.
Japan	Yes.
Mexico	Abstain.
Netherlands	Yes.
New Zealand	Abstain.
Norway	Yes.
Panama	Not present.
South Africa	Yes.
Sweden	Yes.
USSR	Yes.
USA	Abstain.
United Kingdom	Yes.

We have 11 for the Resolution and 4 abstentions. The Resolution is therefore carried.

- 37 -

The CHAIRMAN: We will now proceed with paragraph 10.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): Do I take it that the Commission agrees with the other parts of paragraph 9? (Agreed)

Item 10 was the question of the minimum size limit for sperm whales. Here we had a very full discussion, but it was felt by the majority of the Committee that the evidence really was not sufficiently comprehensive to justify our recommending that there should be a specific change at this Commission Meeting. The Committee, therefore, recommended that the Scientific Committee should be asked to make a further study before the next Meeting of the Commission of the scientific evidence of the effects of reducing the minimum size of sperm whales, and they would like this done not only in relation to land stations but also for factory ships, and not only in relation to the North Pacific but elsewhere. They suggested that as far as the North Pacific was concerned, this might perhaps be undertaken by the Working Group from Canada, Japan, United States and the USSR, which the Scientific Committee have recommended should be set up.

The Committee also recommended that Contracting Governments, if they so wished, should provide the Secretary before the next Commission Meeting with any economic reasons why they considered that a reduction in the minimum size of sperm whales, either generally or in relation to specific areas or specific operations, was necessary. The Committee considered that this material, both from the scientific and the economic sides, should be made available in sufficient time before the 1963 Meeting to enable the Commission to reach a decision on this matter, since it has already been before the Commission on two occasions, and it was felt that it was time that a definitive conclusion was reached.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the review of paragraph 10 of the Technical Committee Report. If there are no questions or comments, may I take it that the proposals made by the Technical Committee are acceptable to the Commission, and that paragraph 10 is agreed? (Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): The next item deals with the minimum length for baleen whales. The Committee considered this in the light of the scientific evidence from the Scientific Committee, and they endorsed the views of the Scientific Committee that the present minimum for baleen whales should be retained.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no questions on paragraph 11, of the Technical Committee's Report, are you prepared to agree to it? (Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): The next item relates to the point raised by the Canadian Delegation in the Plenary Session, the suggested review of the Schedule and the Convention to clarify certain points of interpretation. The Committee felt on the whole that a review

such as has been suggested would be difficult unless some guidance were given to the legal advisers. They felt, therefore, that it might be preferable to recommend that any Contracting Government which had doubts about the legal interpretation of the Convention or the Schedule should seek through the Secretary of the Commission, the opinion of the Commission's legal adviser. In the light of the Commission's legal adviser's ruling it would then be open to the Contracting Government if it wished to do so, to put forward proposals for amendment of the Convention or of the Schedule so as to clarify it, and these could be considered by the Commission at its next meeting in 1963.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments on paragraph 12 of the Committee's Report?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): This suggestion is quite satisfactory to the Canadian Delegation. It gives us a procedure to follow, and we can bring these specific points we have in mind to the attention of the Secretary by correspondence later on.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to accept paragraph 12 of the Committee's Report? (Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): The last item was one which was not referred to us but one on which we thought we ought to make some comments to the Commission. This is the question of the time at which scientific advice is available to the Commission, and in particular, to the Technical Committee. We found that on a number of the items which we were considering, we were unable to get ahead with our work until we had received the views of the Scientific Committee which in its turn was considering the Report of the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee. We felt that this led to a delay in the work of the Technical Committee and so held up the work of the Commission itself. The Committee wanted, therefore, to suggest the scientific work of the Commission should be re-organised within the Rules of Procedure so that the final scientific advice on the items in the Commission's Agenda was available at the beginning of the week in which the Commission meets. I have noted that this is also the view of the Scientific Committee, and I should draw your attention to the fact that at your suggestion the specific proposals for re-organising the machinery were referred to the Finance and Administration Committee which has some comments in its Report on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Under paragraph 13 it would seem to me that the principle is quite acceptable as reported by the Technical Committee, and this will, as Mr. Engholm has pointed out, come up in connection with the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee. Are we agreed on the principle outlined in paragraph 13 of the Report? (Agreed)

We have covered the Report unless there are any further comments.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I wonder if we could return to paragraph 7 of the Technical Committee's Report. In the first line of paragraph 7, it says, "The Committee noted that the length of the season is now the limiting factor ....". I think the consideration in the scientific meetings and in the report was that this was "a" limiting factor. I wonder if the Chairman of the Committee would be prepared to amend this word.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): I would say that this was either an error by myself in writing this or a typographical error, but I am sure that we meant "a" limiting factor rather than 'the' limiting factor; I am sure the Committee feels quite content with that change.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that that small correction be made to paragraph 7? (Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): Would you like me to formally move the adoption of the whole of the Report?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. Then, following that we should have some formal Motion to adopt the Report of the Scientific Committee and also the Report of the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): May I formally move the adoption of the Technical Committee's Report. (Seconded by Dr. Lienesch.)

The CHAIRMAN: Are you agreed to the adoption of the Technical Report and the consequential actions contained therein? (Agreed)

I wonder if we could revert to Item 15 on our Agenda, Report by the Scientific Committee, which we have reviewed and which has been commented upon by Dr. Mackintosh, the Chairman of the Scientific Committee. I should like a motion formally to approve and adopt the Report of the Scientific Committee, and also that of the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee which should form part of the Scientific Committee's Report. (Moved by Mr. Engholm and seconded by Mr. Sjaastad) Are you agreeable to the adoption of the Report of the Scientific Committee? (Agreed)

We now come to Item 16, Report by the Finance and Administration Committee, which has been distributed. I will call again on Mr. Engholm who has been doing a good deal of work this time, as Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee, to give a review of that Report.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): I think it might be convenient if in presenting this Report I were to suggest that the Commission might care to look at it in two halves.

The Finance and Administration Committee, first of all, considered the budgets for the year ending 31st May 1962 - that is to say, the past year - and you will see from the sheets attached to the Report that there is, first of all a statement dealing with the income and expenditure account for the year ended 31st May. This is divided into two parts, the ordinary budget and the extra-ordinary budget.

As far as the ordinary budget was concerned, the results of the year enabled a small balance to be realised, but I should draw attention to the fact that the only reason this was possible was that the special scientific investigation was not able to proceed in this last year owing to the fact that funds were not available in the extra-ordinary budget. This meant that, whereas we had originally budgeted for something like £850 for this item, in fact, no expenditure was incurred. But had the scientific work proceeded the results of last year would have shown a small deficit rather than a small credit balance. As it was, we managed to get away with a small balance of just under £400 being the excess of income over expenditure. As far as the extra-ordinary budget was concerned, here again the position was that, as a result of the fact that the full contributions from the five Antarctic whaling countries were not available, the work could not proceed, and only a very small amount of expenditure was incurred primarily in connection with the travelling and subsistence expenditure of the Chairman of the Committee of Three and in connection with certain printing and date forms. The result was that there was a fairly large balance left over in the extra-ordinary budget since the contribution from Japan was not fully utilised.

The Finance and Administration Committee therefore recommend that the Income and Expenditure Account for the year ended 31st May 1962 - both parts, the ordinary and extra-ordinary budgets - should be adopted by the Commission.

The second sheet attached to the Report deals with the Balance Sheet as at 31st May 1962. You will see here that as far the Balance Sheet was concerned there was a credit balance on 1st June 1961 of just over £1,000, and that if one adds to this a small credit balance of £400 which comes from the ordinary budget there is a favourable balance on the ordinary budget of something under £1,500, but this is a paper balance - and I would stress the point that it is a paper balance - because, in effect certain countries are in arrears with their contributions, and the actual cash balance available is very much smaller on the ordinary budget account; it amounts only to a matter of about £200.

As far as the extra-ordinary budget is concerned, there again, as I have explained, there was a credit balance of £1,783.14s.1d. which has been incorporated in the Balance Sheet. This gives a fairly favourable picture as far as the cash available for the Commission is concerned. Bearing in mind that we shall be coming on to the budget for next year, I hope that Commissioners will not be deceived by this. It is brought about largely because the scientific work contemplated for the Commission last year by the Committee of Three could not, in fact, be carried out. Therefore, I think it might be convenient if, at this stage, I were merely to comment on the two points which the Committee have drawn to the attention of the Commission arising out of their consideration of these two items.



- 41 -

The first was that the Committee wished to draw the Commission's attention to the fact that the Argentine Government was two years in arrears with its annual contributions and that the Government of Panama was virtually in the same position. The Committee, therefore, felt that they should recommend to the Commission that a strong letter should be sent on behalf of the Commission to these two Governments pointing out that they are two years in arrears with their subscriptions, and that this was a serious hindrance to the work of the Commission, suggesting that they should meet their past obligations in the very near future and, moreover, that they should pay their contributions as they fell due.

/Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (continuing) :  
The Committee also noted .....

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM: The Committee also noted that Brazil was one year in arrears. They would like to suggest to the Commission that a letter should be sent to the Brazilian Government on behalf of the Commission reminding her of her obligations and asking for payment of her arrears in the very near future.

The second point to which the Committee wish to draw the Commission's attention was that on the Extraordinary Budget during the year under review only Japan had paid her contribution. Subsequent to the year, that is to say after May 31st, the United Kingdom and Norway have made their contributions to the Extraordinary Budget. The Committee felt that the Commission should be asked to draw the attention of the remaining two countries - the Netherlands and USSR - to the fact that their contributions had not yet been received and that the Commission should ask those countries to pay as quickly as possible. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it would be desirable for me to pause at this stage and, if you agree, to move formally the adoption of the Income and Expenditure Account for the year ending May 31st, 1962, and also the adoption of the provisional Balance Sheet as at 31st May, 1962 before passing on to the budget for next year.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Engholm. Mr. Engholm has moved formally the adoption of the Balance Sheets as presented in the Finance and Administration Committee's report. (Mr. Setter, Australia, seconded the adoption of the Balance Sheets)

We are only dealing with the Balance Sheets at the moment. We will return to further comments as pointed out by Mr. Engholm in the body of the Finance and Administration Committee's report.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): There is just a small point, the reference here was May 3rd. It should be May 31st, should it not?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes it should be May 31st.

The SECRETARY: There is a correction on the second line of the third paragraph and the heading.

The CHAIRMAN: The heading of paragraph 3 should read, "Budget for year ending May 31st, 1962", and then on the second line, "The Committee considered the provisional statement of Income and Expenditure for the financial year ending May 31st, 1962". They were typographical errors.

You have heard the motion to adopt formally the Balance Sheets as presented and reviewed by the Finance and Administration Committee.  
(Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): Would you now wish the Commission to take cognisance of the two points made by the Committee at the bottom of page 1?

The CHAIRMAN: I think so. I think we should deal with parts 1 and 2 of paragraph 3 of the Committee's report.

Senor V.G. ARNAUD (Argentina): With reference to the outstanding contributions from the Argentine Government to the Commission for the financial year 1961 and 1961-62. I am sorry to say that up to the moment we have not received the remittance from Buenos Aires but we have been in touch with our Government. A very early settlement of this matter has been promised and we are expecting a remittance at any moment.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Are there any further comments?

Capt. A.N. SOLYANIK: There is another typographical error on the third sheet of the Ordinary Budget. It says 'rest'. It should say 'rent'.

The CHAIRMAN: It says 'rest of Secretary'. That is what he has been doing all the time. I would not change the word, but it should be rent. Thank you Captain Solyanik. Are there any further comments on paragraph 3? If there are no further comments, you may proceed, Mr. Engholm.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): Section 4 of the report deals with the Estimated Income and Expenditure for the coming year ending May 31st, 1963. The Commission will see that the revised estimate of income and expenditure is set out in the third sheet attached to the Finance and Administration Committee's report.

The CHAIRMAN: The restful document.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): This again is divided into two halves, the Ordinary Budget and the Extraordinary Budget. In the case of the Ordinary Budget the Committee felt that on the expenditure side there should be two changes in the original estimates put forward by the Secretary. These are set out under I and II on page 2 of the Finance and Administration Committee's report. The first of these relates to the employer's contributions in respect of the Secretary for National Health and Pension Schemes. The Secretary himself defrayed the employer's contribution in respect of these

schemes last year, and the Commission's accountants drew the Commission's attention to this. They said that in their view the Commission should be responsible for such payments. The Committee, therefore, recommended that the Secretary should be reimbursed for the 1961-62 payment and that the Commission should henceforth bear these payments themselves. This results in the insertion in the expenditure side of the Ordinary Budget of a figure of £68 12s.6d. in respect of the employer's contribution for 1961-62 and 1962-63.

The CHAIRMAN: May we pause there and clear that one up?

You have heard part I of paragraph 4. Is it agreed that the proposals in part I of paragraph 4 be adopted by the Commission? (Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): The second point on which the Committee recommended that a change should be made in the preliminary estimates relates to the item dealing with the contribution by the Commission as a whole towards the expenses of the special Ad Hoc Scientific Committee.

You will remember that the Commission decided last year that it was appropriate for the Commission as a whole to bear a part of the expenditure for the special Ad Hoc scientific work. The figure which had been inserted before was £850 which had been previously calculated on the general basis of £50 per member country. At that time we were 17 members, and hence a figure of £850. With the re-accession of the Netherlands, the membership is increased to 18 and the Committee, therefore, thinks that the Commission's contribution as a whole towards this work should be increased from £850 to £900. This item has been changed in the expenditure side of the account.

These two changes together with the other items on the expenditure side result in a total estimated expenditure of £4,818 12s.6d. Turning to the income side of the account, the original estimates put forward by the Secretary were naturally based on the present rate of contribution from member governments of £250 per annum which would have given an income of £4,500. This would have resulted in a deficit between income and expenditure for the year of approximately £300 even on the assumption that all contributions were promptly paid, an assumption which, perhaps, we cannot really make in practice. It is perfectly true that this deficit would on paper have been covered by the estimated balance in hand on the Ordinary Budget of £1,436. This is the balance which is on the balance sheet you have just adopted showing the figure of the balance in the Ordinary Budget on 31st May, 1962. This is on the second sheet of the paper which is attached to this document. That balance would, of course, have covered a deficit, but here again the balance is a paper balance, because owing to arrears in contributions the actual balance in hand only amounts to a cash figure of £194 which would not have been sufficient to meet the deficit which would have resulted from maintaining the contributions at the present rate of £250. The Finance Committee considered this to be a very unsatisfactory situation for a major international commission of this kind. They feel that the income of the Commission in any one year ought normally to cover the contemplated expenditure in that year without having to rely upon any small reserve balance which might be available which they considered ought to be kept for emergencies, so

that if anything should arise unexpectedly during the year the Commission would not get into the red. Moreover, the Committee feel that on the whole the Commission should budget for a small credit balance to cater for possible unforeseen increases in scientific work or other work which might arise during the course of the year. The Committee bore in mind that at last year's Meeting of the Commission the Commission asked all member governments to consider favourably before this year's Meeting an increase in the contribution of £50, that is to say, raising the contribution from £250 to £300. The Committee recommend that in the light of the Commission's present financial position the Commission should now decide that contributions from member governments should forthwith be increased from £250 to £300. The estimated income and expenditure account on the Ordinary Budget was therefore revised as you will see in this sheet to contemplate a contribution of £300 each from the 18 contracting governments which would give an income of £5,400, an increase of £900. This again is on the basis that all contributions are promptly paid up. This would enable the forecast expenditure for the coming year to be covered by income and would also result in a slightly improved cash balance and a slightly improved paper balance estimated at 31st May, 1963. You will see that the paper balance on these figures at 31st May, 1963 is estimated at just over £2,000. However, here again if there still remain arrears of contributions at that time, the actual cash balance will be very much less than that £2,000.

The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Commission should decide to increase the contribution for ordinary budget purposes to £300. I think perhaps I should pause there.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Engholm. Are there any comments or observations on the proposals reviewed by Mr. Engholm as contained in the report of the Finance and Administration Committee.

Mr. R. NYSTROM (Sweden): I have not been instructed to vote for the increase of £50 so I cannot vote right now. I have to refer this question to my Government. I reserve my position.

Mr. O.J. la GRANGE (South Africa): I am in the same position.

Senor R. VALENZUELA (Mexico): I am in the same position.

The CHAIRMAN: With the reservations by Sweden, Mexico and South Africa, may I ask the Commission if it is in complete agreement with the proposals listed in the report of the Finance and Administration Committee in regard to the Ordinary Budget? This will mean a recommended increase in countries' contributions from £250 a year to £300. (Agreed)

IWC/14/10

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): I shall now pass on to deal with the Extraordinary Budget. In the case of the Extraordinary Budget the Committee reviewed the expenditure which was listed in the preliminary estimates provided by the Secretary. They felt it could be reduced by £150 having regard to the fact that some of this work had already been done and the expenditure had already been incurred and accounted for in the Extraordinary Budget of last year. They have, therefore, reduced that figure to £2,450. This gives an estimated expenditure on the Extraordinary Budget of £6,000. As you will see, the special contribution from the 4 countries together with the balance of the Japanese contribution, which is left over from last year, will give an income just sufficient to cover the estimated expenditure of £6,300. The estimated income from these various sources to which I have referred is £6,306 4s.1d. This gives an estimated credit balance at the end of the year of the year of £6 4s.1d. In other words, the contribution will only just cover the estimated expenditure. The Committee recommends that the Commission should approve the Extraordinary Budget on the revised basis.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments on the Extraordinary Budget? Is it agreed then that the report of the Finance and Administration Committee in connection with the Extraordinary Budget as outlined in its report be adopted by the Commission? (Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM: The next paragraph deals with the next Meeting of the Commission. The Committee took note of the fact that no invitation had been received prior to the present Meeting of the Commission for the Commission to meet elsewhere than in London in 1963. Therefore, in accordance with the rules of procedure, next year's Meeting will take place in London. The Committee decided to recommend that it should be held once again in these buildings, 10 Carlton House Terrace, and that the Meeting should be held in the first week of July, July 1st to July 6th. Nevertheless, the Committee felt that they ought to draw the Commission's attention to the fact that next year's Meeting will be the fifth Meeting in succession which the Commission have met in London. I think it is the longest period of time which the Commission has met consecutively in London. Under Rule 17 of the Rules of Procedure it is suggested that the Commission may decide that once in three years the Annual Meeting may be held at such other places than London as the Commission may determine. The Committee felt that it would be desirable that in 1964 the Meeting should take place elsewhere than in London. If this is going to happen in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, this would mean that official invitations to hold the Meeting elsewhere would have to be received by the Commission before its Meeting next year.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Engholm. Are there any questions or comments on paragraph 5 of the Committee's Report. May we take it that that is agreed? (Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): The last item relates to the machinery for providing scientific advice. It was requested that we should consider this. We have had a look at the position, and we feel that there was really no need for an Ad Hoc Scientific Committee as well as a Scientific Committee. You will remember that Rule 18 of the Rules of Procedure requires the Commission to establish a Scientific Committee each year. I think that the presumption from that Rule is that this Committee remains in being until the next Meeting of the Commission at which a new Scientific Committee is elected.

That Rule also requires the Scientific Committee to review all current scientific and statistical information, as well as other scientific matters, and to undertake any scientific work referred to it by the Commission and to make reports and recommendations to the Commission. The Committee felt, therefore, that there was no need for any Committee other than the Scientific Committee established at each of the Commission's Meetings.

It also felt that in order that the work of the Commission should not be delayed the findings of the Scientific Committee on the items on the Commission's Agenda should be available to the Commission at the beginning of their work's Meetings. The Committee therefore suggest that the Scientific Committee which is constituted at the Commissions' Meeting each year should meet in the week before the next Meeting of the Commission in order to consider the items of the Agenda and to report the scientific findings to the Commission. If this is adopted, the Scientific Committee which was constituted at this Meeting will remain in being and will meet the week before the Commission meets in 1963 in order to review the items of the Agenda and review any other scientific matters arising during the course of the year so that they can report to the Commission on them before the Commission meets so that the evidence is available from the beginning of the week.

The CHAIRMAN: As you will recollect, the question of the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee and the Scientific Committee was touched on in the Technical Committee's Report and also in the Report of the Scientific Committee itself. Now the Finance and Administration Committee has proposed a procedure or the mechanics for working out this arrangement. Are there any comments or proposals?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I think this Scientific Committee itself hoped that some such arrangement should be made, but may we be clear about the people who will attend the Committee Meeting next year? It will presumably not be confined merely to the people personally nominated at this Meeting, because several of the more experienced scientists who have attended Meetings whenever they could in the past are not here. For instance, we have no one from Norway at all. Presumably something can be provided to allow for that.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman will appoint the Norwegian scientist to the Committee. That is Professor Rud.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): May I speak to this point? I have noticed that in the Convention itself under Article III, paragraph 4, it says that Committees set up are set up from among the members of the Commission and experts and advisers, so I think that there is a legal backing for the appointed members of the new Scientific Committee to bring along any experts and advisers whom they would wish to have at that Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: That is correct. In other words, any Commissioner is entitled to attend any of the Meetings and to be accompanied by experts and advisers if he so wishes.

The Scientific Committee, under the arrangement which is proposed, has the right to form working parties or sub-committees of its own to get assignments completed. I think that should be understood.

Gentlemen, you have these proposals for a procedure for the Scientific Committee. Are you agreed on them?  
(Agreed) I believe that now completes the Report.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): It does.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Engholm.

Senor V.G. ARNAUD (Argentina): I am a little late, but I should like to add the reservation of the Argentine to the increased contributions until I have received my instructions.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, very much, we will take note of that.

May we have a formal resolution for the adoption of the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee?

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): I would like to move the adoption of the Finance and Administration Committee's Report and its consequential action. (Seconded by Mr. Sukhoruchenko, USSR)

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee be adopted? (Agreed)

We have completed Item 16 on our Agenda. There remain a few more items to go through before we conclude this Annual Meeting. It is now almost 5.30 p.m. and I would like to suggest, for the consideration of the Commission, that we adjourn now and reconvene for our final Plenary Session at 9.30 a.m. tomorrow. (Agreed)

(The Meeting adjourned at 5.30 p.m.)



INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

FOURTEENTH MEETING

Session of Friday, 6th July, 1962.

In the Chair: Mr. G. R. Clark (Canada)

The CHAIRMAN: Will the Third Plenary Session of the Commission come to order.

You have before you the Verbatim Report of the Session of 5th July, which has been distributed, IWC/14/10. If there are any corrections or changes to be made I would ask you to refer them to the Secretary and a final document will be distributed.

You will recall yesterday that I expressed with considerable regret the resignation as Vice-Chairman of the Commission of Mr. Engholm, and I suggested that we should give consideration at this Plenary Session, which I expect will be the final one, to the appointment of a Vice-Chairman of the Commission for the ensuing year in order to finish the term of Mr. Engholm. The election of officers of the Commission, of course, will come up at the end of the 1963 Meeting. I hope that you have been able to give consideration to this matter, and I should now like to ask for nominations for the position of Vice-Chairman for the ensuing year.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): I should like to propose to succeed me as Vice-Chairman the Soviet Commissioner, Mr. Sukhoruchenko. I have particular pleasure in doing this because I recall that it was the Soviet Commissioner who proposed me as Vice-Chairman when I was elected, although it was true that I was out of the room at the time!

I would like to propose Mr. Sukhoruchenko.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan): (Interpretation from Japanese) The Japanese Delegation would like to support the nomination of Mr. Sukhoruchenko which was put forward by Mr. Engholm since we respect him very much and think that he will be a suitable Vice-Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Engholm and seconded by Mr. Fujita that Mr. Sukhoruchenko should be Vice-Chairman. As there are no further nominations it seems that it is your unanimous choice that Mr. Sukhoruchenko should be Vice-Chairman. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Mr. M. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation from Russian) My Delegation and I thank you very much for entrusting me with this duty, and I assure you that I shall do my best to carry this out to the best of my ability.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is one other item to which I think I should draw your attention. You will recall that yesterday we decided that there would be a new procedure for the Scientific Committee of the Commission. I think it might be well to give an opportunity, before we finish our meetings this week, to any Commissioners who might wish to add to the Scientific Committee a member of their Delegation, because you will remember that the procedure in the future is to be that the Scientific Committee will continue in existence until a new Committee is appointed. Therefore, they will presumably be having a meeting in advance of the first Plenary Session of the Commission in 1963. I think yesterday, perhaps, I took some liberty in appointing Professor Ruud to the Committee because Norway did not have a representative. I think it is most important that one of the major whaling countries and such an eminent scientist as Professor Ruud should be on the Scientific Committee.

I should now like to ask if any other Delegations would like to have representation on the Scientific Committee.

Dr. A. Remington KELLOGG (U.S.A.): I should like to add the name of Dr. McHugh to the Scientific Committee because I can never get to it that early.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. McHugh of the United States Delegation will be a member of the Scientific Committee.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I had thought when this was discussed yesterday that your comments in respect of the Norwegian request suggested that you would feel it possible for other countries to add scientists at the time. I take it from what you are saying this morning that in view of the Rules of Procedure governing the work of the Scientific Committee you would wish people to be nominated now. I wondered whether it would be possible to establish some general procedure which, because we are now combining the two Committees, would leave some flexibility: For example, we have a fishing scientist here who was available at the time. We would like to be able to feel that we could ask him to go to the Meeting on our behalf. On the other hand, we cannot say now that we have someone available.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I think that is correct. Under the circumstances I think we can bend the Rules of Procedure a little bit until the machinery really gets into operation. I would suggest that under the circumstances at any time until the meeting of the Scientific Committee next year or any meetings during the interim period if any country member of the Commission wishes to nominate one of its people to the Scientific Committee they should be free to do so by writing to the Secretary so that it will be a matter of record. Is that agreeable? (Agreed)

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): I would have thought that under the Rules of Procedure this would be perfectly possible because Rule 18 says that the Chairman should pole Commissioners to determine if they desire representation on the Scientific Committee. It then goes on to say that the Commissioners shall designate their members, but it does not say when they shall designate their members. I would have thought that as long as the desire is expressed it would be all right.

The CHAIRMAN: Maybe we do not even have to bend the Rules. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

I think we can now turn to our Agenda. Item 17, the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Commission a draft of which was distributed and there is a new page which has been distributed covering, I believe, paragraphs 6-11. The reason why this was done a little later was because information about the catch figures was not available at the time when the draft was first prepared. So you have before you the draft of the Thirteenth Report of the Commission. It is document IWC/14/5.

Are you ready to review the draft, the Thirteenth Report? We shall take it paragraph by paragraph. Paragraph 1.

Mr. C.P. SETTER (New Zealand): Without having any strong views on this matter I should like to draw attention to the fact that this Report, which is the report for the year ending 31st May, 1962, carries a report of the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee which met some time afterwards. I am just wondering whether this is appropriate to include, as we have done in the past I know, a report of a meeting which takes place after the end of the year under review. I think the reason behind this is that some reference to the Antarctic catches review of the previous year is generally included in the Report. I was wondering whether just a short statistical summary of the results of the season would be sufficient for the Report and then keep the Report in the actual year which it covers.

/ The CHAIRMAN: I wonder if....

The CHAIRMAN: I wonder if we could have the Secretary explain the procedure adopted in preparing the Report. In the past what Mr. Setter has stated has been the case, but I think it is a matter of having a document which is reasonably up to date, otherwise you are a year behind, and there are incomplete references to the work which has been done by the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee.

The SECRETARY: You have explained the position, but I would add that the information in this Annual Report depends to a large extent on the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee's Meeting. For several years, that meeting has been much earlier than it has been this year and last year, in fact it occurred during the actual year to which the Report referred, and it gave, of course, an account of the Antarctic catches.

When the time of the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee's meeting was put forward, it went into the next year of the Commission. Nevertheless, it still contained the information which we think it is vital to give in an Annual Report, referring to and including the previous season in the Antarctic. It is contemporary, and it contains information which I felt sure everyone reading this Report would want to see. Therefore, when the meeting was put into the next Commission year, I realised to some extent that it might be regarded as cheating but I thought, nevertheless, in the interests of common sense that I should take the information which was only published in the next Commission year and include it in the previous year. Of course, however, if there are other views I shall do what I can to fulfill them.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): As I pointed out, I have no strong views on this, and I would agree to leave this as it is if that is the wish of the Commission. I am quite happy.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now go through this paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1. (Agreed)

Paragraph 2. (Agreed)

Paragraph 3. (Agreed)

Paragraph 4, the 1961/62 Catch, are there any comments?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): On page 3 of this Report, the third ~~paragraph~~ from the bottom of that page, that is the last-but-one paragraph of that section, the last line gives the figures for South Georgia whaling stations, and the last sentence reads: "In 1960/61 when two companies operated from three land stations the total catch of whales amounted to 24,313 .....", that figure should read 2,317.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you please note that correction. That sentence in the penultimate paragraph of Section 4 should be amended to read, "In 1960/61 when two companies operated from three land stations the total catch of whales amounted to 2,317 .....".

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further changes in Section 4? Are you agreed to that paragraph and section? (Agreed)

Section 5? (Agreed)

Section 6, which is contained in the new sheet which has been distributed. There is a single sheet which refers to Section 6 to 11.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): Could I suggest some correction in the fifth line, ".... the already depleted stocks will sink to a seriously low level..." might be taken to mean that they are not at a seriously low level now. It is a little difficult to find the right words.

The CHAIRMAN: To an even more serious level.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): A critically serious level.

The SECRETARY: You do not mean even more critical, do you?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): To increasingly critical low levels.

The CHAIRMAN: In Section 6, the fifth line, the sentence starting, "If the taking of blue whales continues the catches will become progressively smaller and the already depleted stocks will sink to a seriously low level" should be amended, it is suggested, to read, ".....the depleted stocks will sink to increasingly critical low levels."

Dr. R.H. CLARKE (United Kingdom): May I submit that critical cannot be qualified. They are critical or they are not critical.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): Could you not say, "The position of the already depleted stocks will become even more serious."?

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I might read this sentence again as a corrected version: "If the taking of blue whales continues the catches will become progressively smaller and the already depleted stocks will become even more serious."

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): No, the position of the already depleted stocks .....

The CHAIRMAN: Let us try again. "If the taking of blue whales continues the catches will become progressively smaller and the position of the already depleted stocks will become even more serious." Is that acceptable? (Agreed)

Are there any further changes in Section 6? With the corrections we have just made, is Section 6 agreed? (Agreed)

Section 7, Fin Whales. (Agreed)

Section 8, Humpbacks. (Agreed)

Section 9, Sei Whales.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): There is one correction here, 'division' in line 3 should read 'diversion'.

The CHAIRMAN: With that correction, is Section 9 agreed? (Agreed)

Section 10, any comments?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): It has been suggested to me that the last line of that paragraph should be amended to read "of male sperm whales taken has continued to decline". I am not sure about this though, as I have not thought this out. Thinking about it, it might suggest that both females and males are taken, so I think in the circumstances it is better to leave it as it is.

The CHAIRMAN: Is Section 10 then agreed? (Agreed)

Section 11. Are there any changes or corrections in Section 11? If not, is Section 11 acceptable? (Agreed)

Section 12, North Pacific Stocks. I might point out that the blank on the last line of that Section will be taken care of by the Secretary in the final document. The reference will be to some section of the Scientific Committee's Report. This is a matter of editorial work.

Is Section 12 agreed? (Agreed)

Section 13?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): There is a small typing error at the top of the next page, the third line from the bottom of the first paragraph on the next page has a typographical error, it should read,

null and void", it says 'voild'.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments on Section 13?

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I think Mr. Setter's point about the year is relevant here. Perhaps we ought not to do violence to it where we do not need to. Could we say, "successfully concluded during 1962", after all the Agreement was not signed until June.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, you are right, during 1962 would be better. It was in the new fiscal year. We will amend the first line of that paragraph, the first of Section 13, to read, "Negotiations were successfully concluded during 1962 between the ....".

Is Section 13 agreed? ( Agreed )

/The CHAIRMAN (continuing): .....

The CHAIRMAN: Section 14, is that acceptable? (Agreed)

Section 15. **Are** there any comments?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): On Section 15, in the fourth to last line the last word is 'undersized'. I do not think that this is quite correct because the amendment simply permits the taking of the minimum size. There are two different minimum sizes specified in the Schedule, and I do not think either of these is undersized. I think 'undersized' implies something under the minimum permitted in the Schedule. Could this be changed to "baleen whales down to the lesser size limit as recorded in the Schedule"? They are still not undersized. Perhaps it could be "baleen whales of the smaller size limit".

The CHAIRMAN: In Section 15, the fourth line from the end of that paragraph a few changes are to be made. The sentence starts, "The Commission also amended Paragraphs 9(a) and (b) of the Schedule to permit in the North-east Pacific area during the period 1st April, 1962...." - not 1961 - ".... - 31st March, 1965, ..." and then delete the word 'undersized' so that it would read, "- 31st March, 1965, baleen whales of the lower size limits to be taken for delivery to a land station without the condition that the whales be used for local consumption. No objections to these amendments were received."

Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Section 16. (Agreed)

Section 17. I think that the last sentence in brackets at the end of paragraph 17 should be deleted because we are dealing with the previous year. Is Section 17 agreed? (Agreed)

Section 18. (Agreed)

Section 19. (Agreed)

Section 20. (Agreed)

Section 21. (Agreed)

Section 22. (Agreed)

We have reviewed the Draft 13th Report of the Commission. May I ask for a formal Resolution for its adoption, together with the amendments and corrections we have made. (Moved by Mr. Setter (Australia) and seconded by Dr. Remington Kellogg, (USA))

Is that agreed? (Agreed)

I think that this disposes of Item 17 on our main Agenda. We come now to Item 18.

Item 18(a) was referred to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Observers Scheme. The Resolution adopted as a result of the Report of that Committee, which was discussed yesterday, and amended, under Item 7, should now be approved by the Commission at this point, together with the working papers, minutes and proposals which were considered by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Observers Scheme. These do constitute a record of the discussions of that Committee, and



- 56 -

presumably will be used for reference papers when the representatives of the five countries meet again. Is it agreed that these papers should be attached to the Resolution on the Observer Scheme? (Agreed)

Whilst I am on this subject of the proposed meeting of the representatives of the five Antarctic whaling countries, I think, particularly for the guidance of the Secretary of the Commission, it would be most desirable now to try and set at least a tentative date in August for the meeting of those representatives, and also, in order for the Secretary to have a record of it, I would ask for any specific ideas or invitations as regards where the meeting of the five representatives might be held. Yesterday, you will recall that London was mentioned as a possible meeting place, but the Delegates directly concerned might have some other view. However, I am particularly anxious this morning that we should have at least some idea of the date in August for such a meeting.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): As I said during the meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee, as far as the United Kingdom Delegation is concerned we are prepared to meet at any time during August and we are prepared to meet in any place which anyone would wish to suggest. We would be perfectly willing to arrange for a meeting in London if this were the wish of the other countries concerned, but we would be equally willing if they were to prefer the meeting to be held elsewhere to go to another capital.

As far as the United Kingdom Delegation is concerned, with regard to the date, I was wondering whether, in order to give the representatives of the Soviet Union time to consult their Government, we could aim perhaps at the last week of August which begins 27th August, or somewhere around that date.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been suggested by Mr. Engholm that the target date should be the week of 27th August. He has expressed no preference for the place of meeting, although I should point out to you that since this is a matter for the Commission and the Secretary should be available, if it is outside London it will entail more travelling expenses for the Commission. Is the week of 27th August satisfactory?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan): (Interpretation from Japanese)  
We would like to know if the proposed date is convenient to the Soviet Delegation.

Mr. M. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation from Russian):  
We discussed this question yesterday and we thought that we had taken a decision on this. However, if the Commission decides now that the week beginning 27th August should be the provisional date for such a meeting we have no objections on our part. However, the last word rests with our Government who must decide the final date of this meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: That was what I was trying to find out; I was thinking of fixing a target date to aim at. In fairness to other

Delegates, we must remember that they have other commitments as well. Tentatively the idea is that a provisional date would be the week of 27th August. Is that satisfactory as a tentative date subject to confirmation? (Agreed)

Have you any ideas as to the place of meeting, or would this be subject to correspondence with the Secretary.

Mr. M. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R): (Interpretation from Russian)  
I think it would be better to entrust this matter to the Secretary who would have to correspond with the governments in order finally to decide on the place of the future meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will be in touch with the various Commissioners in order to have the date and place of the meeting confirmed. However, it is important that a decision be taken on this as soon as possible because the other members who will be at the meeting have other commitments.

I think that disposes of Item 18(a) of the Agenda, unless there are further comments.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan): (Interpretation from Japanese)  
Before we move on to another item, we should like to refer to a certain section of document IWC/14/14, the Ad Hoc Committee on the International Observers Scheme, Session of 5th July, 1962. I should like to refer to paragraph 3 which mentions the main items which have been discussed. The second sentence from the bottom of that paragraph states that, "The Commissioner for Japan thought the new United Kingdom plan a compromise and he considered it should be made clear that the Commission should have some control over the appointment and duties of observers." At the end of this sentence I feel that the words, "the number of observers in each expedition should not exceed two." should be inserted. This is a very important point, and I should like something to this effect to be added at the end of this sentence.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to clarify this. I believe I am right in saying that what Mr. Fujita has in mind is that on paragraph 3 of the Session of 5th July, where it says, "... the Commission should have some control over the appointment and duties of observers." we should add a sentence, "Further, that it is important that the number of international observers on each expedition should not exceed two." Is it a total number of observers or international observers to which you are referring?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan): (Interpretation from Japanese)  
We are referring to the total number of observers. In order to avoid a possible misunderstanding, we would like to state that in this Section we do not include the number of national observers who have already been appointed, we are dealing with the international observers.

- 58 -

The CHAIRMAN: You are thinking of the observers appointed by the Commission.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan): (Interpretation from Japanese)  
What we mean is that the number of foreign observers should not exceed two on each expedition.

The CHAIRMAN: You mean that the observers from the non-flag countries should not exceed two on each expedition.

Mr. Fujita has just clarified the remarks he made. The amendment could be that after the words, "....the appointment and duties of observers. the sentence, "The Commissioner for Japan further pointed out that it is important that the number of non-flag observers on each expedition should not exceed two" should be added. Is that satisfactory? (Agreed)  
This will be corrected.

I think that now does dispose of Item(a) on the Agenda. Item 18(b) has been dealt with by the adoption of the Technical Committee's Report. Item 18(c) has been dealt with by the adoption of the Technical and Scientific Committees' Reports and by the Resolution amending Paragraph 5 of the Schedule which we adopted yesterday. There is a lot of complicated wording but it in fact means that it goes on until the Commission decides otherwise. Is that agreeable? (Agreed)

Item 18(d) has been dealt with by the adoption of the Technical and Scientific Committees' Reports.

Item 18(e) has been dealt with by the adoption of the Technical and Scientific Committees' Reports.

That completes Item 18 on the Agenda. Is that agreeable? (Agreed)

Item 19 has been dealt with by the adoption of the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Item 20 on the Agenda, you will recall that last year the Commission agreed that the Chairman and the Secretary should prepare and distribute a Press Release. Is it the wish of the Commission that this same procedure be followed? (Agreed)

Item 21, Any other business, the point raised by the Canadian Delegation regarding the legal interpretation of certain parts of the Convention and the Schedule has been dealt with by the adoption of the Report of the Technical Committee. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Also, under Item 21, Any other business, there has been an invitation to send an Observer from this Commission to the ICES Meeting being held in Copenhagen from 1st October to 10th October. May I suggest that we ask Mr. Aglen to represent the Commission again at the ICES Meeting. If you are agreeable the word will be passed on to him. (Agreed)

- 59 -

On that score, I should like to read to the Commission a letter which I have received from Mr. Aglen in which he says:

"July 5th. . Dear Mr. Clark, I am very sorry that I shall be unable to attend the Plenary Meeting of the Commission this afternoon, and I therefore might not have the opportunity as the Observer from ICES of saying anything to the Commission on behalf of the Council. I should be grateful, therefore, if you would kindly convey to the Commission on my behalf the International Council's appreciation of the opportunity of being represented at the Commission's Meeting. The Council was one of the first to advocate the conservation of marine resources based on scientific evidence and will continue to follow with close interest the activities of the Commission, and the special effort it is making to improve the scientific basis for the conservation of the whale stocks. Yours sincerely, A.J. Aglen"

Under Item 21, the International Council of Scientific Unions has asked the International Whaling Commission if it wishes to be kept informed of the activities of the working group on fisheries set up by SCOR.

I think we should reply to the offer and say that this Commission would like to be kept informed of the activities of the fisheries group under SCOR. Further, there is to be a meeting of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission in Paris this Fall. You will remember that in the Report of the Scientific Committee yesterday it was suggested that the International Whaling Commission should have an Observer present. They proposed Dr. Paul Budker. Is it agreed that Dr. Budker should act as this Commission's Observer and representative at the IOC Meeting in Paris?  
(Agreed)

That is all the other business that I have. Is there anything else under this item of any other business which anyone would like to raise?

Dr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): I should like to take this opportunity of thanking the Commission for their acceptance of the Resolution that gives us the opportunity of being able to be on an equal footing as regards pelagic whaling in the Antarctic.

/The CHAIRMAN: Is there any other ....

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any other business under Item 21? If not, I think we are just about at the conclusion of the Fourteenth Meeting of the Commission. I feel that a good deal of progress has been made, but there is still much to be done. The Fifteenth Meeting of the Commission in 1963 should be a most important one because of decisions which may have to be taken arising from the Report of the Committee of Independent Scientists, that is the Committee of Three which we expect will be available to the Commission before its Fifteenth Meeting. I think I should, on behalf of the Commission, thank the British Government for the facilities which they have provided and for the excellent hospitality, also our Norwegian colleagues for their hospitality the other evening. I think we should also in advance thank our Soviet friends for some hospitality which they are giving to some of us this evening.

I think too that I must record sincere thanks to our Secretary, Mr. Wimpenny for his very valuable service not only during the period of the Annual Meeting but throughout the year. Our special thanks also should go to Miss Kirby who so ably looks after the Commission's business, and to all those who have acted on the Secretariat from, I think, the British Ministry. We are also again very grateful to the machine operators who work these machines and take down everything I say, and to the typists. Our special thanks too should go to Dr. Mackintosh and his colleagues on the Ad Hoc Scientific Committee and the Scientific Committee for the very valuable documents which they have produced for the Commission at this Meeting. They have assisted us so materially in our deliberations. Our thanks too go to Mr. Moroney and Mr. Setter for acting as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Observer Scheme.

I do not think I should by any means attempt to bring this Meeting to a close without expressing again a most sincere regret that Mr. Engholm is leaving this Commission. I think we are very greatly indebted to Mr. Engholm for the contribution he has again made to the work of the Commission as Chairman of the Technical Committee and also as Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee. We regret that he is compelled to leave his Fisheries posts and the Commission. We again are very, very greatly indebted to him for all the things he has done for the work of this Commission, and we do wish him well in his new post in the British Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. I think I might add a little comment here. I think the greatest satisfaction which Mr. Engholm could get from his contribution to the work of this International Whaling Commission would be the conclusion and implementation at a very early date of an Observer Scheme, so you could give that to him and so get on with the job. (Applause).

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for your very kind words. As I have said before, I very sincerely regret that my change of duties in the Ministry will mean that I shall no longer be able to represent the United Kingdom as the UK Commissioner on the Whaling Commission. I equally regret having to give up my post as Vice-Chairman, although I am sure that my successor will deal with this particular job far more ably than I have been able to do. I shall naturally still continue to have an affection for the Whaling Commission and will endeavour to follow its activities from my new sphere, and perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it may be that next year I could come as an observer from the agricultural side.

IWC/14/10

The CHAIRMAN: You are welcome. Mr. Sidney Holt of the Food and Agriculture Organisation has been attending our meetings as an observer and he has been particularly helpful in some of the meetings of the Scientific Ad Hoc Committee and the Scientific Committee. Mr. Holt, we are very pleased that you are here with us and perhaps you might like to say a few words to the Commission at this time.

Mr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Thank you for this opportunity just to convey the greetings of the Organisation which I am representing, and to say how pleased we are to have the chance of following the work of this Commission. We wish to express our hope that the investigations now being undertaken by your scientific advisers will eventually, and perhaps without too much delay, lead to agreements which will result in the fullest possible development and use of the most important whale resources.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we are at about the end of our Annual Meeting of the Commission. I wish to thank all Delegations for their assistance and kindness to me, and I think particularly for their indulgence to me in my peculiar way of carrying on a meeting.

Mr. B.C. ENGHOLM (United Kingdom): Before you bring the Meeting to a close, I am sure that I would be expressing the views of all Commissioners in thanking you for the able and, if I may say so, forceful way in which you have conducted the Meeting. I am sure that without your driving force we should never have been able to finish before the scheduled time. It is my very pleasant duty as perhaps the last function, which I shall have to perform on the Commission, to thank you on behalf of all Commissioners.  
(Applause)

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

There being no further business, the Fourteenth Meeting of the Commission is concluded.

(The Meeting concluded at 11.05 a.m.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

EAST BLOCK, WHITEHALL PLACE, LONDON, S.W.1

Telephone: TRAFALGAR 7711 (Extension 383)

Chairman: G. R. CLARK (Canada)

Vice-Chairman: ~~E. C. Anderson (U.S.A.)~~ **M. Sukheruchenke (U.S.S.R.)**

Secretary: R. S. WIMPENNY.

23rd July, 1962.

AP XIV

Circular Communication to Contracting Governments and Commissioners  
and Advisers Present at the Fourteenth Meeting

Since the Fourteenth Meeting the Secretary has been asked to make a number of corrections to the Verbatim Report (document IWC/14/10). These are listed in the attached corrigenda.

Copies of this circular are being sent to all present at the meeting so far as their addresses are known; where the Secretary does not have the addresses of advisers attending the meeting he is sending additional copies to Commissioners and would be grateful if these could be forwarded as appropriate.

---

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

FOURTEENTH MEETING - VERBATIM RECORD - IWC/14/10

CORRIGENDA

- Page 7 last Paragraph - delete last paragraph and insert "We are ready even now in the course of this meeting, as it was stated in the note of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. dated 20th June 1962, to exchange opinions between the representatives of the five countries engaged in Antarctic pelagic whaling and to come to a preliminary agreement about the date and the procedure of such a conference."
- Page 9 " " - delete last 8 lines and insert "If other members of the present meeting consider our proposals unacceptable, we agree to take part in a discussion of this problem and exchange opinions at the present meeting, but only in a preliminary way, so that the working out of this question in detail would be entrusted to the Governments of the five countries concerned. It is well known that the Soviet Delegation made proposals on this at the 12th and 13th meetings ....."
- Page 10 line 2 - delete "12th and 13th" and insert "13th and 14th."
- " 25 last Paragraph line 2 - delete "by", insert "for".
- " 26 line 1 - delete "would" insert "could".
- " " " 5 - " "and" insert "but".
- " " Paragraph 3 line 6 - after "limits" add "are made".
- " " " " line 25 - delete "effective changing" insert "the effect of changing".
- " " " " line 32 - delete "inaudible" insert "if they are not from a discrete stock where the results can be watched".
- " " " " line 35 - after "problems" insert "such as".
- " 27 Paragraph 2 line 1 - delete "was".
- " " " " line 2 - delete "position" insert "question".
- " " " 5 line 3 - delete "likely to be 7,000 units for blue whales" insert "like 11,000 units for balloon whales".
- " 28 Paragraph 1 line 1 - delete "several".
- " " " 2 line 2 - delete "For that species the fin whale is taken separately" insert "Taking fin whales separately, ...."