

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSIONFIFTEENTH MEETING

Session of Monday, 1st July, 1963.

In the Chair: Mr. M.N. Sukhoruchenko (U.S.S.R.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I should like to call the Meeting to order and to declare the Fifteenth Meeting of the International Whaling Commission open.

Before commencing the business of the Meeting I wish to refer to the sad loss the Commission has suffered by the sudden death in February, 1963 of the late Chairman, Mr. Clark. Mr. Clark had been the Commissioner for Canada since 1951. In 1958 he became Vice-Chairman and Chairman in 1960. Throughout he had been a much respected member of the Commission. Mr. Clark had done much for the Commission's successful work. His great energy and his organisational abilities had made valuable contributions to the Commission's discussions. He was a much liked and respected colleague and a very able Chairman. The memory of Mr. Clark will remain in our hearts for long years to come. I suggest that the Meeting should stand in silence in tribute to the memory of Mr. Clark.

(The Meeting stood in silent tribute)

We are greatly honoured today by the presence of Mr. Brooman-White, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Scotland, at our Meeting. I have great pleasure in inviting Mr. Brooman-White to address the Meeting.

Mr. R.C. BROOMAN-WHITE (Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Scotland): I am extremely pleased to be able to come here this morning in order to welcome you here officially on behalf of Her Majesty's Government. I understand that you have had several previous Meetings of this Commission in London. You are always welcome here. We are glad to see you now and we will be pleased to see you at any future time.

We are all very sad and all deeply regret that the Meeting should start on this unhappy note to which the Chairman has referred of the tragic death of Mr. Clark. I know we in Britain appreciate very much the enormous amount of work which he did and the great contribution he made in helping to solve problems of whaling common to all our countries. I understand he was in Tokyo engaged in just such a job as that in February when he suddenly collapsed and died.

The task of presiding over this Meeting now falls to the Vice-Chairman. May I take this opportunity of wishing him and you every success at the Meeting.

The whale was once regarded as one of the most formidable and awe-inspiring creatures. Today our intelligence and ingenuity has turned it into a virtually defenceless and on occasions rather pathetic animal. It occurred to me that it only regains its superiority after death. When the whale is dead it is worth a lot of money. When we are dead from the commercial point of view we are worth virtually nothing! However, equally we can have a certain fellow feeling for the whale because the same technical ingenuity which has so improved your methods with the brilliance of our scientists when it is applied in the field of armaments as opposed to the field of whaling has placed us in not inconsiderable danger of exterminating ourselves, so perhaps we can at least feel some fellow sympathy for the unfortunate whale.

Mr. R.C. BROOMAN-WHITE (Continued)

In whaling, as in wars, we have found it easier to invent the means of destruction than to call on the necessary self-discipline and devise the necessary international arrangements to keep our power within reasonable bounds. The task of this Meeting has become particularly acute, because the steps this Commission itself has taken in recent years to get full information have produced serious evidence. It seems impossible to defer any longer drastic action to reduce the toll on whale stocks if anything is to be preserved for the future.

Obviously, the more drastic the action we take the more serious the immediate impact on the economic prospects of the whaling fleets of our different countries, but on the other hand, if your action is not drastic enough, it looks as though the future prospects of whaling will become negligible or nil. Speaking in general terms, apart from the economic considerations, the past traditions, the glamour of whaling, all the feeling there is about it, the traditions in which my own country of Scotland has played a considerable role in the past, have led the peoples of countries which have no direct contact with whaling to have personal feelings which would lead everybody to deplore the extinction of a species, or certain branches of a species, which has had such a great role in history and is of such enormous interest to mankind.

I know everyone in Britain will wish you success, and I am sure the whole world will wish you success in this Conference.

I also see from your Agenda that you will be discussing the International Observer Scheme. I am very glad to learn that last week the representatives of the Antarctic Whaling Companies reached agreement on proposals to put before this Commission. I do hope that that is a good omen for your reaching agreement on the greater issues of conservation. I really cannot stress too much the importance we attach to this, and I wish you every success in your deliberations.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Brooman-White, allow me on behalf of the International Whaling Commission to express our great thanks for your kind words and for your wishes of success in the work of the Commission and in my work as Chairman. I think I shall not err if on behalf of everybody present I express our confidence in the progress which the Commission will attain in solving successfully the important problems relating to the conservation of whale stocks and the rationing of whaling. Thank you very much indeed, Mr. Brooman-White, for your kindness and for wishing us success in the work of the Fifteenth Meeting of the International Whaling Commission

I would like to thank you also for the hospitality which we are enjoying, the hospitality of this Government.

I should now ask the Press representatives to leave the Conference room as the Commission's discussions are held in private. The Commission will, as usual, issue a statement to the Press at the end of the Meeting.

I should now like to welcome to our Meeting Mr. Gardner, the Commissioner for the United Kingdom. Mr. Gardner, although he was appointed Commissioner last year, is attending the Commission's Meeting for the first time this year

I should also like to welcome Dr. Sprules of Canada to our Meeting. He has attended Meetings before as an Adviser, but he has now been appointed Commissioner for Canada. I also welcome Mr. Bogstad of Denmark and Mr. Bausch of Sweden who are deputising for their Commissioners for the first time.

I should also like to welcome to our Meeting representatives of countries and international organisations who are attending the Meeting as Observers: Dr. Chapman, Chairman of the Committee of Three Scientists; Mr Holt and Mr. Allen, members of the Committee of Three Scientists, Mr. Holt also representing FAO; Mr Aglen representing ICES; Captain Rivera representing Chile; Commander Pinto Pereria representing Portugal; Mrs. Ramirez and Mr. Aguayo representing the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific; and Mr. Bettum representing the International Association of Whaling Companies.

/The Secretary to the Commission

The CHAIRMAN (Continued)

The Secretary to the Commission has also informed me that the International Society for the Protection of Animals has requested him to place before the Commission a formal request for a representative of the Society to be admitted to the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission as an observer.

I shall now ask Mr. Wimpenny to give the Meeting additional information on this matter.

The SECRETARY: I think the best way I can deal with this subject is to read to you the rather short letter I have received from the International Society for the Protection of Animals.

"Dear Sir,

"The Directors of this international organization have noted with considerable interest the exchange in the House of Commons, concerning the whaling quotas, on the 6th May, and have noted that your Commission is to meet from approximately the 1st to 5th July, to consider this matter.

"In view of the world-wide concern on this question by this Society and its members I should be most grateful if you would place before the Commission the formal request of the International Society for the Protection of Animals to admit its representative as an observer at its deliberations.

"May I say my Directors sincerely trust that this will be possible under the Commission's rules of procedure?

Yours faithfully,

Basil P. Howell, M.B.E.
First Vice-President."

I replied to that letter by saying that I would bring their request to the attention of the Commission and, immediately a decision was reached, I would let them know by telephone so that, in case it was favourable, their representative could attend our Meetings as an observer.

I would only add that I see no particular objection to a representative of this Society attending from the point of view of protocol; nor, indeed, do I think it would be objectionable on any other grounds.

I should be glad, having said those words, to have the decision of the Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I should like to thank Mr. Wimpenny for his explanation and to obtain the views of the Commission on this application. I do not think there is any objection to this, but it depends, of course, on what the Commission would wish. Are there any objections? (Agreed)

We now have to consider the Agenda and the arrangements for the Meeting. I will first ask the Secretary to take a roll call of Delegates and to make announcements about the distribution of Conference documents and general arrangements for the Meeting.

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

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The Agenda is before the Commission. It will be remembered that points involving amendments to the Schedule and recommendations under Article 6 of the Convention cannot be proposed at the Meeting unless already provided for on the Agenda. Items not affecting the Schedule or Article 6 of the Convention can be added at the Meeting, or the order of the items can be changed. As Delegates know, they can also adopt the Agenda without any changes at all.

I should now like to hear your views on the Agenda.

/Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada)

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I am pleased to move the adoption of the Agenda as circulated.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I second that.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The proposal is that the Agenda be adopted. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Before we go on to Item 3, the Secretary would like to say a few words to the Commission.

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

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I should now like to ask you to nominate your members first to the Scientific Committee and then to the Technical Committee. I will call on the Secretary to determine the membership of the Scientific Committee.

The SECRETARY: I will ask for nominations for the Scientific Committee.

Australia	Dr. G.L. Kesteven
Canada	Mr. G.C. Pike
	Dr. W.E. Ricker
Denmark	No member
France	No member
Iceland	No member
Japan	Dr. H. Omura
	Mr. T. Doi
	Mr. Y. Nomura
Netherlands	Prof. E.J. Slijper
New Zealand	No member
Norway	Prof. J.T. Ruud
South Africa	No member
Sweden	No member
U.S.S.R.	Dr. V.A. Arseniev
U.S.A.	Dr. A.R. Kellogg
	Mr. D.W. Rice
United Kingdom	Dr. N.A. Mackintosh
	Mr. J.L. Bannister
	Mr. S.G. Brown
	Mr. J.A. Gulland

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Those are the members of the Scientific Committee.

I will now call on the Secretary to determine the membership of the Technical Committee.

The SECRETARY: In respect of the Technical Committee I think it would be sufficient if we take just the names of the Commissioners. We understand that they are assisted by advisers. I will call out in alphabetical order the countries which wish to be represented on the Technical Committee.

Argentina	No member
Australia	Mr. C.G. Setter and advisers
Canada	Dr. W.M. Sprules
Denmark	Mr. J.C. Bogstad
France	Not present
Iceland	H.E. Mr. H. Sv. Bjornsson
Japan	Mr. I. Fujita
Mexico	Not present
Netherlands	Mr. J.G. de Wit
Norway	Mr. G. Sjaastad
South Africa	Mr. W.A. Horrocks as observer
Sweden	No member
U.S.S.R.	Capt. A.N. Solyanik
U.S.A.	Dr. J.L. McHugh
United Kingdom	Mr. H. Gardner

That, Mr. Chairman, constitutes the Technical Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It is usual for the Chairman to nominate five Commissioners for the Finance and Administration Committee. I shall do it more quickly than the Secretary! The Finance and Administration Committee will consist of five Commissioners. I would like to suggest the following representatives as members of this Committee: Mr. G. Sjaastad, Norway; Mr. R.J. Jermyn, New Zealand; Mr. H. Gardner, United Kingdom; H.E. Mr. H. Sv. Bjornsson, Iceland; and Dr. A.R. Kellogg, U.S.A.

H.E. Mr. H. Sv. BJORNSSON (Iceland): I shall be greatly honoured to serve on the Finance Committee on the understanding that when necessary I can be represented by Mr. Benedikz.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I think we can agree to this. If there are no objections that constitutes the Finance and Administration Committee. (Agreed)

We have covered three very important Items of the Agenda already. We are moving so quickly that I feel there is a danger of our finishing the Meeting today!

On Item 4, Finance and Administration, the Secretary says that it will be the duty of the Finance and Administration Committee to consider the Scientific Committee's Report. I do not think there are any objections to referring the Scientific Committee's Report to the Finance and Administration Committee. Item 4 of the Agenda, Finance and Administration, will be referred then to the Finance and Administration Committee. Have you any objections to this? (Agreed)

The CHAIRMAN (Continued)

Item 5 of the Agenda, The International Observer Scheme. Representatives of the five countries concerned have already attained great progress on this matter. It might be preferable for this matter to be considered further in the Technical Committee before considering it in the Plenary Session. Are there any views on this matter? The document has not yet been completed, therefore the only thing we can do at the present moment is to refer it to the Technical Committee as soon as it is ready. Are there any objections to this? (Agreed)

I will ask you to skip items 6, 7, 8 and 9 and to concentrate on item 10, Size Limits for Sperm Whales. At the last Meeting, the Commission asked for further scientific studies to be made on sperm whales. The Commission asked the contracting governments to submit, before the Fifteenth Meeting, any reasons they saw for a reduction in the minimum length of sperm whales. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the scientific studies will be covered by the reports of the Whaling Group on North Pacific Stocks and the Scientific Committee. I suggest that the Technical Committee be asked to consider the question of size limits for sperm whales in the light of the scientific evidence or economic evidence which might be submitted.

I would ask Commission members to present their views on this.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I suggest that this item should also be referred to the Scientific Committee

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any other proposals? Mr. Setter suggests that this item should be referred both to the Technical Committee and to the Scientific Committee, but the document has already been discussed by the Scientific Committee. Is it agreed that the document should be referred to the Technical Committee? (Agreed)

We come now to item 11, North Pacific Whale Stocks. The Working Group on this, composed of representatives of Canada, Japan, USA and the Soviet Union, was set up at the last Meeting. The Group met in Seattle in December 1962 and also in June 1963 before the Commission's Meeting. The Report of the Working Group has already been circulated. I suggest that any recommendations arising from the Report by the Working Group should be referred to the Technical Committee. Are there any objections to any action arising from the Report by the Working Group being referred to the Technical Committee? The Report of the Working Group has been attached to the Report of the Scientific Committee. As far as I understand, there are no objections to this. If not, then it is considered to be agreed upon. (Agreed)

We come now to item 12, Infractions. It is usual to refer this item to the Technical Committee. Are there any other proposals? If not, it is accepted and we refer item 12 to the Technical Committee (Agreed)

Item 13, Report of the Technical Committee. The Report will be considered after it has been prepared by the Committee, and we will consider it at our last Plenary Session.

Item 14, Report of the Finance and Administration Committee. It seems that this Report will also be considered at the last plenary meeting after it has been prepared.

I suggest that we skip item 15 and that we come to item 16, Amendments of the Schedule. Amendments of the Schedule will also be considered after it has been considered by the Technical Committee. If there are no objections, then we will refer it to the Technical Committee first. (Agreed)

Item 17, Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for a period of three years. We will consider this sad question at the last plenary meeting. Are there any objections? If not, it is agreed (Agreed)

Items 18, 19 and 20 will also be considered at the last plenary meeting. Any objections? (Agreed)

You will see that we have finished the Agenda, and I was right in saying we were going to finish today.

I would like you now to concentrate on item 6 on the Agenda, Review of the previous season's catches. I will ask Mr Vangstein to give the usual review of the previous year's catch.

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN: We are unable this time to present complete statistics respecting the last Antarctic season. This is due to the circumstance that we have not received the necessary particulars from one of the expeditions which engaged in whaling operations in the season 1962/63. However, we have received a statement on the number of whales captured and the production of oil. What we lack are the details about each whale, such as the areas where caught, length, sex and so on. All the tables and surveys of the number of whales captured and the production of oil are complete, but the tables covering the distribution of the catch between the different areas, the average size, etc., comprise only sixteen of the expeditions. Regarding seven of the seventeen expeditions which participated last season, we did not get the catch statistics before 3rd June. Although we use modern machines, we need a certain amount of time to elaborate and write out the different tables and surveys. I must therefore, as so many times earlier, urge the representatives of the governments to see that the statistics from the expeditions are sent in as soon as it is possible. Some countries are also very slow in sending the necessary information about the catch on grounds outside the Antarctic. We did not get the last statements until May of this year, and these related to the catch which was concluded six months earlier. From the three land stations in Peru we have, after much urging, received a statement of the number of sperm whales taken, but unfortunately no particulars regarding each captured whale.

We have prepared a provisional edition of International Whaling Statistics No. 51, which comprises the catch outside the Antarctic in the calendar year 1962. Whaling outside the Antarctic in 1962 was undertaken approximately to the same extent as in the previous year, and I would refer you to the aforementioned statistics for further particulars.

In the operations in the Antarctic, seventeen expeditions took part in the season 1962/1963, that is to say four expeditions less than in the previous season. Norwegian companies sold two factory ships for breaking up in the summer of 1962. One Norwegian factory ship was not sent out on account of the very low prices for whale oil in the summer and autumn of 1962. Finally, a British factory ship was sold to Japan for delivery after the season 1961/62. This did not participate in the operations of 1962/63.

Before the Meeting of the Commission in 1962, the five pelagic countries signed the so-called quota agreement, which holds good until and including the season 1965/66. Whaling last season was carried out in conformity with this agreement. This means that the reintroduced maximum catch of 15,000 units was apportioned between the participating countries according to agreed rules. The total catch was 11,300 units, and it was only the Japanese expeditions which obtained their quota, namely 6,150 units. For the first time since whaling was undertaken in the Antarctic, no whaling was carried out from stations in South Georgia. The pelagic catch is therefore also the total Antarctic catch. Last season's Antarctic catch is the lowest season catch since 1927/28. Here I leave out of account the war seasons, the first post-war season and the lay-up season 1931/32. Last season, about 4,000 blue whale units fewer were taken than in the previous season, representing a decline of about 26%. The whaling fleet was, however, reduced by four factory ships and sixty catching boats. In addition, one Norwegian expedition had to cease operations after 50 days' hunting on account of a breakdown.

/The average catch per catcher

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Continued)

The average catch per catcher day amounted to 0.50 blue whale units. This is the same average catch as in season 1961/1962. However, the factory ships used fewer and more powerful catching boats, which under otherwise equal conditions ought to have yielded a somewhat higher catch per catching boat per day. Since the average catch did not increase, this would indicate somewhat poorer whaling conditions last season in comparison with season 1961/1962. One of the causes of the low catch is, however, as already mentioned, the smaller number of factory ships and catching boats engaged. But this reasoning cannot be used when one compares the catch last season with the catch in the seasons prior to 1961/1962. In most of the seasons after the war the average catch per catching boat per day varied between 0.90 and about one blue whale unit, but as from season 1959/1960 there has been a marked fall in the catch results.

The baleen whaling season 1953/1954 lasted 76 days, and 17 factory ships, employing 206 catching boats, obtained 15,456 blue whale units. In 111 days last season the catch amounted to 11,300 blue whale units, and the same number of factory ships with approximately the same number of catchers as in 1953/1954 was operating. There was thus a decline in the total catch of about 26 per cent, in spite of the fact that the catching period was increased by 50 per cent.

In conjunction with reports of weak catches we often received reports of unfavourable weather conditions. With respect to the Norwegian expeditions we have examined the reports concerning wind and sea conditions last season. It appears that the conditions were somewhat better than in the preceding season. On the other hand the wind and sea conditions were somewhat less favourable than in the seasons round 1956/1957. This is probably due to the fact that the expeditions today operate considerably further north than previously, where there is usually less favourable weather. Until a few seasons ago there was no record of any considerable catch north of 50° south. In recent seasons there has, however, occurred a remarkable change. In 1961/1962 season the catch in the said area amounted to about 2000 baleen whales. Last season, on the other hand, there were taken about 5800 baleen whales between 40° and 50° south.

The chief whaling ground was between 20° west and 50° east. In these 70 degrees no less than 75 per cent of the total number of blue whale units was taken. The remaining 25 per cent came from the area comprised in the other 290 degrees. The average size of the blue whales decreased by a good two feet to 73 feet. In area III, where 741 blue whales were taken, the average size was 71.2 feet -- that is to say, only 1.2 feet over the stipulated minimum size. The average size of the other species was, generally speaking, almost the same as in the immediately preceding seasons.

In conclusion, I may mention that owing to the late sending in of statements from some of the companies, we have had to omit some of the surveys which it is our custom to present. For the same reason it has been impossible to make more detailed comments on last season's whaling in the Antarctic. For further information I will refer you to the statistics we have worked out

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I should like to thank Mr. Vangstein for a very interesting review. Are there any questions or remarks on this matter? I understand that so far there are neither questions nor remarks. I would suggest that we take this review for the information of the Commission and ask the Technical Committee to consider this matter at their meetings.
(Agreed)

(The Conference adjourned at 11.20 a.m.
and reconvened at 12.00 noon.)

IWC/15/17

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): We now come to item 7 on the Agenda, Report of the Scientific Committee, and I will invite the Chairman of the Scientific Committee, Dr. Mackintosh, to comment on the Report.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I imagine you would like me at this stage only to say a word or two about the principal points in the Report. I would suggest that they are the resolution on page 4, paragraph 10, in which we support the findings of the Committee of Three, and the emphasis we have put, in pages 6 to 9, on the importance of extending the stock assessments in the future. In paragraph 27 we suggest that the Food and Agriculture Organization might be invited to help in continuing and extending the work of the Committee of Three and all stock assessments of that type in respect of future whaling seasons.

We also regard as of some importance the work of the North Pacific Group mentioned in paragraph 17, because whaling in the North Pacific is a growing industry and, clearly, research on the North Pacific stocks is very important and will become more so. We feel that the research on those stocks might well be brought into the general stock assessments treated in the way in which they have been treated by the Committee of Three.

There are a number of smaller points which will no doubt come up in the course of the Meeting for approval or consideration, but I think those three points are the most important.

Perhaps I could just say, in regard to the position of the Antarctic stocks, that the Scientific Committee has, during a series of meetings, worked with the Committee of Three. We have questioned them, we have asked about the methods of calculation, we have done our best to pick holes in the calculations, and the outcome is that we feel convinced that these calculations are the best that can be done at the present time.

I think perhaps no one can argue about the position of the stock of blue whales; blue whales are in real danger of extinction. We feel that with humpbacks the only possible method of conservation is total protection in the southern hemisphere. For fin whales I can only refer to the findings of the Committee of Three and the supplement to their Report which elaborates those findings in further detail. The Scientific Committee recommends that the blue whale unit limit should be replaced by quotas for species.

I think that is all I need say at this stage. I take it that all these findings will perhaps be referred to the Technical Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I would ask whether any Commissioners wish to comment on the Report of the Scientific Committee at this stage, or whether they would prefer to do so after the Report has been considered by the Technical Committee. I understand that at this stage there are neither questions nor comments and, if that is so, I will ask Dr. Mackintosh to give a more detailed review of this Report to the Technical Committee. We shall then consider this Report at our next Plenary Session. Are you in favour of this proposal? (Agreed)

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I should like to add one point which I think I did not make quite clear, but I do not think it affects the position. The supplementary Report of the Committee of Three was received by us at a rather late stage of our meeting last week and we did not have time to examine it in detail. However, I think that in accepting the findings of the main Report we are, in effect, accepting the findings

of this Report, because they are based upon the same calculations.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I should like to thank Dr. Mackintosh for this additional important information.

If there are no objections we will refer this item to the Technical Committee. (Agreed)

Item 8 of the Agenda is, Special Investigations of the Antarctic Whale Stocks. The Second Interim Report of the Committee of Three, the Report of the Joint Meeting in Seattle in December, 1962, of the Committee of Three and the Scientific Committee, and the Report of the Scientific Sub-Committee Meeting in London in April, 1963, have been circulated to contracting Governments and commissioners. The Final Report of the Committee of Three was circulated at the beginning of the Meeting. I think it would be advisable if we were to invite Dr. Chapman to address the Commission and to give us a review of the Report of the Committee of Three.

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (Committee of Three Scientists): As the Chairman has said, the Interim Report of the Committee of Three has been before you for some months. I regret that there has been less time for you to study the Final Report and the Supplementary Report which have just appeared this morning in their final form.

The recommendations of the Committee of Three based upon information which was put before the Committee are summarized on page 2 of the Final Report with some amplification in our Supplementary Report. The amplification in the Supplementary Report gives some additional reasons which were perhaps not explained sufficiently clearly in the Final Report, and also takes account of the 1962/1963 season the data for which were, of course, not available to us when we prepared the Final Report.

The recommendations which we have made in dealing with the assessments of the stocks are that there should be a complete cessation of the catching of blue and humpback whales, Groups IV and V, for a considerable number of years to allow those stocks to re-build to, or near, the level of maximum sustainable yield. Secondly, the quota on fin and whale catches be reduced to 7000 or less. In the Final Report we state that figure of 7000 or less.

Taking into account the results of the 1962/1963 season, we believe that the trend of sustainable yield of fin whales is towards 5000, whales not units.

/We have two supplementary

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN Continued

miss) We have two supplementary recommendations. One is that the blue whales be eliminated and that separate quotas be established for each species. This seems to be the most efficient and reasonable way of managing the stocks. The second is a point which Dr. Mackintosh has already emphasised in his Report of the Scientific Committee that population analyses be continued based on the pooled biological data of all countries participating in Antarctic whaling.

On the Supplementary Report I only wish to emphasise that the analysis there is a continuation of the methods used previously, simply taking into account the 1962/63 data. The results of the 1962/63 were in agreement with what was expected from our previous analysis.

There is one other point to which I ought to call attention in this Supplementary Report. We do make some forecasts of what might happen with various possible balances of quotas. One point I would like to mention in this connection is that if the aim is to get the maximum yield over the long term then it is important that the quotas be set lower than the sustained yield rather than higher as is pointed out and as is fairly obvious, because if the quotas are set higher than the sustainable yield the result sooner or later will be the extinction of the stocks. If the quotas are set lower than the sustainable yield then the stocks will be given a chance to re-build and in some years - it will depend on the quotas - they will be re-built to a level which will sustain the maximum yield, which we believe in the case of fin whales to be about 20,000 whales per year.

I think that summarises the position. The Committee will be glad to answer any questions concerning the Report.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Chapman, for your very interesting information. Under your Chairmanship the Committee has been able to cover a wide field in spite of the difficulties and the absence of the uniform method of defining the stocks of marine animals. I would suggest that these matters be referred to the Technical Committee, and after consideration by the Technical Committee these can be discussed further. Is everybody in favour of this proposal? (Agreed)

We now come to Item 9 of the Agenda. Since the four parts of this item have been suggested by the Commissioner of the United States, I should now like to invite the United States Commissioner or any other Commissioners to outline any specific measures they have in mind before the matter is considered in detail by the Technical Committee.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I believe that all the matters in Item 9 have already been covered in the Report of the Committee of Three and in the Report of the Scientific Committee. The United States have nothing specific in mind in proposing this Item; in fact, I think it is probably unnecessary. I would suggest that it be referred to the Technical Committee for perusal.

The CHAIRMAN: Is everybody in favour of Dr. McHugh's proposal that this should be referred to the Technical Committee. (Agreed) The matter will then be referred to the Technical Committee.

Since we have given preliminary consideration to all the questions I think we might adjourn for today. The Technical Committee and the Scientific Committee will be able to start their work. I will call on the Secretary to tell us the arrangements regarding the Technical Committee.

The SECRETARY: (Made announcements regarding the arrangements for the Technical Committee)

The CHAIRMAN: The Conference is adjourned.

(The Session was adjourned at 12.25 p.m.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

FIFTEENTH MEETING

Session of Thursday, 4th July, 1963

In the Chair: Mr. M.N. Sukhoruchenko (U.S.S.R.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I declare the second Session of the Plenary open and I call the Meeting to order.

We are very pressed for time. Mr. Wimpenny has asked us not to spend more than an hour. Therefore, this will mean that we will have to speed up our work from the beginning.

The Report by the Technical Committee is not yet available. Therefore, it seems that today we shall only be able to consider those items which have been considered by the Technical Committee.

I shall now call on Dr. Sprules and ask him when he thinks the Report of the Technical Committee might be ready.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES: We have been trying very hard to speed up our deliberations and we have now scheduled a meeting for this evening. It may be possible for us to meet immediately after this Plenary Session. If not, we will meet at eight o'clock tonight. I would hope that our business will be completed following this short meeting this evening.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Would the Meeting therefore agree to our discussing only those items which have already been discussed and considered by the Technical Committee? This would mean that we would be able to take final decisions on those items. Is that agreed?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): If it is agreed to take only the matters which have been considered by the Technical Committee, having regard to the reservations made on behalf of Australia, may I ask if the question of the humpback whales could be left until after the question of the blue whale unit has been considered by the Technical Committee?

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Dr. Sprules, may I call on you to make your observations or comments on those matters which have been considered by the Technical Committee?

Perhaps we could begin with Item 16 on the Agenda.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES: Referring to the main Agenda under Item 16, I would briefly like to review the matters which have been discussed in the Technical Committee and on which we have reached some agreement.

The first of these under Item 16 of the Agenda is sub-section (b), Reconsideration of the word "aborigines". You will note from the Draft Report of the Technical Committee that we are recommending that there be no change made in the schedule as it exists at present.

Mr. G. J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): Regarding the proposal on the position of the Sanctuary in the Report of the Technical Committee, I should like to call the attention of the Commission to the fact that there is a possibility that the catch of pigmy whales will be allowed in a certain area. There is also a possibility that the limit for fin whales will not be in harmony with the advice of the Scientific Report. It is necessary to call the attention of the Commission to the fact that the Sanctuary should be closed in years to come to compensate for the danger which might arise as regards the stock of fins when we decide to improve the limit of the fin whale catch.

Therefore, contrary to the proposal put before the Commission by the Technical Committee, I should like to propose that we close the Sanctuary as we did about four years ago.

Dr. A. R. KELLOGG (U.S.A.): I second that.

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

WFO/15/17

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I do not know whether it would help to recall some of our discussions about the Sanctuary in previous years. Our view for some time has been that so long as we had restrictions on the total catch in the Antarctic, it was preferable not to have the Sanctuary, because then the catch would be spread more evenly. The burden would be spread more evenly over the whole stock. But we did say that we would like to have the possibility of the Sanctuary in reserve if a situation arose in which we would hope to preserve a nucleus of stock for rebuilding if we could not protect the rest. I think that was the view of the Scientific Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Mackintosh.

What would be the opinion of Mr. Lienesch and Dr. Kellogg if we could discuss that under item (c), Position of the Sanctuary, and in the meanwhile make a decision as suggested by the Technical Committee on the first item, 16(b). Are there any objections or remarks concerning item 16(b)?
(Agreed on item 16(b) as proposed)

We now come to item 16(c), Position of the Sanctuary.

Dr. W.M. SPURLES : The Technical Committee considered this item very early in its Agenda, before it had given consideration to many other factors. The agreement reached at that time was that the Schedule should be amended not to change the substance of the Schedule item, but to shorten it. There is a proposal in our draft report that the Schedule item now read: "This paragraph, as a result of a decision of the Fourteenth Meeting, was rendered inoperative until the Commission otherwise decides." You have already heard an additional proposal which has been presented at this Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Is everything clear, gentlemen?

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (U.S.A.): I suppose technically the proposal put by Mr. Lienesch should be taken as an amendment to the proposal submitted by the Technical Committee, in which case it would be voted on before the original motion.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Kellogg. As I understand it, the proposal as moved by Mr. Lienesch was an amendment to the proposal submitted by the Technical Committee. What would the Commission think if we now took the vote on the Technical Committee decision, and after that the proposal moved by Mr. Lienesch?

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (U.S.A.): I believe that according to the rules of procedure you take the amendment before you take the original motion.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I suggest that the amendment is a direct negative of the original proposal, and therefore a vote

on the original proposal will decide which way the Commission wants to go. To open the Sanctuary, as I understand it, would require a three-fourths majority of this Meeting.

I just point out that as an exact negative of the original proposal, I think we can vote on the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It seems to me that whether we vote on the proposal first or the amendment first it does not make much difference; the result will be the same. But since Mr. Lienesch and Dr. Kellogg insist on voting on the amendment first we will do it like that.

I would like now to take the poll on the amendment put by Mr. Lienesch, seconded by Dr. Kellogg, to the proposal moved by the Technical Committee.

/I shall now ask Mr. Wimpenny

The CHAIRMAN (Continued)

I shall now ask Mr. Wimpenny to poll the Commission.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Would you repeat the voting procedure, please?

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): We are now going to poll the Commissioners on the amendment moved by Mr. Lienesch and seconded by Dr. Kellogg. This is an amendment to the proposal by the Technical Committee and I will call on Mr. Lienesch to repeat his amendment.

Mr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): In paragraph 5 the exact wording of the Article is quite clear, but from 1955 up until now it has been inoperative. I do not know whether it is necessary to read out the Article.

The SECRETARY: I would suggest that this amendment might read: "To remove the brackets"

Mr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): Yes, to remove the words in brackets.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I take it Dr. Sprules understands that the amendment is to delete the words inside the brackets.

The Secretary will now take a poll of the Commissioners.

Argentina:	Abstain
Australia:	No
Canada:	Abstain
Denmark:	Abstain
France:	Abstain
Iceland:	Not present
Japan:	No
Mexico:	Abstain
Netherlands:	Yes
New Zealand:	Abstain
Norway:	No
Panama:	Not present
South Africa:	Not present
Sweden:	Not present
USSR:	No
USA:	Yes
United Kingdom:	No.

(There being 2 votes in favour and 5 against with 5 abstentions the amendment was lost.)

The SECRETARY: There has to be a majority of three-quarters of the total votes for such a Resolution to be carried and the amendment is, therefore, lost.

I "C/15/17

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Is there a seconder for the proposal as moved by the Technical Committee? (Seconded by Mr. G. Sjaastad)

The SECRETARY: I will now poll the Commission.

Argentina:	Yes
Australia:	Yes
Canada:	Yes
Denmark:	Abstain
France:	Yes
Iceland:	Not present
Japan:	Yes
Mexico:	Abstain
Netherlands:	Yes
New Zealand:	Yes
Norway:	Yes
Sweden:	Not present
USSR:	Yes
USA:	Yes
United Kingdom:	Yes

(There being 11 votes in favour and none against with 2 abstentions, the proposal was carried.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation: I will call on Dr. Sprules to continue.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES: The next item we considered was the protection of humpback whales, which would come under several sections of item 16 of the main Agenda.

As I understand it, there has been agreement at this Meeting that this matter should not be considered at this time.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): We have not yet discussed this Motion.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES: The Technical Committee considered this very important problem and, on the basis of all the information available to it, the Committee has recommended that there be an amendment to paragraph 6 section 2 of the Schedule to the Convention, and that it now read:

"It is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill humpback whales in the waters south of the Equator."

I would bring to your attention a reservation which has been placed on the acceptance of this recommendation of the Technical Committee by Australia.

With this summary I would move the adoption of the amendment to paragraph 6(2) of the Schedule.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Could I again refer to my previous request when I asked that the Meeting agree to defer this proposal until we have had a chance to discuss the question of blue whale unit quotas in the Technical Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Will anybody second Mr. Setter's proposal? (Seconded by Mr. R.L. Jermyn)

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Could I suggest that, in deciding this issue, we should only require a simple majority of the Commission to decide whether this matter could be deferred. It is not a question of amending the Schedule; it is a question of deferring the discussion of the item.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I would ask you to show by a simple show of hands whether you are in favour of deferring this question to a later stage. I will ask the Secretary to count the votes.

(A vote was taken by show of hands and, there being 9 in favour, the proposal was carried.)

Dr. Sprules, will you continue your review?

/Dr. W.L. Sprules

Dr. W.M. SPRULES: The next item considered by the Technical Committee which has a bearing on Item 16 of the main Agenda was consideration of the minimum size limits for sperm whales which will be found under section (i) of Item 16 of the main Agenda. We noted the evidence available from the Scientific Committee. After discussing the problem of size limits for sperm whales, the Technical Committee decided to recommend to the Plenary Session that there be no change in the size limit for sperm whales. (Seconded by Capt. A. N. Solyanik) (Agreed)

Those are the only decisions made by the Technical Committee which refer to Item 16 of the main Agenda which I believe you asked us to consider at the beginning of this Meeting.

We have, however, reached a decision on Item 12 of the main Agenda if you wish to consider that.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Yes. I would ask Dr. Sprules to take Item 12 of the Agenda.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES: You will recall that you asked the Technical Committee to consider the Infractions Report which is listed under Item 12 of the main Agenda. I would report that the Technical Committee established a sub-committee under the Chairmanship of Mr. Blaney of the United Kingdom. The sub-committee reported to the Technical Committee, and our findings are listed in document IWC/15/19 under the heading Infractions.

In summary I would point out to the Plenary Session that the findings were that there had been a reduction in the total infractions in the Antarctic area but a slight increase in the infractions in other areas. The Technical Committee certainly hopes that this trend will not continue in the areas outside the Antarctic. Furthermore, the Technical Committee wishes to stress the desirability of all contracting governments reporting at as early a date as possible any intention to grant special permits for the taking of whales outside the provisions of the Convention. There have on occasions been some delay in the countries indicating the granting of special permits, and this makes it very difficult for the Secretariat to advise the other member countries of the intent of those countries interested in taking special whales.

I would move the adoption of the Report of the Technical Committee as it relates to the Infractions.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): In seconding the adoption of this Report I would like to suggest a slight change in that last sentence where it mentions "the granting of special permits for the taking of whales outside the provisions of the Convention". There is provision in the Convention under the Schedule for taking whales for scientific purposes. I think it might be preferable if we say, "the granting of special permits for the taking of whales for scientific research", and leave the words "outside the provisions of the Convention" out of the Report. Apart from that, I would like to second the adoption of this Report.

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (U.S.A.): I think it is simply a matter of saying 'as provided under Article VIII of the Convention'. It is not the Schedule; it is the Convention.

The SECRETARY: I thought perhaps it might help if I read out the paragraph concerned with the deletion which has been suggested by Mr. Setter:

"The Committee also endorses a recommendation of the Sub-Committee that contracting governments should be reminded of the provisions of Article VIII of the Convention which require them to notify the Commission at once of the granting of special permits for the taking of whales for scientific research."

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are you satisfied, Dr. Kellogg?

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (U.S.A.): It is not outside the provisions.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES: On the assumption that this would be acceptable to all the other members of the Committee on which I serve, I myself would be pleased to amend my motion to give recognition to Mr. Setter's proposal. I would now move the adoption of the Infractions Report with the deletion of the words 'outside the provisions of the Convention'.

Dr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I should simply like to give notice in plenary, as I did in the Technical Committee, that I should like at some stage to comment substantially on the actual question of the issue of permits under Article VIII. Clearly this is not the place to do so, but I presume I shall be able to do so when the report of the Scientific Committee is discussed more fully.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any other comments on the Report of the Technical Committee which has been moved and seconded?

/If there are no objections

The CHAIRMAN (Continued)

If there are no objections, we will take it that the proposal put forward by the Technical Committee is adopted. (Agreed)

Were there any other decisions taken by the Technical Committee on any other item on the Agenda, Dr Sprules?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES: Yes, one other item which was referred to the Technical Committee was item 11 on the main Agenda, North Pacific Whale Stocks.

The Technical Committee was very pleased to note the progress which had been made by the Working Group on North Pacific whales, and we wish to report to the Commission that we feel this Committee is doing a good job. We wish it well in the continuation of its work on North Pacific stocks.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I take it that there are no remarks on the Report by the Working Group.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES: The detail of the Working Group's deliberations is contained in a report which is attached to the report of the Scientific Committee. Their proposals are included in that report. In the Technical Committee, we have in effect adopted the report of the North Pacific Working Group and recommend it to you for acceptance.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): If there are no further remarks, then the report of the North Pacific Working Group is accepted.

Dr. Sprules, are there any other decisions on any further items on the Agenda?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES: I regret very much to inform you, Mr. Chairman, that we have been unable to complete any other sections of the Technical Committee Agenda, and will not be able to report further until after another meeting of our Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr Sprules.

Shall we now take item 15 on the main Agenda, Fourteenth Annual Report. The Fourteenth Annual Report has been prepared by Mr. Wimpenny and has been circulated to the Commission at the beginning of the Meeting. I shall now call on members of the Commission to present their remarks on and make proposals on each paragraph of this Report.

The SECRETARY: May I point out that there is a gap in the first paragraph of the Report, in which the Chairmanship of the

IWC/15/17

Scientific Committee is left blank. When this report was prepared it was not known that Dr. Mackintosh was going to be Chairman and it was left blank. The words "Dr. Mackintosh" have, therefore, to be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I do not think there will be any objection to this decision.

Are there any remarks on the report? Do I take it that there are no remarks on the Fourteenth Annual Report?

Dr W.M. SPRULES (Canada): On page 3 of the report, line 8, I think there is an error. I rather suspect that the words "as their quota was reached" belong to the preceding sentence.

The SECRETARY: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Sprules, you are quite right on that.

Dr W.M. SPRULES (Canada): One other matter which relates to a recommendation which we have just considered with regard to the issuing of special permits, under item 18 - Permits to take Whales for Scientific Purposes during this last whaling season - I notice the reference to the fact that the Soviet Government granted permits for two baleen whales of different kinds to be taken by each of the four Soviet Antarctic pelagic expeditions both before the opening and after the closing of the 1962/63 season. I would like to ask if these were all of the permits which were issued for the last whaling season.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I should like to call upon Captain Solyanik to reply to that question.

/Captain A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.):.....

Captain A.N. SOLYANIK (USSR)(Interpretation): The information given by the Soviet Government was transferred to the Secretary of the International Whaling Commission and, as far as we know, the Secretary has informed the other members of the International Whaling Commission about those permits.

That is why I cannot understand this question.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): If there are no further remarks I take it that the Fourteenth Annual Report is adopted, bearing in mind the minor details which have been adopted here. (Agreed)

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I take it that, with respect to page 5 of the Draft Report, some material is to be circulated for inclusion in the bracketed space where we are talking about the effect of the 1962/1963 season on stocks.

The SECRETARY: That has been circulated as a separate piece.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I see that has been included.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I think we can also take decisions today on item 7 of the Agenda, Report by the Scientific Committee. Dr. Mackintosh has already given his review of this Report by the Scientific Committee which was referred at our Plenary Meeting to the Technical Committee. Therefore, we might just say that we receive and note this Report, bearing in mind that if there are any amendments when the Report is discussed in the Technical Committee we shall take them afterwards.

Is everybody in favour of this procedure? (Agreed)

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I should like to ask for some clarification on that. Do I understand the Chairman to mean that we shall simply take note of the Report at this stage, but that any recommendations in the Report can be discussed in Plenary again when it comes up from the Technical Committee?

The SECRETARY: I think I ought to clear this matter a little. It is general usage that the Scientific Committee's Report comes up to the Commission directly, but it is consulted by other Committees because so often it contains material for the more important questions which face the Meeting. So, in my experience, it has been usual to accept and note this Report in the Commission and that is sufficient.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I cannot say I feel very happy about that. I am not quite clear whether that means that some of the recommendations in this Report will not be discussed. On this occasion, for example, there are a large number of recommendations in the Scientific

Committee's Report which have a direct bearing on some of the major issues being discussed elsewhere. There are a number of others which do not seem likely to be discussed in the Technical Committee. I feel that we should, even under our pressure of time, give a little time to looking at some of this in Plenary.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I was going to ask a rather similar question to that which Mr. Jermyn has raised. There are one or two points which have not been considered so far -- for example, in paragraph 15 there is a recommendation about special permits, and there is also a new Supplementary Report of the Scientific Committee meeting which was held to consider future programmes and the election of a Chairman. I believe that has been circulated.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): When I said that, at this stage, we might only receive and note the Report by the Scientific Committee I meant, of course, that if there are any amendments or proposals, or any additions which may be made after the Report has been considered by the Technical Committee, we shall take those amendments and additions afterwards.

Are you satisfied with that, Mr. Jermyn?

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any comments on the Report by the Scientific Committee? Since there are no remarks, I propose that the Report by the Scientific Committee be received and noted. Will someone second this proposal? (Seconded by Dr. A.R. Kellogg)

If there are no objections that means that the Report by the Scientific Committee is received and noted. (Agreed)

I should like to thank Dr. Mackintosh and his Committee for the great amount of work they have carried out.

We have now used all the time which was allotted by the Secretary, so I would suggest that we adjourn for today.

(The Conference adjourned at 3.40 p.m.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

FIFTEENTH MEETING

Session of Friday, 5th July, 1963

(In the Chair: Mr. M.N. Sukhoruchenko (U.S.S.R.))

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I call the Meeting to order. We have a lot of work to do today and not much time. I declare the third, and I think the last, Plenary Session open.

I have a question to ask Dr. Mackintosh. The Secretary has informed me that after our last Plenary Session the Scientific Committee had another meeting. I will now ask Dr. Mackintosh if he has any observations to make on Item 7 of the Agenda.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): There are one or two points which we have not quite finished with. Perhaps I could draw attention to paragraph 15 which deals with special permits. I do not know whether you intend to consider this any further or whether anyone else wishes to speak about it. However, you will see that on page 5 near the top we have some recommendations about the notification, etc., of special permits suggesting that the Scientific Committee should be consulted, if possible before the whales are taken under special permits. We urge that the number taken should be the lowest possible consistent with the research to be undertaken. Item (4) in that paragraph - "the Committee should be informed fully and specifically of the results obtained by taking whales under each such permit" - is, of course, already part of the Convention. I think I am correct in saying that that is asked for under Article VIII.

I do not know what can be done about these recommendations, but we would like to draw the attention of the Commission to them.

In the paragraph after that, we draw attention to the very heavy mortality of humpback whales in Groups IV and V, and have no explanation to offer beyond what is given in pages 60 and 61 of the final report of the Committee of Three.

On pages 6, 7 and 8 we are still waiting to know what will be decided about the methods of continuing stock assessments. On the last page, near the foot, you will see that we have still to deal with the opening date of the Antarctic season, and we have no recommendation to make.

There is one other thing - unless you want to deal with these points at once - which we have not actually put in the Scientific Report but which was mentioned in the Scientific Committee, and that is that members of the Committee, I am sure they would like me to say, expressed very great appreciation of the work of the Committee of Three, not only for the work they have done specifically for the Commission but also for the help and advice they gave to us and members of the Committee in the methods of work which we are so concerned with.

As you know, there is a further report. The Scientific Committee had a further meeting for the election of the new Chairman. All I need say about this is that I have been Chairman for a very long time, and I am very glad to say that Professor Ruud has accepted the Chairmanship by unanimous vote for the coming year. We understand the next meeting will be in Oslo, and we thought this might be an appropriate time for a change.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Mackintosh

Under item 28 of the Scientific Committee's Report, you will see that the Committee estimate that an additional sum of about £3,000 is required for further scientific investigation. It may be more reasonable to take a decision on that item when we are considering the report of the Finance and Administration Committee.

Are there any comments on Dr. Mackintosh's review? Would Professor Ruud like to say something?

Professor J.T. RUUD (Norway): Document IWC/15/21 is the report of a meeting held of representatives of the Scientific Committee, as appointed by the Commission at its first plenary session on Monday, 1st July 1963.

As has already been announced by Dr. Mackintosh, I was elected Chairman of the Scientific Committee on Dr. Mackintosh's proposal, who expressed his desire to be relieved from an office he has held since the Commission was established in 1949. I assume that the Commission does recognise how greatly it is indebted to Dr. Mackintosh for the outstanding service he has rendered to the Commission through all these years.

Regarding the document now before you, it is meant to keep the Commission informed about the research work we intend to organise in the coming season. I should like to stress that the success of our work will depend primarily on the support and assistance the expeditions are willing to give in the collection of material and data. We hope very much that it will be possible to collect many more earplugs from baleen whales taken, and we must have the support of the companies operating in the Antarctic in the next and coming seasons in organising a scheme for sightings of humpbacks and blue whales to be recorded and made available to the Commission.

In this connection, I would like to express the hope that the sightings Captain Solyanik spoke about in the Technical Committee yesterday will be made available to the Commission, because the data which he referred to are of the utmost importance for the formulation of any view the Scientific Committee can reach on the balance of humpback and blue whales. I stress this point and hope that Captain Solyanik will use his influence to this end, because the Commission and its committees can share the Commissioners' confidence in some set of data or evidence only if it is shown in the examination of such data or evidence. In my opinion, if I am to act in a responsible way as Chairman of the Scientific Committee, the Commission must take this stand that neither it nor its committees will entertain argument with regard to the state of whale stocks based on evidence which has not been seen and used by the Scientific Committee.

Prof. J.T. RUUD (Continued)

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I beg to draw attention to the urgent need for having next season's catches reported to the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics before 1 May, 1964, and in an addendum to the document, IWC/15/21, placed before you today, we have given detailed information about the data required and how they should be reported to the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics.

I do not think I will take more time, Mr. Chairman, because this is dealt with in the Report, but I am willing to answer any questions the Commission wishes to raise.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Professor Ruud.

Would anybody like to comment on what Professor Ruud and Dr. Mackintosh have said?

Captain A.N. SOLYANIK (USSR)(Interpretation): We have analysed the notes on the co-ordinated research programme for 1963/1964 and our Delegation considers such work to be very valuable. I would only like to add, as I stated yesterday in the Meeting of the Technical Committee, that in the Soviet Union research work on the study of whale stocks in the Antarctic will be enlarged in the forthcoming season.

On each factory ship there is a special scientific group whose work is co-ordinated by the Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography. Next year, on some of the factory ships, there will be a scientific group consisting of up to fifteen scientists. Besides that, we are planning that special research vessels should also be sent there. We have planned a vast programme of whale marking and we have already prepared darts and rifles and nominated the ships for these purposes.

The burden of these expenditures the Soviet Union will carry by itself.

The additional data which we shall get from the specialists on the whalers, and also those data which are available to us from the transport and other ships, about whale stocks, will be submitted to our scientists and they will transfer them to their Institutes. The scientists in our Delegation have come here with the special purpose of exchanging data. These scientists have taken part in the work of the Committees, and other scientists will have an opportunity of receiving all the information in which they are interested.

We know that the Institute of Oceanography of the United Kingdom is conducting a large amount of work on the collection of information about whale stocks from the British fleet also, and we should like to ask about the possibility of collecting all data of this kind in the Scientific Committee also. We should like the Scientific Committee to make a summary of such data. This would be very helpful to us in order that we may gain better knowledge for the estimation of whale stocks in Antarctic waters.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Captain Solyanik.

Professor J.T. RUUD (Norway): I am greatly relieved by the fact that my appeal to Captain Solyanik has had such a quick result and that he has been able to tell us that the material about which he told us yesterday will be passed on to our Russian colleagues. Since I have a great admiration for the group working on whaling problems, I am not at all in doubt that when they have evaluated the material Captain Solyanik told us about yesterday it will appear before the Commission in due time, so that we shall be able to take that notice of it which it really deserves.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): Do I understand that we are now disposing of any remaining issues in connexion with the Report of the Scientific Committee? You will recall that I gave notice the other day that there was one question I wished to raise. Would this be the appropriate time?

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): You are quite right in understanding that we are discussing the Scientific Committee's Report. I asked for questions and, since there were none, I asked for comments on the views expressed by Dr. Mackintosh and Professor Ruud.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): May I then enlarge on a point which was made by Dr. Mackintosh?

Members will recall that at this Commission Meeting we have been reminded in a number of ways of the problems arising through the rather large-scale use of Article VIII of the Convention to authorize special research programmes. The Infractions Sub-Committee has, this year, specially asked that member Governments should remember the need to send in quick and full returns of any whales or any permits granted under Article VIII.

/The Scientific Sub-Committee

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (Continued)

The Scientific Sub-Committee in April went so far as to express considerable dissatisfaction with the whole way in which Article VIII works, and in fact suggested that Member Governments should seek the consent in advance of the Commission before granting such permits. Clearly that would not be possible without amending the Convention, and we all realise how difficult that would be.

The Scientific Committee in its Report, paragraph 15, to which Dr. Mackintosh has referred, took I think the wiser course of recommending certain action which does lie within the framework of the existing Convention. They suggest that use should be made of the Scientific Committee of this Commission, whether at its annual meeting or in some other way, as it is the most appropriate body to be consulted and informed of research plans of Member Governments and of the results of such research. This seems to my Government a most important and valuable suggestion. We have been very concerned about some of the recent actions taken under Article VIII. In particular, late in March we expressed our concern through this Commission's Secretary about the notification received of the South African decision to take 350 under-sized sperms; we regarded that as something about which we felt Commission Members should know a lot more. I should say that we have since been approached privately by the South African authorities who have given us an explanation of the special one-year programme of research they propose to undertake. However, we feel that explanation is something which the Commission as a whole should have known of. We do feel it is up to this Commission to act as a collective watchdog on the way Article VIII operates. Article VIII, as we all know, leaves an enormous loophole in the general protective provisions of the Convention, and it is important to make use of the Convention requirements for quick and full reporting of the permits granted under this Article in order to prevent serious abuse.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that while we may not all be able to agree here - we clearly have not the time - on exactly how the proposals put in paragraph 15 of the Scientific Committee's Report should be implemented, I would like formally to propose that we rescue those from the obscurity of that Report, that this Commission generally endorse those proposals in paragraph 15 of that Report and instruct the Secretary to write to all Member Governments asking for their comments on how it could be operated in practice. That, it seems to me, would give us a chance at next year's Commission Meeting to establish firm arrangements for consultation and better use and co-ordination of research effort in respect of Article VIII.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Jermyn. Would any other Delegates like to make any remarks?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I would like to ask whether Mr. Jermyn was putting forward as a resolution of the Meeting that we do ask the Secretary to refer this to the Member countries for comment.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): Yes, I was making a formal proposal.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I second that.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): We understand that you are making an official proposal. Do I understand you correctly that you are suggesting that some sort of arrangement should be made to consult the Governments as to their plans for further research and their plans for granting special permits for the taking of whales for scientific investigations? Am I right in this?

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I think it might be best if I put in quite clear terms exactly what I am formally proposing that the Commission should decide. What I am suggesting is that this Commission should endorse in principle the recommendations in paragraph 15 of the Scientific Committee's Report, Document IWC/15/3, and instruct the Secretary to bring these to the attention of Member Governments and seek their comments.

The SECRETARY: I have nothing to say except that I clearly understand what Mr. Jermyn intends in his instructions to the Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any other comments? It seems that we already have several proposals in connection with what Dr. Mackintosh and Professor Ruud have said. It seems reasonable, therefore, that we should discuss those proposals separately.

There was a proposal concerning item 28 of the Scientific Committee's report concerning the additional expenditure of £3,000 for scientific investigations. I have already said that it seems more reasonable to discuss that item and make a decision on it when we consider the Report by the Finance and Administration Committee. Is everyone in favour of that? (Agreed) We note this request by the Scientific Committee and we will take our final decision when we consider the Report by the Finance and Administration Committee.

The second point concerns item 15 of the Report by the Scientific Committee. This item concerns the permits for taking whales for scientific investigations. It seems to me that everybody would agree that it is obviously not possible for the country or the government to foresee the necessity of taking such whales for scientific investigations. Of course, in the course of the investigations the necessity may arise to take an additional whale for scientific investigations. I would say, from my point of view, that it would be wrong to deny the scientists the possibility of taking such a whale. However, I quite agree with what Mr. Jermyn has said that the scientific work must be planned in advance, and that the Scientific Committee must be informed as soon as possible in advance about the necessity of granting a permit for taking whales for scientific investigations. I think it would be reasonable for us to accept such a proposal. We could recommend that the countries should inform the Commission in advance about their wish to grant special permits for the taking of whales for scientific investigations. Is Mr. Jermyn content with this?

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): That would seem to me excellent. The only reason I suggested that we should endorse in principle the specific recommendations in paragraph 15 of the Scientific Committee's Report was that that spelt out over four sub-paragraphs some of the ways in which this might be given effect to. I realise we cannot at this Meeting hope to discuss those or reach agreement on them. That was why I proposed that this Commission should give its general endorsement of this principle and arrange for the views of Member Governments in detail to be sought for a fuller discussion next year.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I understand you quite clearly. Would anybody present here second the proposal moved by Mr. Jermyn which recommends that the countries concerned should inform the Commission in advance about their plans to grant special permits for taking whales for scientific investigations, bearing in mind, however, that there may be such cases when the necessity may arise to grant such a permit.

Mr. G.G. SETTER (Australia): When I seconded Mr. Jermyn's previous proposal I did say on the understanding that what he was proposing was that the Commission accept in principle the recommendations of the Scientific Committee and ask the Secretary to refer them to Member Governments for comment so that they can be considered more fully next year. If that is the proposal I second it.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I thought that this would be a recommendation by the Commission without addressing our Governments. If there is a proposal to submit it to the Governments, then I do not object to this. Are there any other comments on this? Does Mr. Jermyn insist on what he first proposed?

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): Mr. Setter of Australia has exactly the right understanding of what it is I have in mind. I do not really care whether we formally endorse it or whether we simply make a recommendation. My concern is to make sure that the Commission puts itself on record as being in favour of the general principles and will arrange for Member Governments to give detailed comments later.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It seems to be clear to everybody now. The proposal has been moved by Mr. Jermyn and seconded by Mr. Setter. Are there any other proposals? Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I would like to refer briefly to a comment made by Dr. Mackintosh as it relates to paragraph 27 and paragraph 30 of the Report of the Scientific Committee. You will recall that there is a firm recommendation in the Scientific Committee Report under paragraph 27 that the Commission negotiate with F.A.O. in an attempt to establish a group which could continue the stock assessment programme which has been started by the Committee of Three. Canada feels very

strongly that a good deal of very valuable work has been done by our brains trust and we certainly hope that this type of assessment will be continued in the future for as many whaling areas as possible. I should think that if the Scientific Committee Report were adopted by the Commission, then effect would be given to the scientists' recommendation in paragraph 27. However, I am not quite clear what the Soviet reservation in paragraph 30 actually means with regard to carrying out the recommendation of the Scientific Committee. I am wondering if we could have clarification of the Soviet reservation with regard to the recommendation in paragraph 27.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Sprules.

Would Captain Solyanik like to make any comment on that?

/As far as I understood.....

The CHAIRMAN (Continued)

As far as I understood Captain Solyanik, the vast majority of scientific investigations have been carried out in the Antarctic, and vast sums of money were expended on those scientific investigations. This is, of course, very useful, and if all countries are in a position to do the same, it will also be very useful. However, it seems that not all countries can carry out investigations separately by themselves. Therefore, I understand that it was proposed that the work which has been done by the Committee of Three Scientists might be continued. We can say that the work which has been done by the Committee of Three Scientists has really been valuable work. When you spoke of the reservation, I understood that it was merely that you wished to inform your Government about the content of this Resolution. As I understand it, if we do agree that the Committee of Three Scientists should continue their work it will involve additional expenditure. I understood that you wanted to give your final decision on that after you had consulted your Government on that.

Captain A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): You understand the position quite correctly. Because of that fact, we will express our view on this question during the discussion of the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee. On this question, all members of the Committee came to a common conclusion.

In answer to Dr. Sprules, I would like to mention paragraph 30 of the Report of the Scientific Committee where it says that the Soviet representative on the Scientific Committee, having agreed in principle with the proposal for the continuation and development of whale stock assessment by the International Whaling Commission, considers it necessary to reserve the right to further discussion on this question. He also mentioned the reason for such a reservation, the Soviet Union's non-membership of FAO.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Captain Solyanik. Is Dr. Sprules content with the explanation given by Captain Solyanik?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I think so, thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): May I have your views on items 3 and 27?

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): It is our general understanding, is it not, that this is all to be discussed, in fact, when we discuss the Finance Committee's Report, that you are not now seeking substantive comment on paragraph 27 here.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): You are quite right, Mr. Jermyn. It is my understanding that we shall discuss this further when we discuss the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee, because this involves the expenditure of money.

However, we might express our opinion on the possibility of the continuation of work by the Committee of Three Scientists. As far as I understood from what has been said here by many people, it seems that we do consider it necessary for the Committee of Three to continue their work.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I am sorry to speak again, but I had been saving my fire for the substantive discussion on this. If you are now inviting comment, I should like to make it perfectly plain that my Delegation is not at all happy about the thought of continuing the work of the Committee of Three, or of engaging in another continuing research programme of the kind envisaged. We have serious misgivings about the way in which scientific research has been used as an alibi in respect to many of the activities of this Commission. We are not happy about playing around with scientific research for a further year. Therefore, I would like to make our general position quite plain at this point.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Jermyn. Am I right in understanding that you do not consider it necessary in planning our investigations for the next year also to plan the work of the Committee of Three? Am I right in understanding you?

Mr. R L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I think our attitude could be summarised briefly as being that we fail to see exactly what the Commission has in mind in talking of the continuation of the Committee of Three for a further year or more. The Committee of Three was set up to do a particular job. It has done it exceedingly well. The results have been treated in a way which we are all aware of. We cannot see a great deal to be gained from continuing it for a further year in those kind of circumstances, or of setting up a similar body. If members of the Commission were to undertake to bring their policies in line with the scientists' recommendations after another year, we would have to think again.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Jermyn

Professor Ruud or Dr. Mackintosh, would you like to make any additional comment on that?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I think I can only say that we have made our views very clear in the Report of the Scientific Committee. Research will go on, I think, by the National Research Groups, but perhaps we do rather feel that we wonder what is going to be done with the results we arrive at.

Professor J.T. RUUD (Norway): I think it should be made perfectly clear at this stage in the Commission's work that unless the necessary funds are placed at the disposal of the Scientific Committee to get the expert help we need for the best possible stock assessment, we shall put the Scientific Committee into a very difficult position next year.

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (U.S.A.): It seems to be rather unfortunate that some of the delegations are being blind to question the accuracy of the conclusions of the Scientific Committee. Unless there is a better realisation of the implications of such studies, I for one do not see any need to go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I think that there might be some misunderstanding. I do not think that anybody here present expressed the opinion that we do not need the work of the Scientific Committee any longer. On the contrary, it seems that everybody present is very grateful to the Committee for the work it has done. The Scientific Committee expressed their wish to continue this scientific work, because some additional question arose which required further investigation. That is my personal understanding of the decisions taken by the Scientific Committee. It seems to me that most of us will be ready to support it. As I understand it, Mr. Jermyn expressed a contrary view. He also said that the work which was done by the Committee of Three was valuable, but it seems that it is his opinion that work by the Committee of Three has been finished and that there is no necessity to continue this work any longer. It seems that he does not think it necessary that this work should be continued. This is Mr. Jermyn's opinion, on which nobody has commented as yet. I think it would be premature to draw any conclusions from this.

That is just by way of explanation.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I would just like to clarify the position in my own mind, as I see it. We have before us a proposal by the Scientific Committee that an approach be made to FAO to continue this work on behalf of the Commission.

Whilst I am not at present in a position to commit the Australian Government with regard to any additional expense in this matter, I think they generally agree that this work should go on. I personally would hope that it would be possible for the Committee of Three to carry on for at least another year.

The CHAIRMAN: (Interpretation): It seems to me that Mr. Setter is supporting the proposal by the Scientific Committee. Are there any other points of view?

If there are no more comments, then I think we will poll the Commissioners on the proposals moved by the Scientific Committee and also on Mr. Jermyn's proposal. Is everybody in favour of that procedure?

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I am not clear what you are proposing to take a poll on. As I understand it, the Scientific Committee has recommended that somebody negotiate with the FAO with a view to getting this job done by FAO rather than the Committee in the future. Is someone now suggesting that the Committee of Three should continue as well or in place of the the FAO doing it?

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): There may be some misunderstanding. As I understand it, the Scientific Committee think it is necessary for the Committee of Three to continue their work, and that this work should be closely connected with FAO.

As I understood Mr. Jermyn, I think he said that as their work was finished there was no need to continue the Committee of Three.

It seems to me that there we have two different proposals. Therefore, according to the rules of procedure, we should take a vote on that.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I am sorry, I cannot understand who has suggested that the Committee of Three should continue. This does not appear in the Scientific Committee's Report at all.

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

Dr. W.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I think there is one point that wants clearing up. We did not recommend that the Committee of Three should continue. On the contrary, in paragraph 25 of our Report we said:

"Clearly the present arrangements by which the initial work has been done voluntarily by a Special Committee of three experts cannot continue,".

However, we put forward the idea that FAO might take on this work. We do not necessarily say that that is the only way to do it. If it were not done by FAO and the Committee of Three were willing to continue, of course that would be another possible way of doing it, but we felt that the Committee of Three had done so much in addition to their ordinary work that it was really rather a lot to ask them to do more.

Mr. Wm.C. HERRINGTON (USA): We should like to ask for clarification of what Mr. Jermyn has proposed, since we have a different understanding of the question he raised.

We understand that he referred to the fact that three years ago this Commission set up a Committee of Three and undertook by 1964 to get its policies in line with the conclusions which would be developed from the work of the Committee of Three. At this Meeting the Commission has so far largely ignored the conclusions of the Committee of Three.

I understood Mr. Jermyn to raise the question as to whether or not it was the intention of the Commission to make use of the conclusions of the scientists and put them into effect, or whether it was the intention to ignore the conclusions of the scientists. I would like to know whether this, indeed, is the issue that he raised.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I wonder if I can make a suggestion in the hope of resolving this issue. Certain Delegates, possibly the New Zealand Delegate, feel that some Commissioners have paid so little regard to the work of the Committee of Three that we might as well disband this body. I think that is possibly their point of view. Other Commissioners, on the other hand, would like this work to continue. We may not, in the end, take decisions at this Commission this year which would be in accordance with the wishes of all members round this table, but there is also 1964 to come. I think it would be very unfortunate if we came through to our 1964 Meeting and found that this work of the Committee of Three had been discontinued. On the other hand, some Delegates do not seem willing at this time to commit themselves to making permanent arrangements for the future.

What I would like to suggest, therefore, if this is possible, is that the existing arrangements for the Committee of Three should be carried on for one further year.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Gardner.

Mr. Jermyn, we seem to be having a very long discussion on this.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I am sorry, Mr. Chairman; this is not of my choosing, but our views were asked.

I think Mr. Gardner has helped to clarify the position. Perhaps we have confused the issue by talking in terms of continuing the work of the Committee of Three. It seems to me there are two problems which arise from the Scientific Committee's Report. The first is whether to continue, for one year or longer, the kind of special stock assessment research being done by the Committee of Three. Secondly, if we agree that the answer to the first question is, "Yes", how should we do it? Should we continue the Committee of Three? Should we ask FAO to do it? Or should we make some other arrangement?

All I was saying in my first statement on this point was simply that my Government is seriously unhappy about the thought of simply continuing this kind of work for a year or further years. We agree that the Committee of Three has done a first-class job; we agree that there is more work to be done in this field. We have, however, a feeling that this is the way the Commission salves its conscience about taking unfortunate decisions, by saying that we are arranging to have further research done. That is why we have misgivings about this kind of research.

If, however, other members of the Commission decide that they want to continue research, we would obviously go along with that. When it comes to the question of how we do it, if people want to continue the work of the Committee of Three I cannot give any undertaking on behalf of my Government that Mr. Allen's services could still be made available on the basis on which they have been in the past.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I think the question is now clear enough. There does not seem to be any necessity to carry on the discussion any longer. Is everybody in favour of this? (Agreed)

I think it is still necessary to take a vote on the recommendations of the Scientific Committee in items 27 to 30

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I do not think we have disposed of item 28 of this section, and item 29 has to do with something quite different. Item 30 is just a Soviet reservation with regard to item 27. It would seem to me that the specific recommendation of the Scientific Committee requiring our attention is contained in paragraph 27. This is a firm recommendation about an action the Commission would take to negotiate with FAO to find out if there would be some way in which that Organization might continue the work of the Committee of Three for, perhaps, one or more years. I think we are just concerning ourselves with item 27 of the Scientific Committee's Report.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Sprules, that is what I thought at the beginning, that we should take a vote on item 27.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Are we voting on the recommendation of the Scientific Committee on an approach being made to FAO in regard to the continuation of stock assessment work? Is that what we are voting on?

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): We want to take a poll of the Commissioners on item 27 of the recommendations by the Scientific Committee. Is that clear to Mr. Setter?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Yes, thank you.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I should only like to mention that the proposition I made a little while ago was, in fact, an amendment to the recommendation of the Scientific Committee. My recommendation was that we should continue the existing arrangements, if that were possible, for one further year. That is, therefore, a different proposal from that in paragraph 27, and you may feel that that proposal should be voted on first.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Am I right in understanding that Mr. Gardner asks that his proposal be voted on first? What I had in mind was that this proposal could be voted after.

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (USA): Mr. Gardner's proposal is an amendment and has to be voted on first.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any objections to this amendment?

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I should like it put to a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, we are going to vote on the recommendation put forward in item 27 with the amendment made by Mr. Gardner. Are there any objections?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I think we are in some difficulties here. I presume we are voting on a suggestion that we ask the Commission to ask the owners of these three gentlemen whether they would make their services available again for another year. We do not know whether this could be done. We have already heard from Mr. Jermyn that he has some doubt as to whether Mr. Allen's services can be continued. I rather expect that some of the other gentlemen are in the same position on this Committee of Three. It would seem to me that perhaps we had better find out, before we vote on this, whether there is some possibility of the group being able to continue to serve us. If this is not possible, then we are simply voting on a proposal for the Commission to approach the people for whom these gentlemen work and asking them to make their services available for one more year.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I do agree that my proposition falls to the ground if the three countries are not prepared to make the services of these scientists available. However, since this Commission does not seem willing to take a long-term decision, the sensible course seems to be to make some short-term arrangements. I was hoping that the three bodies which have been so helpful to us in the past would continue to be helpful for one more year.

I am willing to consider a slight modification of my amendment to meet this contingency. The sort of wording I have in mind would be:

"That the Commission resolves to ask the Scientific Committee to continue its work in the analysis of the stocks of whales and,

(1) requests the members of the Committee of Three, with the approval of their Governments, to continue this work for one more year, and

(2) requests the Secretary to discuss with the Director General of FAO the possibility of that Organization undertaking this work thereafter if requested."

That means, we hope, that the Committee of Three and the authorities responsible for them will agree to this carrying on for one year and that the Secretary will ascertain for our benefit next year whether FAO would be able to help. Then we should be able to come to some decision next year as to the continuance of this work.

If it is the wish of the Commission, I would be prepared to modify my resolution in this way.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Gardner.

Is the amendment put forward by Mr. Gardner clear to everybody? Is there any necessity to have further consultation concerning that? Would Mr. Holt like to say anything on this matter?

Mr. S.J. HOLT (FAO): When the Scientific Committee proposed that perhaps FAO should be approached to see what arrangements might be made for that Organization to help with the stock assessment work on a continuing basis I did get into contact with my Director. He said that he thought that the Organization would agree to negotiate and could agree to accept that kind of responsibility in principle. The details, of course, would have to be worked out. He did indicate that they were watching with great interest what action the Commission were taking on the Report made so far, because a considerable amount of time had been spent on this work.

I imagine that if the Organization were asked if I could participate in the Committee of Three there would be agreement in principle to this, although I should like to say that in practice the amount of time required from all of us has been greater than any of us could really spare. For this reason we have had to depend quite a lot on the assistance of other scientists, in particular of Mr. Gulland, in the past year. If I were able to continue for one more year as a member of the Committee of Three I should have to ask the Commission to agree that some of the work which would be my responsibility might be undertaken by people working with me, under my supervision, at FAO.

/Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan).....

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): We heard with interest the contributions of various speakers concerning the proposal of whether or not the Committee of Three should be continued and in what way it should be continued. Since we do not have much time, we would like to settle the programme as soon as possible. It appears to us that paragraph 27 of the Scientific Committee Report was decided after consideration by the Scientific Committee itself in consultation with the Committee of Three. Therefore, we would agree to adopt paragraph 27 without the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I think that since Mr. Gardner has moved an amendment to the proposal we will have to take some action on it. I would ask you whether everybody understands the amendment as put forward by Mr. Gardner and whether it will be necessary to have it in written form.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I wonder if you could perhaps read it out once again.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I would ask Mr. Gardner to read his amendment out at dictation speed.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): It is as follows:

"The Commission resolve to ask the Scientific Committee to continue its work in analysis of the stocks of whales and

(1) requests the Members of the Committee of Three with the approval of their governments to continue this work for one more year and

(2) requests the Secretary to discuss with the Director-General of F.A.O. the possibility of that organisation undertaking this work thereafter if requested."

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I would like through you, Mr. Chairman, to ask Mr. Gardner what would happen if this resolution were adopted and the approval of the governments concerned was not obtained. Would there be any assessment done in the coming year?

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I think in those circumstances the Scientific Committee would have to take over.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I should now like to put Mr. Gardner's amendment to the vote.

The Secretary will now take a poll of the Commissioners.

Argentina:	Abstain
Australia:	Yes
Canada:	Yes
Denmark:	Abstain
France:	No
Iceland:	Not present
Japan:	No
Mexico:	No
Netherlands:	Yes
New Zealand:	Abstain
Norway:	Yes
Sweden:	Not present
USSR:	Abstain
USA:	Yes
United Kingdom:	Yes

(There being 6 votes in favour and 3 against with 4 abstentions the amendment was carried.)

(The Conference adjourned at 11.15 a.m. and reconvened at 11.35 a.m.)

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Before the coffee break the amendment which was proposed by Mr. Gardner to paragraph 27 of the Report of the Scientific Committee was adopted. At that time the Japanese Delegation voted against it simply because we did not know how much expenditure would be involved if Mr. Gardner's amendment were adopted. We do not know whether the budget which will be needed for the implementation of Mr. Gardner's proposal will be more or less than the figure of £3,000 which appears in paragraph 28 in connection with paragraph 27. We are not suggesting that a discussion on the budget should be undertaken at this moment. We will be quite happy to discuss this when a suitable opportunity arises. However, we would like to know how much expenditure will be involved. We would like the amount of the budget to be discussed in connection with the amendment.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I had thought we might possibly discuss this when we consider the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee, but if it is the wish of the Commission, perhaps I could say a few words now.

It did seem to me that the Scientific Committee was quite right in saying that for a long-term investigation it would be more economical to make arrangements through F.A.O. because in the long term you could not expect the United States and New Zealand Governments and the F.A.O. to make the services of the three scientists available without charge. However, we are, in fact, hoping that they will be prepared to do this for one further year, and with that provision it seems to me that the cost would certainly not be in excess of £3,000. I note that in one year, as given in the Tables annexed to IWC/15/2, the cost of this Committee of Three was only £2,200. Last year when they held their special meeting in Seattle the cost came to £4,100. Possibly Mr. Chapman can give a better indication, having regard to the work which might fall to the

Committee in the next twelve months, as to what the cost might be, but I had understood from a talk with him that it was certainly not likely to exceed £3,000 and might well be less.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Is Mr. Fujita content with the clarification which has been given by Mr. Gardner?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): It has satisfied me for the time being, but as I stated before I think that some discussion concerning the budget should take place at some appropriate time during this Commission Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): We will all bear in mind that a final decision will be taken on that when we consider the Report by the Finance and Administration Committee.

As you can see from the Report, the election of a new Chairman took place in the Scientific Committee. Dr. Mackintosh, having been in the service of the Commission for a very long period of time, asked not to be the Chairman any longer. It seems that his request has been satisfied. Professor Ruud will now replace Dr. Mackintosh in the Chair of the Scientific Committee. I am sure that everybody will join me in thanking Dr. Mackintosh for having done very valuable work for the Commission and in wishing every success to Professor Ruud in his work as Chairman of this Committee.

I think we can say that we accept both the Reports presented by the Scientific Committee - the first Report which was circulated earlier and the second Report dealing with the meeting the Committee held during the Annual Meeting. Are there any other comments?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): Could I just thank you very much for the kind things you have said? It has been a pleasure to work on this Committee, but I would like to say that I do not know how I could have managed without the help of Professor Ruud who has worked very closely with me during these years. If I can help him to anything like the same extent in the future I shall be very happy to do so.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation): Thank you...

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr Mackintosh I think we all appreciate your wish to help with the work of the Scientific Committee in future.

Would anybody like to make any comments on the final decision on the report of the Three Scientists? If there are no comments, that means that the Report of the Scientific Committee is accepted. (Agreed)

We now come to the report of the Finance and Administration Committee. That is dealt with under items 4 and 14 of the main Agenda. May I invite Mr. Gardner to give his review of the report

Mr. H. GARDNER: The Committee had before it document IWC/15/2 which covered the financial statements and the notes by the Secretary. That was the main document which was considered by the Finance and Administration Committee.

We held two quite short meetings. They were very harmonious meetings. We reached complete agreement on this document, and our report has been circulated as IWC/15/18. We hope very much that the Commission will be able to agree our recommendations as rapidly as we were able to agree to put them before the Commission.

First of all, paragraph 2 of this Report deals with the statement of income and expenditure for the year ending 31st May 1963. That was based on the statement attached to IWC/15/2.

Also given, was a provisional balance sheet for that year. I do not think I need go into the details.

Both that statement of income and expenditure, and the provisional balance sheet, were recommended to the Commission for acceptance.

We also examined both the ordinary and the extraordinary budgets which, again, have been circulated. We recommend that those two budgets should also be recommended for acceptance.

We did note that certain countries were in arrears with their subscriptions. We make our budgets on the assumption that every country will pay. If certain countries do not pay, then that creates difficulties from the point of view of the finances of this Commission.

We have, therefore, in this Report called attention to the position of Argentine and Panama, and we have asked especially that those governments should now bring their subscription up to date.

We did note that the Netherlands Government which rejoined the Commission had, of their own free will, made a payment of £250 in respect of the year 1961/62. We felt that that gesture was one which deserved appreciation from the members of the Commission.

That deals with paragraph 2 of this Report.

Paragraph 3 deals with the estimated income and expenditure for the year ending 31st May 1964. There again, looking at the ordinary budget, there will be certain provisions which may somewhat increase our printing expenditure in the coming year. What we had in mind in particular was the expense of publishing the Report of the Committee of Three. This will, I think, be appended - as we have agreed - to the Report of the Fourteenth

Meeting of this Commission, and we only mention that point so that it can be noted by the Commission.

The extraordinary budget, of course, covers the travel and subsistence costs of the Committee of Three Scientists in attending the Fifteenth Meeting of the Commission and the Meeting of the Scientific Committee last week.

We note that, allowing for this expenditure, there will in the extraordinary budget be a balance of £684 at 31st May 1964, and that is a point which the Commission may wish to take into account when looking at item 25 to which I shall come.

We took note of the International Observer Scheme, and since, as we understood the position, the cost of the Observer Scheme would fall on the five Antarctic pelagic whaling countries and would not in any way fall upon the Commission as a whole, we felt there was no need to make any recommendation on that for this purpose.

I now come to what is perhaps the item in this report that members may wish to consider more closely. We have now agreed that for one further year the Committee of Three should continue its work. I mentioned earlier my thoughts that the expenditure - assuming the services of the Three Scientists are made available for this purpose without charge - should not exceed £3,000, although we have no precise estimate now of what the expenditure will be and probably Dr Chapman will be able to help on that. But it certainly seems that the expenditure under this heading should not be more than £3,000 in the coming year, and may well be less. The Committee did not feel it was its function to recommend whether or not there should be a continuing investigation, but merely to recommend, if there were a continuing investigation, how the cost should be met. Hitherto, the cost of the Committee of Three has, as I understand it, fallen entirely on the five Antarctic pelagic whaling countries. It seemed to our Committee that the work of the Committee of Three, although specifically of concern to those five countries, was also a matter of concern to all member countries of this Commission. It seemed to us in principle that it was right that part of the cost should fall on the Commission as a whole, and the greater part of the cost should continue to be divided between those five countries in proportion to their quotas.

That is the proposal, therefore, which is made in paragraph 5, the second half of paragraph 5, as to the way the cost of this investigation by the Three Scientists should be met in the current financial year. We would suggest that each member country of the Commission should be called upon to make a payment of £50 towards the costs of the work of the Committee of Three in this present year. That would be additional to the ordinary contributions they make of £300 a year. This contribution of £50 from each member country would provide £900, and we recommend that the balance over £900 should be divided between the five Antarctic pelagic whaling countries in proportion to their quotas. Of the cost of £3,000, that means that £2,100 will fall to be divided between those five countries. If the cost were less than £3,000 then a sum of less than £2,100 would fall to be divided in this way. But we did note, according to the estimates which have been circulated to the Commission, that there was a balance of £684 estimated up to the end of the year ending 31st May 1964, and we thought that that balance - which had arisen from contributions already made by the five Antarctic pelagic whaling countries - could properly be taken into account in deciding what contribution they should make in the current year.

Therefore, if that proposal for dealing with the cost of the Committee of Three in the current year is approved, there will need to be made an

alteration to the estimate of income and expenditure for the year ending 31st May 1964, the estimate which has already been circulated.

There was one further point we considered on an entirely different subject from finance. This comes under the heading of administration. Of course, this Committee is responsible for administration as well as finance. We had before us a letter from the Commissioner for Norway on behalf of the Government of Norway inviting the Commission to hold its Sixteenth Meeting in Park Hotel, Sandefjord, Norway, in the week commencing 22nd June 1964. Mr. Sjaastad told us that accommodation would also be available in the preceding ten days for meetings of the Scientific Committee and the North Pacific group, and that there would be no charge for the use of conference rooms. The Committee gave careful consideration to this matter. One point to which we gave special consideration was whether this Commission would be ready to meet on 22nd June, which is a week earlier than we usually meet. We received advice from the Secretary that that would not give rise to any inconvenience, and we understood from the Norwegian representatives that it might be difficult to arrange a meeting a week later. In those circumstances, we felt ourselves very appreciative of this offer of the Norwegian Government. We recommend to the Commission that they should be thanked warmly for their invitation, and we recommend that this offer should be accepted.

I shall be very happy to answer any questions which any member may wish to put on this report.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Would you like to ask questions of Mr. Gardner? I would like to emphasise that I mean only questions.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): We are grateful for the explanation which was given by Mr. Gardner concerning the contribution and the method by which that contribution shall be shared by the countries concerned. Do we understand that the expenses will not exceed £3,000, and that the method of allocation will be in accordance with paragraph 5 of the Finance and Administration Committee's Report? Would you please confirm that.

Mr. H. GARDNER: That is quite right. That is my understanding, that the work will certainly not exceed £3,000. On that basis, we recommend distribution of that cost on the basis set out in this Report.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Would any other Commissioner like to ask a question? I would again emphasise that they should be questions.

Mr. G. J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): We were pleased to hear the remarks made by Mr. Gardner in connection with the Finance and Administration Committee's Report. However, we have considered the situation with regard to the visit to Sandefjord at the end of June 1964. Would it be possible to have the meeting still earlier? I am aware that it is difficult to have adequate time in which to draw up preliminary statistics on the previous season, but for the industry concerned it would be very convenient

if they were able to make up their minds whether or not they wished to take part in the Antarctic whaling in accordance with the decision of the Commission on the unit limits for the following season. It seems quite evident that we may expect that, as a result of the decision of this meeting, there will be a smaller catch possibility in the 1964/65 season, and it would appear that decisions would have to be taken as to whether or not to send out less expeditions than hitherto. It all depends on the outcome of the deliberations at Sandefjord, and therefore in the interests of the industry it would be advisable to have the meeting somewhat earlier. It would be preferable to have it as early as possible, and the figures for 1963/64 have to be taken into account.

I would like an idea as to whether there is any possibility of getting an earlier date for the meeting in Sandefjord than is now proposed for consideration by the Commission.

/The CHAIRMAN: I understand

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I understand that this is not only a question from Mr. Lienesch but a remark. I wonder whether Mr. Lienesch would object to our discussing this question later when we consider the matter of our next Meeting. (Agreed)

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I should like to ask whether the Chairman of the Committee of Three can confirm Mr. Gardner's expectation that the cost of continuing the Committee's work next year will, indeed, be £3000 or less.

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (Committee of Three Scientists): I have made a hurried study of the possible costs and believe that Mr. Gardner's estimate is quite correct. There will, of course, be no salary costs involved, or very minimal ones for some routine assistance. On the other hand, of course, there will be larger travel costs. However, I think these will approximately balance. So that I feel quite confident that the investigation and the additional analyses can be carried on for the sum of £3000.

I am not sure whether this is the most appropriate time to do it, but I should like to call the attention of the Commission to the valuable assistance, the extremely valuable assistance, which the Committee of Three has had during the past year from Mr. Gulland. I should like to state that, if the Committee of Three feel that they can continue this work during the next year, they would very much appreciate having the continued assistance of Mr. Gulland. If the British Government can provide Mr. Gulland's services on the same basis as the New Zealand Government provides Mr. Allen's services, my own are provided by the United States' Government, and Mr. Holt's by FAO, we should like this Committee of Three to become, in fact, a Committee of Four for the coming year to carry on the assessment which you have requested us to continue to make for this one year.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Chapman. Is Dr. Sprules content with the answer?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Yes, thank you.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I would only like to say that we shall, of course, be very happy to continue the same arrangements with regard to the services of Mr. Gulland.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Gardner.

If there are no further questions, may I have your comments? I think it would be wise for us to take comments on the different sections of the Report. We will take item 2 -- and only item 2 -- first. I would like to have your comments on item 2 of the Finance and Administration Committee's Report.

As you see, this item consists of two points. The first part is that we should accept both the ordinary and the extraordinary budgets. The second part concerns the contributions from Argentina and Panama which are still outstanding. The proposal there is that we should send a letter to

these Governments asking them to pay their contributions.

Are there any comments on this item of the Report? If there are no comments, does that mean that this paragraph is agreed upon? (Agreed)

We now come to item 3 of the Report which is the estimated income and expenditure for the year ending 31 May, 1964. It may be your wish that this should be discussed together with item 5. If there are no objections, we will take items 3 and 5 together in our discussion.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): With regard to item 3, there is a statement that there is money available in the ordinary budget to cover the expenses of publishing the Report of the Committee of Three. I am not sure whether this will come up at any other time in our Meeting, but I should like to express, on behalf of Canada, an earnest hope that the Report of the Committee of Three be properly published and made available for distribution.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I wonder if there may not be some misunderstanding here. What I understand is that the Report of the Committee of Three will be published as an Appendix to the Proceedings of this Commission and will, therefore, fall on the ordinary budget. The sum of £684 will not be available for meeting that cost.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Am I correct in assuming, then, that there is no other place on our Agenda where we could discuss the publication of the Report of the Committee of Three?

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I am new to the procedures of this Commission, but I had understood that when we approved the Report of this Commission for its fourteenth year that would include approval for publication both of that Report and its Appendices, and one of the Appendices is the Report of the Committee of Three.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): May I ask the Secretary to comment on this?

The SECRETARY: What Mr. Gardner has said is correct. It is contemplated that the Report of the Committee of Three will be published in the Fourteenth Annual Report which is likely to be published before Christmas.

I would add that this is quite normal for us. It is quite the normal thing for us to produce as Appendices special reports and publications which we receive. This is not any big thing for us.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): In relation to paragraph 5 of this Report, I would just like to clarify Australia's position. I have no authority to commit my Government to any additional payments in relation to the Commission. I should, therefore, like to reserve Australia's position.

Captain A.N. SOLYANIK (USSR)(Interpretation): I should like to say a few words concerning paragraph 5. As we have already informed the Commission, we have adopted a large programme of research for the coming year. It is likely that, according to our estimate, we shall have spent all the money which we have designated for this purpose. That is why it seems unlikely that we shall find it possible to increase the contribution by £50. The same may be said about the further increase in annual contributions concerning the additional sum of £2100 which must be divided on the basis of the quota agreement.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): The Commission will recall that when we discussed whether there should be such a continuing research programme I expressed my Government's misgivings about that. The Commission has, however, decided to undertake such a one-year programme at least. On that ground alone I feel I must reserve my position when it comes to the question of financing it.

There is a second ground for reservation by New Zealand on this proposal, and that is our misgivings in the light of the use to which such scientific evidence is being put and our misgivings about putting any of that on the normal budget of the Commission as a whole.

On both those grounds I must join Mr. Setter in reserving my Government's position on the proposal as a whole, and particularly on the question of increasing the normal budget by £50 for all members.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(Interpretation): According to the Constitution of the Japanese Government, any expenditure must be approved by the Diet and, therefore, all that we can say is that we shall pay in accordance with the annual budgetary appropriations. I will, of course, do my best to get authorization by the Diet.

I should like to ask a question in connexion with what has been stated by the USSR, namely, that they will not be able to pay the cost. Australia and New Zealand have also made reservations on the assessment of the contribution. We are wondering what will happen when these countries have ceased to pay the costs and only the remaining countries are paying them. That is the situation which arises from the statements made by the Delegations I have mentioned.

Mr. E. FERNANDEZ-RIVERA (Mexico)(Interpretation): I cannot give any decision regarding my country's attitude about the £50 contribution until I have consulted with them.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(Interpretation): No answer has been given to the question I raised just now, either by the Delegates or by the Chairman. We would like to know what the result will be when this position arises.

/Captain A.N. SOLYANIK

Capt. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): In order that Mr. Fujita can have the answer as early as possible, I can give the explanation now. I fully understand that some Commissioners have reserved their position on this question. Each country has its own budget and its own expenditures. Each country has its own rules as to how these expenditures should be allocated to the corresponding organisations. When we were preparing what views to put before this Meeting, no comments were made on this. Nobody can know what increases in expenditure there will be for the 1964 Budget. Whether this sum of money is £50 or £5,000 there is a great need for this to be laid down in a formal way. This question must be solved by the ruling organisations. At the present moment we are unable to say yes. It seems to me that if the International Observer Scheme is approved, this may make it much easier for us to accept all these expenditures. However, today we are unable to vote in favour of any additional expenditures.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): We have roughly understood what has been said by Captain Solyanik. We understand that due to the procedure taken by their Government they cannot say anything definite on behalf of their Government. In fact, he has made reservations concerning the costs and allocation. We do think that the Commissioners should do their best in the light of the decision which will be taken now.

When Captain Solyanik made his first statement we understood him to say that they had used up all the money set aside for this purpose and were not in a position to be able to pay. That is the reason why I am raising this question. I understand now that according to the domestic procedure that will be decided by the Government, and he cannot say anything definite now. That is what we understood him to say.

Capt. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Your understanding of our position is correct. First of all, we must register this additional sum of money officially. Secondly, our estimate of expenditure for the forthcoming year has already been adopted. A lot of difficulties would be created if we tried to make any changes to it as regards increased payments.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): Could I ask one question for clarification? At the time the Finance Committee prepared this Report - I remember because I sat on it - we were thinking in terms of how to finance a programme which went on for several years. You will notice that it talks about the annual sum required, etc., so that it would have meant for Members other than the Big Five an increase of £50. a year for several years. In the light of the decision we have taken on the research programme, which is that we will have a one-year programme only run by the Committee of Three, can I assume that what is now suggested is that there will be a special one-year only additional contribution of £50. asked from Member Governments rather than a regular increase of the Budget from £300 to £350 every year?

Mr. H. GARDENER (United Kingdom): Perhaps I can deal both with this question and with what Captain Solyanik has said.

He said that we had, in fact, approved the estimate of income and expenditure but that is not so. The last sentence of paragraph 5 says that, "If this scheme is agreed a corresponding alteration will have to be made to the Estimate of Income and Expenditure for the year ending May 31st, 1964", and I would like to suggest that if, in fact, this recommendation is agreed the Secretary should circulate a revised estimate of income and expenditure which can then be formally approved. There would have to be inserted in that in the Ordinary Budget this contribution of £900 to the cost of the Committee of Three one one side and on the other side there would have to be the contributions from the Contracting Governments of £350 instead of £300. In the Extraordinary Budget there would have to be provision for the balance of the cost for the expenditure on the work of the Committee of Scientists and the contributions from the five Governments.

Dealing with Mr. Jermyn's point, we have only recommended that this work should be carried on for one year, and we should consider at our next Meeting in the light of the Secretary's discussions with F.A.O. what provision should be made thereafter. Therefore, our only resolution today is that there should be a special addition for this year, as I understand it, of £50 to the contributions from Member countries, and the position for the future would be considered afresh at our Meeting in twelve months' time.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): The reason I asked that question was because I think it does make a very great difference to how we proceed. Clearly if we had a long-term programme it would have to be financed every year and proper allowance would have to be made. If we are thinking of a one-year only programme and are worrying about how to finance it for the next year, it seems to me that we ought to look very closely at the fact that our budget provides for us to end the year with a balance of over £3,000. This is, of course, a fictional balance in that it includes income in arrears which has not come to hand but there is at least £900 there. I realise we must keep our reserves up, but I wonder whether we need to contemplate asking Members for £50 contribution for a one-year only scheme when there seems to be money in the balance to cover it.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any other comments on this matter? May I take it that there are no other comments?

I would now like to have your views on the following matter. We could take a decision on the Ordinary Budget of the Commission without considering the expenditure for the Committee of Three. After that we might take a decision on the Extraordinary Budget. Would you be in favour of this? (Agreed) Are there any objections concerning that first part, the Ordinary Budget of the Commission?

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I am sorry. This is my fault. I am confused. Do you mean is there any objection to the Ordinary Budget as suggested by the Committee or the Ordinary Budget with a £50 addition?

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I would like to repeat that this does not include the expenditure involved in the Committee of Three's work. If there are no further comments on this, I declare that the Ordinary Budget is accepted.

As far as the Extraordinary Budget is concerned, most of the people who spoke reserved their positions subject to the approval of their Governments. There was also a proposal to invite our Governments to approve of this Budget. There was also an opinion expressed by Mr. Jermyn of New Zealand that the expenditure involved in the work of the Committee of Three should be borne only by five countries engaged in the Antarctic pelagic whaling. Am I right in understanding that an opinion was expressed to that effect?

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I think I may have confused you here. I was not suggesting for a moment that the whole £3,000 should come from our Budgets but simply that if the Commission as a whole feels that all Members should pay part of the cost of the programme - and the paper recommends that they pay £900 of it - that is not something which we would feel happy about. If the Commission feels that it wants to do that, I put forward a suggestion that they might think of taking that £900 out of the Commission's balances, not the whole £3,000.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Jermyn, for this clarification. Do I understand you correctly, that you suggest that the balance figure of £684 be used as part of the expenditure involved in The Committee of Three's work?

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I am sorry that this is developing into a dialogue between us; that is not at all my wish.

Are we not confusing here the extraordinary budget with what might be called a special expenditure on the science programme? The extraordinary budget is only the budget contributed by the five pelagic powers, and they are the only people who can really say what should happen to any money left in. I do not think the rest of us can decide to do anything with that £684.

As I understand it, what the Finance Committee here is suggesting is that if a research programme costing £3,000 is to be set up, and if the pelagic five agree to contribute £2,100 of that, they may decide to use the £684 they have left owing to them. It is their money after all. They may decide to contribute that. But that is a decision for them. I would not presume to tell them. All I am suggesting is that if the Commission wants to draw £900 from Commission funds, it should look at its own Commission balances.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Could I ask the Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee to speak on this matter.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I believe it may be possible after this discussion to put a suggestion which may meet the views of all concerned round this table, that is what I want at least to try to do.

The first proposal we made is that part of the cost of this investigation, which we approved at a cost of £3,000, should fall on the ordinary budget. If that is accepted, then there will need to be inserted in the ordinary budget an item of contribution to the cost of the Committee of £900. That will fall on the expenditure side. That is the first point which this Commission has to decide: should £900 towards the costs of the Three Scientists fall on the ordinary budget?

The second point is, if that item appears on the expenditure side, what should you put in on the income side? The Finance and Administration Committee suggest that on the income side you should insert £350 instead of £300 as the contribution of the eighteen member governments, but there is an alternative. In that ordinary budget there is shown at the end of the year an estimated balance of £3,441. That sum would be ample to cover this sum of £900 added to the expenditure, without calling upon additional contributions for this coming year from member countries. It is true that the estimated balance of £3,441 assumes that all the countries in arrears with their subscriptions pay up their subscriptions, and we hope they will do so.

However, I would like to suggest, in view of the difficulty that certain countries round this table feel in agreeing to a contribution of £350 instead of £300, that we should leave the contribution at £300 and allow this £900 to be met out of the balance which we already have in the budget.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Agreed.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): Having this £900 on the ordinary budget, the balance of £2,204 will appear on the extraordinary budget reduced by £648, so that there will be a sum of approximately £1,400 to appear on the ordinary budget to be divided among the five Antarctic pelagic whaling countries.

If I have made that position clear, I think possibly that would meet the discussion which has been taking place round this room, and we could possibly circulate a formal proposal for approval on those lines.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Gardner.

I feel that we should now adjourn for lunch, and perhaps we might ask Mr. Gardner if during the short adjournment he would put everything he has suggested in written form and circulate it round the table. We will discuss it after that.

A meeting on the International Observer Scheme will be held at 1.30 when matters still outstanding on the International Observer Scheme will be discussed.

We will reconvene in plenary session at 2.30 p.m.

(The Conference adjourned at 12.50 p.m.
and reconvened at 2.45 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Will the Meeting please come to order.

When we adjourned before lunch, we were discussing Mr. Gardner's proposals. On the basis of that proposal, we now have the draft before us. This document has been circulated around the table. Perhaps Mr. Gardner has something he would like to add on this draft

Mr H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I have done my best to set out clearly on this paper what I put before the Commission before lunch. Perhaps I may suggest that members should have an opportunity to read this to see if there are any questions they wish to ask, but I do think it gives effect broadly to what we agreed.

There is one point perhaps I should mention. It will be noted that a sum of £900 has been inserted in the ordinary budget, but the contributions from the contracting governments remain unchanged at £300. We have inserted in the extraordinary budget £3,000 as the cost of the special investigation, and that will be met partly by this sum of £900 transferred from the ordinary budget, partly from the estimated surplus of £684 which appeared originally and which has now been deleted, and finally by contributions from the five governments of the Antarctic pelagic whaling countries in the proportions shown, adding up to a total of £1,416.

It will, of course, be appreciated that none of those five countries at present has authority to incur this expenditure, but if this resolution is passed by this Commission they have agreed to seek authority.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Gardner.

Would the Commission like to have a short period of time to have a closer look at this document. I take your silence to mean that you want to have some short period of time to consider it

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): If there are no questions on this document, perhaps I can formally move its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any questions to Mr. Gardner?

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (U.S.A.): I formally second Mr. Gardner's proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I have a question on item 1(c) (ii). Is the wording in that paragraph acceptable? It says that the sum of £1,416 which shall be subdivided between the five Antarctic pelagic whaling countries in accordance with their quotas. It seems to me that the Commission may ask their governments to pay out that sum. May I have the views of the Commissioners representing the five Antarctic pelagic countries? May I have their views as to the wording of this item?

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway) (Interpretation): I agree with the view which you have just put forward. I cannot see that the Schedule of the Convention would give the Commission the right to put extra obligations on certain member countries. However, the Commission may pass the recommendation to the five countries to pay amounts to do with certain objectives. I shall agree that such a recommendation be passed. However, I do so on the understanding that the Norwegian Government cannot be bound to pay this amount.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any comments from the Commissioners representing the five pelagic countries?

Mr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): I can tell you that we are fully in agreement with the views just put before the Commission by the Norwegian Delegate. I am quite willing to present the request of the Commission to my Government for the extra contribution, but I can give no proof at the moment that this proposal will be accepted, although for myself I have the impression that we are prepared to co-operate to the utmost as regards scientific research.

/The CHAIRMAN:

IWC/15/17

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(Interpretation): Our Delegation agrees to the wording which appears in this paper, and we shall do our best to ask our Diet for their approval if the other countries agree to pay the amount in accordance with the procedure which appears in the paper.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Gardner, would you be prepared to have an amendment to this?

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): Yes. I was wondering if the views which have been expressed would be met if, in paragraph (c)(ii), we inserted the words, "with the agreement of their Governments". It would then read, "The sum of £1,416 which shall, with the agreement of their Governments, be subdivided"

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I think it will be better to recommend that they get the consent of the Governments. As far as I understood it, that is what people here meant. It seems to me that we should insert the words "Recommend with the consent of the Governments". Can I have your agreement to this draft resolution, bearing in mind that we have this amendment? Is there any objection? If there is no objection the resolution is carried. (Agreed)

I should like now to take item 18, Date and Place of Next Meeting. I understand that we have an invitation from Norway to hold our next Meeting in that country. This was mentioned by Mr. Gardner when he was giving a review of the Committee's Report. We have also heard the date, 22 June, 1964. I am sure you will all join me in thanking the representatives of Norway for inviting us to hold our next Meeting in their country. If there are no objections to this proposal, I will thank the Norwegian Government, through Mr. Sjaastad, for their invitation.

Another point here concerns the date of the Meeting. Is the date, 22 June, 1964, acceptable to everybody, bearing in mind that the Norwegian Delegation has expressed its view that it would be more convenient for Norway to have the Meeting convened on that particular date?

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway)(Interpretation): It may, perhaps, be a matter of some surprise to the Commission that we have suggested this date and said that only this date would be acceptable to us. We were, however, forced to make a decision here. The reason is that we have to make advance bookings in the hotels in Sandefjord and it will, unfortunately, not be possible to change these dates because the hotels where rooms have been reserved cannot accommodate the Commission at any other time.

One of the reasons for our choosing Sandefjord as the Meeting place when the Commission comes to Norway is that there is a very comfortable and modern hotel there, but as well as that Sandefjord was one of the towns where whaling was started in Norway. There is a museum there which shows the development of whaling in Norway. This is one of the reasons why we should like the Commission to hold its Meeting in Sandefjord and not in Oslo.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Sjaastad, for your kind clarification.

Mr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): We have heard such strong arguments before the Commission that I hesitate to make any other proposal at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Do I understand, Mr. Lienesch, that you second the proposal to have a Meeting in Sandefjord? (Seconded by Mr. G.J. Lienesch)

If there are no further comments, is that agreed? (Agreed)

We have now dealt with the Report by the Finance and Administration Committee, and that means that we have covered items 4 and 14 of our Agenda.

If there is no objection, I would suggest that we take item 8 on our Agenda, Special Scientific Investigation of the Antarctic Whale Stock.

Would Dr. Mackintosh or Professor Ruud like to comment on this matter?

/Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH.....

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I do not know that there is anything more I can say beyond what is in the Scientific Report. I would think that this is, perhaps, a matter on which a Member of the Committee of Three or Professor Ruud might comment since this is looking to the programmes for the coming year or years.

Prof. J.T. RUUD (Norway): I understand that Item 8 on the Agenda deals with the special scientific investigation of the Antarctic whale stock, the Second Interim Report of the Committee of Three Scientists, the Report of the Joint Meeting, the Report of the Scientific Subcommittee Meeting and the Final Report of the Committee of Three Scientists. I think that this point ought to be handled by the Chairman of the Committee of Three, Dr. Chapman, who I am afraid is not here at the moment, or perhaps by Mr. Holt.

Mr. S.J. HOLT (Committee of Three Scientists): My other two members have deserted me and we agreed that they should because we felt that we had no more to say on this. We thought that this subject had, in fact, been covered under other Items of the Agenda, through having discussed at length the recommendations of the Committee of Three both directly and through the Report of the Scientific Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Holt. I quite agree with what you have just said. Does anybody else wish to speak?

Prof. J.T. RUUD (Norway): At our first Plenary Session these Reports were referred to the Technical Committee. I do not know if Dr. Sprules has something to add.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): This matter was indeed referred to the Technical Committee. The final Report of the Committee of Three was available to us during our discussions. We gave very close consideration to each of the very important recommendations contained in the Report but I am afraid that I have nothing further to add.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any comments on this? If there are no other proposals then I think we might say that we receive and note the Report.

Item 9 on the Agenda. Since this matter was introduced by the U.S.A. Delegation, would Dr. Kellogg or Mr. Herrington like to say anything on this?

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (U.S.A.): These four points were included in the Agenda to provide a basis for discussion by the Conference of the Report of the Committee of Three but otherwise the actual points which were raised in the Committee of Three's Report would not be pin-pointed. They are up for discussion in case anyone wishes to elaborate on them or question the accuracy or the intent of the Report of the Three Scientists.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Kellogg. You may recall that this Item has also been referred to the Technical Committee and I shall now ask Dr. Sprules if he has any comment on this?

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (U.S.A.): I merely wish to say further that these are the points which should be taken up if action is desired on the intent of the Report.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I have not had an opportunity to tell you yet what happened in our meeting last night when we terminated the discussions of the Technical Committee. Unfortunately, we were unable to complete all the Items on our Agenda, and this is one of the Items which was not fully considered by the Technical Committee. We have to report back to you no progress with regard to this Item.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): What shall we do with this Item? I think we could break for tea now and tackle this matter with renewed force afterwards.

(The Conference adjourned at 3.20 p.m.
and reconvened at 3.40 p.m.)

We have come to the conclusion that it might be better to leave Item 9 for the time being and proceed to Item 16. As far as Item 9 is concerned, I would ask you to consider it in the meantime. I would be grateful if you can help me in this because I am a very inexperienced Chairman! Moreover, the Technical Committee has not adopted any decision on this Item. There was a wide difference of opinion, and there was no possibility of arriving at a unanimous decision.

I would now like to invite Dr. Sprules to go on with his review of the sub-Items of Item 16.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES: (Canada) We have submitted a new Document IWC/15/19 which has been circulated and contains in it a summary of the few decisions we were able to make at our last meeting last night.

I would like to point out that these begin on page 5 and are carried on on pages 6 and 7. This summary was not approved by the Technical Committee because we have not had an opportunity to have a meeting to approve this Draft. However, I shall review it with you and I am sure if any of my Committee has any comments to make on any Item they will have ample opportunity to do so under the Agenda Item 16.

We had a brief review of the progress of the International Observer Scheme made available to us and we noted this with interest.

We then considered the blue whale catch limit in the Antarctic area and there were several proposals made by different Delegations. Each of these is listed on page 5 and page 6 of this Draft Report. You will note that the United Kingdom proposal is for 4,000 blue whale units. There is a Japanese proposal for 10,000 blue whale units. There is a Soviet proposal for 12,000 blue whale units. We discussed each of these proposals at great length and we took into consideration the recommendations of the

scientists, the industry interests and the rational development and continuation of whaling in the Antarctic area. We were unable to reach agreement and thus regret very much that we can only outline these proposals that were considered and ask this Commission to reach a decision.

The other Items on our Agenda we were unable to complete. We were unable to consider the opening dates and length of the Antarctic pelagic baleen whaling season. We did not reach a decision with regard to the Items on your Agenda which I reviewed just before the break.

I am afraid that that is the sum total of our deliberations.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The work has not been very successful, has it? Could we now discuss Item 16 (h), Blue whale unit catch limit in the Antarctic. The proposal by the Technical Committee concerning this matter has been reviewed by Dr. Sprules. Dr. Sprules has just stated all the points of view which were expressed at the Meeting. May I ask for your comments on this matter?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): As we have been requested to speed things up, we will not explain the reasons for our proposal which we have stated several times. We will simply submit our proposal as a motion, which is to the effect that the catch limit should be set at 10,000 units for the coming 1963/64 season.

Capt. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Having your suggestion as a guide, having in mind that it is a very difficult and complicated question and taking into consideration the general mood of the Meeting, the Soviet Delegation has re-considered the statement which was made yesterday. We are prepared to accept the Japanese proposal of a limit of 10,000 blue whale units.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): We have been thinking very deeply on this question and have had talks with a number of other Delegations. Our position, as is explained in the Report of the Technical Committee which has been circulated, is that the findings of this Commission ought to be in accordance with the scientific evidence, and that the scientific evidence points to a level of 4,000 blue whale units rather than the figure of 10,000 which has been suggested. We have not departed from our position which, I think, is in accordance with the position that a number of other Delegations round this table have taken in the discussion. However, we have looked further at this question because we have to approach this not only as Commissioners of individual governments but as Members of this Commission as a whole. We would like to see when this day is over a conclusion emerge from this Commission that would be acceptable to the Commission as a whole.

I would recall the origin of this matter. I am advised that there was a resolution adopted at the 1960 Meeting of the Commission when the special scientific investigation was commissioned to the effect that it was the intention of member countries to bring the catch limit into line with the scientific findings not later than 31st July, 1964, twelve months from now.

Mr. H. Gardner (Continued)

That was the target set by this Commission in the Resolution passed in 1960 which led to these special scientific investigations. We have heard from the Delegations of the Soviet Union and Japan, in particular, of the difficulties their industries would face if there was an immediate and drastic reduction in the amount which could be caught.

I did mention last night that the United Kingdom Government would also face a considerable difficulty under the present quota arrangements if, for example, the amounts we could catch with our one expedition were to be reduced from 500 or 600 units down to 250 units, which would be so small as to make it not worth while sending the expedition to sea.

Therefore, what I would like to try and suggest as a compromise between all the different points of view which have been expressed is that we should adhere to the Resolution of 1960 and seek to give real effect in twelve months' time to the findings of the scientists, but that we should for this current year consider this proposal of 10,000 blue whale units, which has been submitted by the Japanese Commissioner and which the Soviet Union Commissioner is also prepared to accept. I do feel if we are too hasty on this, that if, for example, this Commission recommended a catch limit of 4,000 or 5,000 units, we might well find that the Soviet Union Government or the Japanese Government would exercise their right to object, and then we should have achieved nothing.

From the practical point of view, I do not think that would be a responsible action for this Commission as a whole to take. On the other hand, I would understand that both the Soviet Union and the Japanese Delegations do not feel that their Governments would feel it necessary to raise objection if 10,000 were the limit adopted by this Commission at this meeting.

Therefore, for the United Kingdom Delegation's point of view I would be prepared to support this recommendation. In doing this, I would like to stress that this would only be for one year. I would like to stress that even though some members feel that on this matter we have not made as much progress this year as we might have, there are other matters on which we have made much progress. The International Observer Scheme will, we hope, be operating next season. We have considered a total prohibition on humpback whales. I am prepared at the appropriate time to put forward a formula we have agreed with the Japanese Delegation for a very large measure of protection of blue whales, and I think with that we shall have done a great deal at this meeting and can carry matters further, I would hope, at our meeting in 1964.

Therefore, on that basis I myself for the United Kingdom Delegation would be prepared to support the proposal put forward by the Japanese Delegation and accepted by the Delegation of the U.S.S.R.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Gardner. It seems that three Delegations have supported the proposal to have a quota of 10,000 blue whale units for the next season, and to have further scientific investigation to reconsider the matter at the next meeting in the light of the scientific investigations.

Are there any more comments on this matter?

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway) (Interpretation): Allow me to make a brief remark on the position of Norway as to this matter. In our opinion, this proposal of 10,000 blue whale units is too high, if the purpose is to

have the largest measure of conservation of the whale stocks. If it is true that it will not be possible to catch more than between 8,000 and 9,000 blue whale units in the coming season, then this proposal means no actual reduction in catch. I am aware that a further reduction will mean difficulties for the industry. However, this is something we have experienced since the childhood of this industry. If the raw material at hand is not sufficient for the capacity, then the capacity must be reduced. Such is the situation now, so whether we like it or not we must draw the right conclusions from this reduced raw material.

Finally, let me say this: often in international negotiations opinions may differ as to the right solution. I think we are in the position that the coming season will in itself provide the answer to the problem we have.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Sjaastad. May I ask the Norwegian Commissioner what would be the figure he would suggest?

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway) (Interpretation): I shall vote in favour of Mr. Gardner's original proposal.

Mr. Wm.C. HERRINGTON (U.S.A.): As has already been stated, this Commission has had working for it for several years in its Scientific Committee and its Committee of Three the most competent scientists available in this field. As a result of their work, they made the following recommendations to the Commission: (1) That there be complete cessation of the catching of blue and humpback whales, Groups IV and V, for a considerable number of years. This was later modified to apply to all humpback whales in the southern hemisphere; (2) that the quota on fin whale catches be reduced to 7,000 or less. Later, as a result of their analysis of the effects of the last season of whaling, they modified this to 5,000 or less. They added that the greater the reduction in the present quota the more rapidly will fin whale stocks rebuild to a level which will sustain productivity. They also recommended that the blue whale unit be eliminated, and a separate quota established for each species. Finally, they recommended that the population analysis be continued based on the biological data of all the countries participating in the last whaling season when only 11,283 units were taken.

Scientists have estimated that during the next season, the 1963/64 season, using the same effort as during 1962/63, they would expect a catch of about 8,500 blue whale units. It follows, therefore, that any quota of more than this number is meaningless in the conservation measures. In effect, a higher quota provides a goal and incentive to increase the fishing intensity expended last year. It is an incentive for harder fishing, rather than a limitation on catch.

We know of the several proposals made for limits for the coming season. Three of these provide for quotas which are greater than the catch expected during the coming season, using the same fishing effort and size of fleet as operated during the past season. In justification for these quotas, we heard many explanations, but I believe they all boiled down to what is necessary to provide a profitable operation for the entire fleet which operated last year. I do not recall a single consideration based on conservation. There was one proposal -- that of the United Kingdom --

supported by Norway, which was based on the report of the scientists. It did not get very much support from the other Antarctic whaling countries. It would seem that any proposal for a quota which is greater than 8,500 blue whale units cannot be considered to contribute in any way to the needs of conservation, it is entirely based on the economic needs of the present whaling fleet.

/The CHAIRMAN: ...

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Herrington. Am I right in understanding that you suggest the figure of 8000?

Mr. Wm.C. HERRINGTON (USA): In our view the only sound proposal made was that of the United Kingdom, and we would support their original proposal of 4000 blue whale units.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): The Chairman has asked us to be brief so I shall simply say that I would entirely endorse and support the remarks just made by the United States Commissioner.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I should also like to add my voice in support of the views expressed by Mr. Herrington.

Mr. G.J. IJMESCH (Netherlands): We have heard many opinions expressed and we are, I believe, now faced with a very important decision which the Commission has to take. We have to compare scientific evidence and economic necessity. Each of us can see the situation from one viewpoint, but it is difficult to see it from both sides.

I should like to call your attention to the fact that, if we reduce the blue whale unit maximum to 10,000 it will be a decrease from 15,000. This will also be a step towards conservation, although it may be somewhat theoretical. But the other suggestion is not entirely practical either.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further proposals I take it that, according to the Rules of Procedure, we have now to take a vote on the proposals which have been moved. Since we are considering the Report by the Technical Committee and this is something on which that Committee has not adopted any final decision, I think I am in a position to take a vote on the proposals in the order in which they were moved. Are there any objections to this? If there are none, it is agreed.

I will now ask the Secretary to take a poll of the Commission on the proposal put forward by the Japanese Delegation seconded by the Soviet Delegation, and supported by the Delegation of the United Kingdom and, it seems, by the Delegation of the Netherlands. I will ask Commissioners to give their opinions on whether this proposal is acceptable to them or not.

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway)(Interpretation): It appears to me that the voting procedure which the Chairman has just outlined may not be the best one. To me it sounds more logical to start voting on the proposals taking the proposal for the maximum reduction first. The reason is that there may be Delegations who would give their alternative support to other proposals if the first proposal were not passed. This would not be possible if we were to vote in the way which the Chairman has suggested.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Sjaastad, I am ready to accept any proposal on the procedure of voting. It seems to me that it is the results that matter.

Would there be any objection if I were to suggest that we take a poll on the minimum figure which has been suggested, that is the maximum reduction?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(Interpretation): The present problem is very important and, therefore, I am not sure if voting for the minimum is the best procedure by which to settle it. We hope that the members of the Commission will analyse the situation which may arise as a result of the voting procedure and will consider this matter.

So far as the Japanese Delegation is concerned, we should like our proposal to be considered first and decided upon.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I am sorry, Mr. Fujita, I did not quite understand what you meant. It appears that if we wish to reach an agreement on the changes or the amendments to the Schedule we have to take a vote on them.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(Interpretation): I think the method by which we can resolve this is not confined to the method of voting.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I think I understand you, Mr. Fujita, but we must above all consider the fact that we are governed by the Rules of Procedure. Otherwise we shall just exchange opinions and not reach any decision at all. I think that we have had ample opportunity to exchange our opinions on this matter, and it has been taken up and discussed at length at the meetings of the Technical Committee.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I should like to say that the only Motion at the moment formally before the Meeting is that for 10,000 units proposed by Japan and seconded by the Soviet Union. As I understand it, there is no other Motion before the Meeting; we have merely had comments from different Commissioners.

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway)(Interpretation): After the statement just made by Mr. Gardner, which I believe is a correct one, I will formally move the proposal which Mr. Gardner submitted yesterday in the Technical Committee. As will be recalled by the Commission, the proposal submitted yesterday by Mr. Gardner in the Technical Committee was that there should be a catch limit of 4000 blue whale units for the next season.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Sjaastad. Am I right in understanding that you still insist that your proposal be the first to be put to the vote although it was the second to be moved?

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway)(Interpretation): I have no strong views or convictions on the correct rules of procedure here; I would leave that to the Chairman. I only wish to point out that, if we follow the procedure

which I have suggested, it will then be possible for a Delegation to vote for alternative proposals.

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (USA): As an amendment to the 10,000 I second Norway's suggestion.

Captain A.N. SOLYANIK (USSR)(Interpretation): I should like to say a few words in order to clarify the situation. Yesterday, at the meeting of the Technical Committee, a lot of proposals were made. The Committee heard with great attention both the findings of the scientists and the ideas of those who were thinking about the interests of the industry. I should like to say that yesterday, when we made comparisons between two seasons, 1962/1963 and 1961/1962, we took into consideration the fact that, in the last season, the number of catchers which were operating in Antarctic waters were fewer by 60 compared with the number in previous years. We also took into account the fact that one of the Norwegian factories had to leave Antarctic waters because of an accident. We can say that, during the last season, the factual catch was at the level of the previous one, which means 15,000 blue whale units.

Taking into consideration the opinion of the majority, the fact that the situation in the Antarctic waters has changed, the desire that Antarctic pelagic whaling should be prolonged for very many years, and that the countries engaged in Antarctic pelagic whaling -- particularly Japan and the Soviet Union -- are deeply concerned, we came to the conclusion after long discussion that we should reduce the catch limit to 10,000 blue whale units. I am saying this only because I want to clarify the position of the Soviet Delegation which was insisting yesterday on a catch limit of 12,000 blue whale units.

If we take a total quota now of 10,000 blue whale units the Soviet Union will find itself in a most unfavourable position. We have 70 catcher boats which are taking part in pelagic whaling operations in the Antarctic waters and our national quota, which rules our behaviour, is 20 per cent. This means that we may catch only 2000 blue whale units. The Norwegian fleet has 32 catchers, half as many as we have, but their quota is 28 per cent, which means that the Norwegian fleet has the right to catch 2800 blue whale units, approximately one and a half times more. The Japanese fleet has a total number of 79 catcher boats and their quota is equal to 41 per cent, which means that the Japanese fleet, with a quota of 10,000 blue whale units, will have the right to catch 4100 blue whale units. That means that, with the same number of catchers, they will have to right to catch twice as many whales as the Soviet Union.

We have taken a great decision today. We consider that, in the course of today's discussion the only proposal which has been made formally is that by Japan, which we support. We hope that, in order to reach common agreement, this proposal will be supported by the majority of the Delegates.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Captain Solyanik. We have a proposal from the Japanese Delegation for 10,000 units, and we have an amendment put forward the the Norwegian Commissioner for 4000 blue whale units. The amendment has been seconded by the Commissioner for the United States. I am wondering what is the right thing to do. If we put the amendment for 4000 blue whale units to the vote first and it is passed, in the period of 90 days each country has the right to object to this proposal. We should then be left with the 15,000, and we should be in a worse position. However, I think we have to follow the Rules of Procedure and take the amendment first. Is everyone in favour of that.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I am in favour of that procedure which seems to be in accordance with the normal practice. I am advised that Delegates are entitled before they cast their vote to explain why they are casting it. It seems to me that it might be helpful in view of what some people may feel is the rather ambiguous position of the United Kingdom if I were to explain in advance why I shall be voting against this figure of 4,000. This is certainly something I would like to see brought into operation but it is quite clear that if the Commission did, in fact, pass that resolution two of the major Antarctic pelagic whaling countries would object and we should have achieved nothing. I believe by adopting the other alternative of 10,000 units proposed by the Japanese Delegation we shall have achieved something and this will pave the way to achieving more next year. They have made concessions. They were first talking of 10,000 units for three years. They are now prepared to consider 10,000 units for one year only and the whole matter reviewed next year.

That is the statement I would wish to make as to why I shall be voting against this when the time comes.

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway) (Interpretation): In view of the statement which you have made and in view of the statement which has been made by the United Kingdom Commissioner and in view of the fact that this is a situation which we review so seriously in Norway, the Norwegian Delegation will withdraw its proposed amendment to the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): That simplifies things quite a bit. We now only have one proposal before us, the quota of 10,000 blue whale units.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I do not wish to delay a vote on this but it seems to me that the withdrawal of the alternative proposal does create a new situation. Since there is now no alternative, I wish at this stage to suggest a different amendment to the Japanese proposal, the gist of which would be that Members this year in agreeing to 10,000 blue whale units would undertake at the next Commission Meeting to base that year's quota directly on the evidence of the scientists.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It seems that we now have a new amendment to the proposal put forward by the Japanese Delegation. As I understand the amendment, it means that it would accept this figure of 10,000 blue whale units this year but next year this figure should be reduced so that it is on a level with that which is suggested by the scientists. Am I right in this, Mr. Jermyrn? (Yes)

This seems to be a very complicated problem. The fact is that we do not know what the scientists are going to propose or suggest at the next Meeting.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): May I suggest that what the New Zealand Commissioner is asking for is already on the records of this Commission. When I addressed this Meeting earlier I drew attention to the resolution adopted at the 1960 Meeting, which was to the effect that it was the intention of member countries to bring the catch limit into line with the scientific findings not later than 31st July, 1964. That resolution is in our records. It has not been rescinded, and it does precisely what the New Zealand Delegate has asked should be done.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): This Commission has an unhappy record of passing pious resolutions about abiding by its scientific evidence for many years now. We have this year for the first time some genuine scientific facts on which to base the quota for the year. We are told that we are about to choose not to do so now. I do not feel it is enough simply to have something in the record. I would like to feel that the Commission in agreeing to 10,000 this year, in complete breach of the evidence presented to us, should take some more formal undertaking to make a substantial reduction next year.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Might I suggest because of my very deep and kindred feeling for you at this moment, Mr. Chairman, that it might be possible to serve the New Zealand Delegate's purpose if after the matter of blue whale units in the Antarctic for the coming season had been decided, this Commission decided to re-affirm the resolution of 1960. This would then put it in a much more recent record than 1960. It would simply re-affirm for all of us the original intent of the use which was to be made of the information obtained by the Committee of Three.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): We now have before us the proposal put forward by the Japanese Delegation and the amendment put forward by Mr. Jermyrn.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I would be happy to simplify the voting procedure by withdrawing my suggestion as a specific amendment in the light of what Dr. Sprules has suggested as an alternative supplementary resolution.

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (U.S.A.): Judging from the comments which have been made, I would say it is a question of re-affirming this 1960 resolution, which was to the effect that "It is the intention of the Commission in setting up this special group of scientists that the Commission should not later than 31st July, 1964 bring the Antarctic catch limit into line with the scientific findings having regard to the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article V of the Convention."

Mr. H. GARDENER (United Kingdom): I would be very happy to second that proposal and suggest that we might decide it by a show of hands.

Mr. G.L. LINESCH (Netherlands): There is a resolution before you which has been accepted; this was accepted during our absence as members of this Commission. Therefore, I have to reserve the rights and obligations of member governments in connection with the content of this resolution. Our position will be re-considered after the experience of the season to come.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): When the Japanese Delegation resolution was adopted I was not present at the Meeting. Therefore, with respect to the words and meaning of this resolution I would like to reserve my position.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): If there are no further comments, I would like to put Dr. Kellogg's proposal to the vote on the re-affirmation of the resolution accepted in 1960. It seems that we can do it by a simple show of hands.

(On a show of hands the Motion was carried by 10 votes)

I shall now put to the vote to proposal put forward by the Japanese Delegation concerning the quota of 10,000 blue whale units for the next season of 1963/64.

The Secretary will now take a poll of the Commissioners.

Argentina:	Yes.
Australia:	Yes.
Canada:	Abstain.
Denmark:	Abstain
France:	Abstain
Iceland:	Not present
Japan:4	Yes
Mexico:	Yes
Netherlands:	Yes
New Zealand:	No
Norway:	Abstain
Sweden:	Not present
U.S.S.R.	Yes
U.S.A.	Abstain (Dr. Kellogg said
United Kingdom:	Yes. they had to do so

(There being 7 votes in favour and 1 against with 5 abstentions the proposal was carried)

since they were morally bound to support the findings of the Committee of Three)

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I think I should explain my vote on that point. I would have felt happy in view of the remarks which have been made about the 1960 resolution to abstain on the 10,000 blue whale units. However, since three of the pelagic powers did not feel able to say at this Meeting that they regarded that undertaking as binding I felt I had no objection but to vote against.

/The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation):

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Jermyn. It seems we have reached a decision on one of the sub-items of item 16. May we now pass to the next item, item 16(a), provision for international observers.

Mr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): There is just one small item I would like to raise on that item. In the Schedule, we have to take into consideration the obligations of the Bureau at Sandefjord for notification. If we agree on 10,000 units, for the statistics at Sandefjord the notification should be at 9,000 units, and not 13,500 as at present. You will find that in the Schedule on page 4 at the top. This is in the event of our reaching unanimous agreement within 90 days on the question of the 10,000.

I only mention this to call it to your mind. You will find the relevant part at the top of page 4 of the Schedule. We have to decide here in the Commission to change the figure from 13,500 to 9,000 if the 10,000 units are agreed on after the requisite 90-day period.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): We do not understand what Mr. Lienesch has said, and we would like him to repeat his proposal please

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Since that applies not only to the Japanese Delegation, may I ask Mr. Lienesch to repeat his remarks.

Mr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): If you refer to the Schedule of November 1962, you will see at the top of page 4 that there is an indication that notification has to be given about reaching the catch limit. When the catch limit was 15,000 notification had to come when the catch of 13,500 units was reached. Now we have limited the catch to 10,000, and we now have to have notification at 9,000.

It is not just a formality, but it is linked to the agreement of 10,000 units. That is why I call your attention to it. There is no ulterior motive behind it.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Lienesch is referring to paragraph 8(c) of the Schedule and this seems to us to apply to when the quota system was not put into force. We now have a quota arrangement, and therefore we are wondering whether it is necessary for us to have this kind of provision. We would like to seek the opinion of members of the Commission on this.

The provisions which were referred to by Mr. Lienesch would be amended as follows, otherwise we shall have to consider the various implications by the adoption of the quota arrangements in connection with paragraph V.2. of the Convention which states that: "These amendments of the Schedule (a) shall be such as are necessary to carry out the objectives and purposes of this Convention and to provide for the conservation, development, and optimum utilization of the whale resources; (b) shall be based on scientific findings; (c) shall not involve restrictions on the number or nationality of factory ships or land stations, nor allocate specific quotas to any factory or ship or land station or to any group of factory ships or land stations; and (d) shall take into consideration the

interests of the consumers of whale products and the whaling industry."

The present Schedule of the Convention contains so many provisions which assume the situation where the quota arrangements were not in force, and the provision which Mr. Lienesch quoted is one of them. Therefore, if we question one of the provisions we shall raise various problems in connection with Article V.2. of the Convention, as I said before.

Mr. G.J. LIENESCH (Netherlands): It is only a question of formality. As this Commission as such has no connection directly with the quota regulations, so the provisions laid down for the notification of statistics to Sandefjord do not cover the quota regulations this year, and to consider the situation arising from the quota arrangement is outside the scope of the Commission.

Therefore, I merely draw your attention to the fact that through this formality we can be in accordance with the resolution of the Commission. There is no link here with any quota regulation.

Thus what the Japanese Delegate has in mind does not fit into the regulation. It is not opposing the content of Article V of the Convention and, therefore, as a proposal to you I believe it is correct.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Lienesch. That is quite clear.

Would anybody second the proposal put forward by Mr. Lienesch?
(Seconded by Dr. Kellogg)

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): It will be rather inconsistent if we now indicate in paragraph 8(a) of the Schedule that the catch of Contracting Governments shall not exceed 10,000 units - that is what we must put in now - and below that it says that there must be notification of stopping of whaling when you have reached 13,500 units, so we must put in some more realistic figure.

The SECRETARY: May I presume that the proposal then is to replace, in Article 8(c), the figure of 13,500 by 9,000? That is the simple proposition on which we are voting.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation) We now have the proposal put forward by Mr. Lienesch and seconded by Dr. Kellogg, and it seems that there is also a proposal moved by Mr. Fujita who suggests that we do not make any correction at all.

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (U.S.A.): We have already voted on the 10,000 units. Therefore, it naturally follows that you must correct the Statute. You have no choice but to correct it.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Shall we take a poll on it. I think we can do this by a simple show of hands. Commissioners or their deputies will vote.

(On a show of hands the proposal was carried with 10 votes in favour)

Can we now come on to item 16(a), provision for international observers. Would anybody like to comment on this matter?

The SECRETARY: I put round this morning a document headed "Meetings on the International Observer Scheme", marked IWC/15/16, which refers to this item on the Agenda.

I will not weary you, as many of us who were on the Special Committee dealing with the matter were wearied in the period between 29th April and today, during which time a special gathering of Delegates from Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, met in Moscow from 29th April to 5th May under the Chairmanship of Mr. Sukhoruchenko, and in London from 26th June until 5th July, that is today, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Wall.

/I said, in the covering note

The SECRETARY (Continued)

I said, in the covering note to the documents which were attached to it at the time when the paper was sent out,

"There may be a small addition to the paper setting out the scheme, but, if it is to come into force for the 1963-64 Antarctic pelagic whaling season action will have to be taken at the Fifteenth Meeting on the paper giving a draft resolution."

That is the paper at the end of this series.

I am glad to say that, since this document was issued, the group who have been considering the Observer Scheme have reached a stage at which they feel they can all initial an agreed Scheme. The Scheme is essentially the same as is shown in the document on the table, with the addition of an end-piece after section IV, Language, which is largely legal, and one or two smaller amendments which are not of very great import.

It seems to me, therefore, that we in the Commission are in a position to accept that there will be an International Observer Scheme this coming whaling season. However, if this document containing an agreement is to have effect, there must be some connexion with our Commission, as it has to be operated by the Commission's Secretary. In order to do that we have drawn up a draft resolution which has to come before this Fifteenth Meeting in order to give effect to the Commission's part in the Scheme by the inclusion of an alteration to the Schedule. I think it might help if I were to read the entire draft resolution, and it can then be voted upon.

"The Commission note that 5 countries engaged in the Antarctic Pelagic Whaling:-

the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, the Netherlands, Norway and Japan, - parties to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling and to the arrangements for the Regulation of Antarctic Pelagic Whaling, signed in London on June 6, 1962, have arranged to conclude an Agreement on the International Observer Scheme.

"The Commission resolve that, -

"The operation of the observer arrangements shall be the responsibility of a committee consisting of the Commissioners for the member countries engaged in the Antarctic Pelagic Whaling."

"The Commission agree upon the insertion of the following words at the end of the first sentence of para. 1(a) of the Schedule to the Convention:-

"..... and also such observers as the member countries engaged in the Antarctic pelagic whaling may arrange to place on each other's factory ships."

That, Mr. Chairman, is the resolution. I should like to emphasize that it is absolutely essential for these words to be carried as a resolution in this Commission session if we are to have a system of international inspection in the coming whaling season.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Wimpenny. I should like to add a few words to this. It seems that we also have to make an

amendment to paragraph 1(a) of the Schedule to the Convention. It is necessary to do so because otherwise some of the countries may be confronted with some difficulty in putting this agreement into effect in the coming season. It may become necessary for them to put this through their parliamentary procedure and not all countries will be in time to do that.

Are there any comments on the review given by Mr. Wimpenny or on the text of the draft resolution?

Mr. R.L. JERLYN (New Zealand): I should like to be helpful in the Chairman's eyes for once and say, on behalf of at least one of the non-pelagic countries, how much we welcome this agreement among the pelagic five. If a formal proposal for this resolution is wanted I should be happy to move it formally. (Seconded by Dr. A.R. Kellogg)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Is everybody in favour of this?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, as an amendment to the Schedule this needs a three-fourths majority and we have to poll the Meeting to formalize it.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Yes, Mr. Setter, we are going to have a poll of the Commission. I will ask the Secretary to do that now.

The SECRETARY: I will take the poll in the usual way.

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

(There being 11 votes in favour, none against, with 2 abstentions, the Motion was carried.)

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, if there is no objection we will now consider item 16 (d), (e) and (f) together. They are all concerned with the protection of humpbacks in the Antarctic in Areas IV and V and Areas I, III and VI. Is everybody in favour of our discussing all these three items together? (Agreed)

Are there any comments on this matter? Would Dr. Sprules like to say anything on behalf of the Technical Committee?

Dr. W.H. SPRULES: I should be glad to, Mr. Chairman.

The Technical Committee did reach a decision with regard to the protection of humpback whales, and you will note this in the Report of the Technical Committee. In effect, the Committee's decision was that there should be a complete suspension of whaling for humpbacks in the southern hemisphere and that, at the end of three years, the Commission should review the position to determine whether any other action should be undertaken. The Committee also agreed to propose an amendment to the Schedule which relates to paragraph 6(2). The wording proposed is:

"It is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill humpback whales in the waters south of the Equator."

At the time this matter was discussed and this agreement reached in the Technical Committee the Delegate from Australia recorded a reservation, and that has been included at the end of the section on the protection of humpbacks in the Report of the Technical Committee.

The only other point that I would recall to your attention is that, at an earlier Plenary Session, the Australian Delegate requested that this item be left over until some later time. It is now under consideration.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I should like to explain the Australian position in this matter. At the time this was discussed in the Technical Committee I explained that Australia was prepared to agree to the total prohibition of humpback whaling provided that the International Observer Scheme was put into effect and that the other recommendations of the Scientific Committee were accepted. The situation is now that we have agreed to the Observer Scheme, but consideration has been given to the industrial and economic problems facing certain of the Antarctic whaling countries with regard to the blue whale unit quota, and we have agreed to have a blue whale unit catch limit considerably in excess of what the scientists have recommended. I think all Commissioners will appreciate the importance of humpback whaling to Australia and, whilst we were prepared to go along with all the proposals submitted by the scientists, in the situation which has developed now I would like to suggest an amendment to the proposal put forward by the Technical Committee.

I understand that the question of the protection of blue whales will be coming up for consideration after this item. When it was discussed in the Technical Committee a proposal was made that the blue whales be protected in waters south of 40° south. The scientists reminded us that the blue whale stocks are in equally as depleted a condition as the humpback stocks, and I would suggest an amendment to the proposal which has been put up to provide for the protection of humpbacks in waters south of 40° south, on the understanding that this matter will be examined again at the next Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I should like to ask Mr. Setter to repeat his proposed amendment to the proposal put forward by the Technical Committee.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): The proposal put forward by the Technical Committee is that it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill humpback whales in the waters south of the Equator. The amendment which I have suggested is to omit the words "of the Equator" and substitute "south of 40° south."

/The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation)....

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any further comments? May I ask for a seconder to Mr. Setter's amendment? Is the amendment clear, Gentlemen? It seems that the amendment is that the words 'south of the Equator' in the resolution as put forward by the Technical Committee should be deleted and replaced with the words 'south of 40° south'.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I am prepared to second that amendment. I should like to make clear that I do so solely in order that we can have some discussion at this point.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other proposals? If not, I would like to put the amendment suggested by Mr. Setter to the vote?

The Secretary will now take a poll of the Commissioners.

Argentina:	Abstain.
Australia:	Yes
Canada:	Abstain
Denmark:	Abstain
France:	Yes
Japan:	Yes
Mexico:	Abstain
Netherlands:	No
New Zealand:	Abstain
Norway:	No
U.S.S.R.	No
U.S.A.	Abstain
United Kingdom:	Abstain

(There being 3 votes in favour and 3 against with
7 abstentions the amendment was lost)

If there are no further comments then we will put to the vote the proposal by the Technical Committee. Is everybody in favour of this? (Agreed) However, I do not believe we have a seconder? (Seconded by Mr. Sjaastad, Norway)

The Secretary will now take a poll of the Commissioners.

Argentina:	Abstain
Australia:	No
Canada:	Yes
Denmark:	Abstain
France:	Abstain
Japan:	Yes
Mexico:	Yes
Netherlands:	Yes
New Zealand:	Yes
Norway:	Yes
U.S.S.R.	Abstain
U.S.A.	Yes
United Kingdom:	Yes

(There being 8 votes in favour and 1 against with
4 abstentions the Motion was carried)

I understand that Mr. Aglen is leaving and he would like to say a few words as the Observer for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.

Mr. A.J. AGLEN (I.C.E.S.): Thank you for interrupting the business at this stage and allowing me to say a few words as Observer for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. I should like to express on behalf of the Council their thanks for inviting me as their Observer to this Meeting of the Commission. The International Council is, I think, one of the oldest international bodies, and I believe it was one of the first international bodies to espouse the cause of conservation. It is not, however, a regulatory body and therefore does not itself have the kind of difficulties which this Commission has encountered at this Meeting. However, it is aware of the existence of these difficulties, and I am sure it would wish me to express on its behalf its good wishes to this Commission in its further deliberations and hopes that progress will be made in later years towards conservation.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I am sure you will all join with me in expressing our thanks to Mr. Aglen. We are grateful for the fact that Mr. Aglen has been able to come here and observe our Meeting, and for the assistance he has given us during the course of our work.

It seems that we have only one sub-Item left under Item 16, which is (g), Opening dates and length of Antarctic pelagic baleen whaling season. Would Dr. Sprules like to comment on this matter?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Yes. As I indicated a little while ago, this is one item on the Technical Committee's agenda which we were unable to discuss at all because of the lack of time.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): May I have the Commission's views on this matter.

Capt. A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): I would suggest that we leave the opening dates and the length of the season the same as it was last season, that there be no change.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I am very happy to second that proposal of the Soviet Delegation.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The proposal has been moved by the Soviet Union and seconded by the United Kingdom. Are there any other proposals, Gentlemen?

If not, we will put this to the vote.

The Secretary will now take a poll of the Commissioners.

Argentina:	Abstain
Australia:	Abstain
Canada:	Abstain
Denmark:	Abstain
France:	Abstain
Japan:	Yes
Mexico:	Abstain
Netherlands:	Yes
New Zealand:	Abstain
Norway:	Yes
U.S.S.R.	Yes
U.S.A.	Yes
United Kingdom:	Yes

(There being 6 votes in favour and no vote against
with 7 abstentions the Motion was carried)

It now seems that we have dealt now with Item 16 on our Agenda.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): This, in effect, completes the information and advice which we had for you in the Report of our Technical Committee which has been considered, I presume, under Item 13 of the Commission's main Agenda. However, I am somewhat at a loss to know what the proper procedure would be at this moment with regard to an Item which had been seriously considered for a long time by the Technical Committee and which, unfortunately, does not seem to appear anywhere in our final Report. This was a rather detailed discussion of a recommendation in the Report of the Committee of Three regarding the need for protection of blue whales in an area somewhat similar to the area recommended for the protection of humpback whales. Although we considered this blue whale matter for some time we did not reach a final decision although we thought the matter was quite important. There was general agreement that some major protection for the blue whale stocks was required. For some reason or other we have no comment on this in our Report.

We have also passed consideration of the Report of the Special Scientific Committee and the Report of the Scientific Committee. All I can do is to say that I bring this to your attention from the Technical Committee.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I think that Dr. Sprules is too humble in suggesting that this is not referred to in the Report of his Committee, because the Report of his Committee had a most comprehensive survey of everything. I find that in this document circulated for us today, IWC/15/19, right at the end he does mention just this point, when he says, "The Committee was unable to conclude its discussions on the protection of blue whales arising out of Items 8 and 9 of the Commission's Agenda." Therefore, he has indeed referred to this very topic which I am sure we would all wish to discuss and come to a conclusion on.

There was some discussion in the Technical Committee as to whether, in fact, this question was or was not included on the Agenda, but we decided that if there was not an Item on the Agenda it was proper to invent one. However, we felt that the Agenda did cover this matter and that we ought to take action on the recommendation of the Scientific Committee for the protection of blue whales in just the same way as we had taken action for the protection of humpback whales.

Mr. Gardner (Continued)

We had some discussion on the fact that there was a certain part of the Antarctic waters where the stock of blue whales was predominantly a stock of pigmy blue whales, and the Japanese Commissioner attached particular importance to the continuance, at least for the next year, of the catching of pigmy blue whales in this area, but were prepared to agree that in all the remainder of the area the catching of blue whales should be prohibited in just the same way as have now agreed to prohibit the catch of humpback whales.

Therefore, if I may take it upon myself to put a formal motion before this Meeting on this matter, the question will then be open for discussion.

We have now with our amendment for humpback whales deleted paragraph 6(3) of the Schedule. I would like to propose a new paragraph 6(3) in the following terms:

"It is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales in the waters south of 40° south latitude, except in the waters north of 55° south latitude, from 0° eastwards to 80° east longitude."

I would like formally to propose that these words should be inserted in the Schedule.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): We had intended to say something about the proposal. However, we will be brief in this statement, and therefore we will second the proposal submitted by Mr Gardner.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It seems that Mr. Gardner has put forward a proposal, and Mr Fujita has seconded it. Are there any other proposals?

If there are no other proposals, then it seems that we poll the Commission on this item. I will ask Mr. Wimpenny to poll the Commissioners accordingly.

The SECRETARY: I will poll the meeting, Mr Chairman, as you request.

Argentina:	Abstain
Australia:	Yes.
Canada:	Yes.
Denmark:	Abstain
France:	Abstain
Iceland:	Not present
Japan:	Yes
Mexico:	Abstain
Netherlands:	Yes
New Zealand:	Yes
Norway:	Yes
USSR:	Abstain
USA:	Yes
United Kingdom:	Yes.

(There being 8 votes in favour, 0 against and 5 abstentions the motion was carried.)

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I am sorry to seem unhelpful, but you did, as I recall, just remark that we seemed to have finished item 16 of our Agenda. I am afraid I think the formal position is that - you, of course, will rule on this - I do not think the plenary has decided what to do about item (b), item (c) and item (i) of item 16, which were reported on by the Technical Committee. I think we need formal plenary decisions on all of those.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): My recollection of this matter is that as Chairman of the Technical Committee I reported to the plenary session which took place on Thursday, 4th July, 1963, on these matters, and there is a draft outline of our decisions at that time, which has been circulated. I think that there is a decision, including the votes recorded on these items, which have just been referred to by the Delegate from New Zealand.

I know exactly how he feels because Mr. Gardner had just a moment ago put me in exactly the same place, pointing out that I had not read my own report very carefully, and I wish to thank Mr. Gardner formally for using the word 'humble' instead of 'stupid'.

Mr. R.L. JERMYN (New Zealand): I am sorry to have introduced a red herring among the whales!

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): We still have item 11 before us, North Pacific Whale Stocks, paragraph 17 of the Chairman's Report of the 14th Meeting. I am sorry, it appears that it is a mistake. It seems that we have already dealt with this item on the Agenda.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I am glad the Chairman has jointed the Delegate from New Zealand and myself!

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It seems that we still have to accept or adopt the report of the Technical Committee as a whole. That is item 13 of the Agenda.

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (U.S.A.): I move the adoption of the Report.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Dr. Kellogg has moved the adoption of the Report as a whole. May I have a seconder?
(Seconded by Mr. Gardner)

If there are no other proposals, I think we agree on the Report by the Technical Committee as a whole. (Agreed)

It seems that we are still able to reach an end, we are now left with items 17, 19 and 20. Mr. Wimpenny expresses some doubts as to the fact that we have not yet formally adopted items 8 and 9. It seems to me that we have already taken some decision on that and that we have already dealt with those items.

Mr Wimpenny has just drawn my attention to the fact that item 9(2), Establishment of separate quotas and regulations for each species and stock, has not yet been considered. Do we really have to come back to this item? Would Dr Mackintosh like to comment on this matter?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I can only say that we in the Scientific Committee had hoped that there would be separate quotas for separate species, but I think in view of the discussions which have taken place since, I do not know that we wish to press for it.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any other comments on this matter, gentlemen?

Captain A.N. SOLYANIK (U.S.S.R.): My opinion is that at this meeting we must note the wish and the will of the Scientific Committee, and take into account the mood of the majority not to take any final decision.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Captain Solyanik suggests that we should just note what has been said by the Scientific Committee. Would anybody like to second that proposal?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): I am of the same opinion as Captain Solyanik. This problem was discussed at the Committee, but we reached no conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It seems that Mr. Fujita is supporting Captain Solyanik's proposal. Are there any other proposals?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): One point which I might perhaps emphasise is that the Committee of Three, as well as the Scientific Committee, did recommend that quotas are necessary for the full and proper conservation of stocks, and if the findings of the scientists, the Committee of Three and the Committee are eventually adopted in full, those findings do imply quotas for species. I thought that point might be made clear perhaps.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Mackintosh. We now have the proposal as suggested by Captain Solyanik and seconded by Mr. Fujita. Are there any other proposals? It seems it is not necessary to take a vote on that and we just agree to accept this.

Before coming on to item 17, I would like to ask Mr. Wimpenny whether he has any further comments to make

The SECRETARY: No, I have no other comments.

Dr. J.M. SPRULES (Canada): Just before we move to item 17, I should like to have just a moment to say a few words on behalf of Canada with regard to items 8 and 9 which we have just noted on the main Commission Agenda.

The Canadian Delegation was placed in rather a delicate position during the meetings of the Technical Committee in that the Commissioner was serving as Chairman, and I had to listen to the learned dissertations of all the other Delegates during that time, but really did not have an opportunity to express the Canadian view with regard to some of these matters.

I want just to say, in leaving these items 8 and 9, that Canada is somewhat concerned about the rather negative attitude which has been taken in some of the Commission's decisions today as they relate to very specific and well-documented recommendations of the Scientific Committee and the Committee of Three. We, in Canada, have based fisheries and general marine resources management on the best scientific information we could find for many years, and a lot of this management has been very successful towards the end of continued and long-term annual yield from the resource. Many times we have based our management on scientific evidence which was not nearly as conclusive as the scientific evidence which was presented to this Meeting by the Committee of Three. I would again express Canadian concern.

I realize that we have now reaffirmed, also in a rather negative way, the resolution of 1960 inasmuch as three major countries did not indicate their approval of the reaffirmation of the resolution. This leads me to believe that next year's Meeting in Norway is going to be, perhaps, somewhat similar to the Meeting we have had this year.

The major matters that were under consideration this year had to do with the Antarctic whaling operations and, for that reason, on several items Canada abstained in the vote. As all of you know, this is not normal procedure for Canada; we generally have a fairly strong feeling one way or another and vote in accordance. The matter that is of particular concern to us at the moment resulting from the action taken here today is the future in some of the other areas where there are fairly substantial whale resources which are of much more direct economic interest to Canada. The countries which are concerned with the Antarctic should, naturally, have had the major concern in the decisions today; but we are worried about other areas, and we are concerned particularly about areas where the scientific evidence about the need for restriction in whaling operations is not as conclusive as it was in the Antarctic. We had certainly hoped that two quite significant decisions -- concerning the continuation of stock assessment analysis and the Observer Scheme -- would have become truly international. I think that in some ways the term "International Observer Scheme" is correct, but there are many other areas in which I hope in the future the Commission will again give consideration both to stock assessment analysis and international observers in order that stocks in areas which are now going to have far more effort placed on them may be properly protected for the use of all of us for a long time in the future.

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (USA): I do not know whether it is quite out of order at the moment, but I should like to make a statement.

The Commission owes a debt of thanks to Dr. Sprules for the admirable manner in which he conducted the sessions of the Technical Committee. Many difficult questions were handled with great skill. He was far more successful than he is inclined to admit. (Applause)

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Kellogg. It seems from your applause that you all join in what Dr. Kellogg has said about his gratitude to Dr. Sprules for his excellent Chairmanship of the Technical Committee.

I should like now, as Chairman of this Meeting, also to thank Dr. Sprules for his assistance to me in my work. The matters which have not been solved at the Technical Committee meetings were not so difficult as the ones which have been decided upon.

It seems that we have now come to item 17 of the Agenda, election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for a period of three years.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I am sorry to raise a small matter, but I was not quite quick enough to raise it before we finished with item 16. I should like just to refer to the opening date for blue whales. According to paragraph 7(a) of the Schedule, the opening date for blue whales is 14 February, but in fact in a footnote there is recorded the objection of some countries which had the effect of returning it to 1 February. It has been suggested that there might be some misunderstanding about which is the opening date which applies now and about whether there is any possibility of those objections being withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I am very sorry, Dr. Mackintosh, but would you give us the gist of what you have just said again?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): In paragraph 7(a) of the Schedule the opening date for taking blue whales in the Antarctic is given as 14 February, but objections were raised and notified with the effect that the opening date is from 1 February. It will presumably be 1 February now unless those objections are withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I think the proposal was to have the same date and the same length of season. It was said that the opening date was 14 February and the closing date 7 April.

The SECRETARY: Dr. Mackintosh's estimate of the opening date of the blue whale season is quite correct. The date in the Schedule is 14 February, but objection was raised to that by several countries. Later the Secretariat was told that objections would be withdrawn provided that other nations withdrew their objections. The position today is that there is still an objection to the coming into force of the regulation.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (United Kingdom): I was asked to draw attention to this in case there might be some consideration given to the possibility of the withdrawal of those objections, in which case presumably the date might go back to 14 February.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Mackintosh. It seems that the country may consider the suggestion and may consider this matter again. However, we have already taken a decision on that matter

and it does not seem to be necessary to come back to it. Is everybody in favour of this? (Agreed)

We will now take item 17 on the Agenda, the election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the next three years. May I have your proposals on this matter? We will deal first with the election of a Chairman.

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I hope that, although I am one of the newest Commissioners on this Commission, I may, as representative of the host country, have the honour of proposing the Chairman for the next three years.

You have served through a very difficult session as Chairman, in your capacity as Vice-Chairman, succeeding the late Mr. George Clark, and we shall have an opportunity later to thank you for the way you have conducted our Meeting. You are clearly a man of great experience, and certainly this week must have added to your experience. I am sure that it would be the wish of all the members of the Commission that you should be proposed and elected as Chairman for the next three years, and I am very happy to make that proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Sjaastad.

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway)(Interpretation): I will second Mr. Gardner's proposal of Mr. Sukhoruchenko as Chairman.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(Interpretation): The Japanese Delegation supports the nomination of the Chairman to act as Chairman for three years, as was moved by Mr. Gardner and seconded by Mr. Sjaastad.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other proposals? I should very much like to hear some others.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I move that nominations cease.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I really thought that you would sympathize with me and that you would consider that I had already tortured you enough at this Meeting. I did not think you would want to be tortured at the next one.

Are there any further proposals?

Dr. A.R. KELLOGG (USA): I support Dr. Sprules' Motion that nominations be closed. That ends it.

(The motion was carried unanimously by acclamation)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I should like to thank you for the confidence you have placed in me. I would like to assure you that I will do everything possible to help the Commission to work successfully.

Thank you very much indeed, Gentlemen.

We now come to the election of the Vice-Chairman. Are there any proposals?

/Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway).....

Mr. G. SJAASTAD (Norway) (Interpretation): I move the proposal that the United Kingdom Commissioner, Mr. Gardner, be elected Vice-Chairman for the coming three years.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): We have pleasure in seconding the nomination of Mr. Gardner as moved by Mr. Sjaastad.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It seems that we only have one nomination for the Vice-Chairman for the next three years, Mr. Gardner of the United Kingdom. I am very happy to support this proposal. I think in Mr. Gardner we will have a very good Vice-Chairman.

(The motion was carried by acclamation)

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): As a very new Commissioner I felt impelled to appeal to the Members to make some other proposal but I am very honoured by the election of myself as Vice-Chairman. I shall do my best for this Commission.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): We have dealt with Item 17 of our Agenda.

We now come to Item 19, Arrangements for Press Release. Last year the Secretary and the Chairman of the Commission were asked to prepare this Press Release. May we have the same arrangement for this year?

(Moved by Dr. A.R. Kellogg, U.S.A. and seconded by Mr. H. Gardner, United Kingdom)

Is it agreed that we should ask the Secretary to prepare this Press Release?

Only one Item remains on the Agenda, Item 20, Any Other Business. Does anyone wish to raise anything under this Item?

The SECRETARY: We usually have invitations from foreign bodies or other international bodies outside our own. We have one from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. The Commission has been invited to send an Observer to the Fifty-First Meeting of I.C.E.S. to be held in Madrid in October, 1963. For many years Mr. Aglen, who is on the Bureau of I.C.E.S., has been good enough to act as our Observer in that body. I would suggest that we ask him to do the same for us again this year if the Commission agrees.
(Agreed)

We have before been invited to the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission I understand that the next Meeting will be held in Paris in April, 1964. The Commission will not be in session again before invitations to this Meeting are issued, as they usually are. In these circumstances I think it might be wise to nominate our French friend, Dr. Budker, who has formerly represented us on this body. (Agreed)

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources and the World Wild Life Fund have shown interest in the Commission's work and have been provided with recent Annual Reports of the Commission. Both organisations have their Headquarters at Morges in Switzerland and both have asked if they could be provided with the Reports of the special investigations into the Antarctic whale stocks. I would be glad to know if the Commission would agree to Reports being sent to these two bodies in advance of their reproduction in the Commission's Fourteenth Report, which is the next one. (Agreed)

Mr. H. GARDNER (United Kingdom): I merely wish under Any Other Business - and on this occasion I would like to rise to my feet to do it - to propose a very warm vote of thanks on behalf of all the Members of the Commission to the Chairman for the way he has conducted the Meeting. It has been, I am told - and I am a new man to these things - one of the most difficult meetings in the history of the Commission. We are all of us very exhausted but none so exhausted as our Chairman who has been quite tireless in carrying us through all these difficult problems we have had to face. I think we have done very well for the future by electing Mr. Sukhoruchenko as our Chairman for the next three years. I would like to propose a very warm vote of thanks, coupled with the hope that in your term of office as Chairman you will always be accompanied by your indefatigable interpreter to whom we are most grateful. (Applause)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you for your kind words. I think that all the Delegations representing their governments here at our meeting have put a great deal of effort into the work we have carried out. We have adopted good decisions on many rather complicated matters today. The problems have been very complicated, and we would not have been able to reach those decisions without the enthusiasms you have expressed in trying to find the proper solutions to the matters we have discussed. All the Delegations have put a lot of effort into trying to solve the problems. Thank you for the work you have done.

I would like to wish you and your families well.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I am sure that all the Commissioners here would wish to join with me in expressing a very sincere vote of thanks to the host Government who have supplied us with the very fine accommodation which we have lived in for the last few days. They have made available many facilities which have helped our meetings to proceed. Certainly we would wish to thank them, I know, for the very fine hospitality which was offered to us on the second night of our stay here this week. In addition, I am sure we all, again, wish to express deep gratitude to the Secretariat who, along with the Technical Committee, had to work overtime, and to their temporary help which has made it possible to keep a verbatim account of our Meeting.

We are indebted to the host Government for all these many fine facilities. (Applause)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It is obvious from your applause that you support wholeheartedly what Dr. Sprules has just said. We are very grateful to the Government of the United Kingdom for the facilities and hospitality they have offered. The Secretariat has a very hard job to do but they have done this successfully. I would like, therefore, to join with Dr. Sprules in expressing our thanks to the Secretariat.

If there are no further comments I declare the Fifteenth Meeting of the International Whaling Commission closed.

(The Conference closed at 6.45. p.m.)