

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSIONSPECIAL MEETING

Session of Monday, 3rd May, 1965.

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

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, please occupy your seats. Ladies and Gentlemen, let me call the Special Meeting of the International Whaling Commission to order. The present Meeting has been called to meet proposals put forward by a number of countries, Members of the Convention: the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Norway, Canada, Argentina, Iceland, Denmark and Australia, and seconded by other Members of the Commission in accordance with Rule 17 of the Rules of Procedure.

As is known, an agreeable decision on the quota of catch for the season just ended was not reached at the Sixteenth Meeting of our Commission. Scientific data and the results of the season just ended testify, however, that the present conditions of Antarctic whale stocks demand taking urgent and effective measures to prevent the rapid decrease of these stocks and to create everything possible to restore the whale resources in the Antarctic.

I hope that this Special Meeting will be of great importance for the regulation of whaling and will help us to solve important problems on the rational exploitation of whale resources. My hope that this Meeting will be a success is based on the understanding that it would not have been sense to call the Meeting if the Commissioners had not prepared beforehand some real and effective measures, the taking of which could solve the problems we are facing. I am sure that these are the problems and proposals to discuss at this Special Meeting.

It is a great honour for our Meeting that Mr. James Hoy, the Parliamentary Secretary at the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food is present here at the opening of the Special Meeting, and with the greatest pleasure I give the floor to Mr. Hoy.

Mr. J. HOY (Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food): Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen, I count it a great privilege to welcome you to London today on what I believe is a unique occasion in the history of the International Whaling Commission. This is, I understand, the first time that the Commission has met outside its ordinary general meetings, and I am sure you will all agree that the problems which face the whaling industry today are of such an urgent and pressing character that they fully justify the calling of an extraordinary meeting to deal with them. We are all grateful to the Government of the United States for taking the lead, in response to worldwide concern about the future of whale stocks in making the approach to the Chairman which has led to you, Sir, calling this Meeting.

The problem which faces you is not an easy one, it is not one for which there can be any painless solution.

The choice facing the whaling industry today is either to accept drastic and painful restrictions on the catch immediately and for a considerable period to come, until the stocks recover, or to carry on with rapidly diminishing returns for a few brief years until the stocks of whales on which it depends are brought if not to the verge of extermination then to a level which makes the whaling expeditions unable to operate and turns them into wasted resources. It will be a tragedy if the right choice is not made, and a tragedy which will affect not only the whaling industry, for the need to keep the exploitation within rational bounds applies just as much to other natural resources - though I know of no other case in which the dangers of inaction are so apparent and so great.

If I have struck a sombre note it is certainly not my intention to suggest that there are not also grounds for hope. Although it must be admitted that the Commission has not yet succeeded in doing as much as the situation requires -- if that were so, then this Special Meeting this morning would not have been necessary -- it has nevertheless many achievements to its credit. It has secured the protection of the blue whale throughout the southern hemisphere, with the exception of a small area, and the total protection of the hump-back; but such severe measures would not have been necessary if more moderate restrictions had been imposed earlier, as perhaps they would have been if the Commission had had at its disposal the scientific evidence which it has today. The Commission must now act upon this evidence and so ensure that the stocks of fin and sei whales, which are under increased pressure by very reason of the protection which has now been given to the other species, are not reduced to the same condition.

The general willingness of so many countries to come to the Special Meeting is, I am sure, an earnest of the determination not to be disheartened by past failures and to make a fresh attempt to find the solution which eluded them last year. Although we in the United Kingdom are no longer engaged in deep-sea whaling, we can from our own experience fully sympathise with those countries which today have the difficult task of reconciling the immediate economic needs of the industry with the long-term need to conserve the resources on which they depend. But however difficult the problem may be, we cannot doubt that it is capable of rational solution, and we wish you every success in your present deliberations when, as perhaps never before, the eyes of the world are upon you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The CHAIRMAN follows ...)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): On behalf of the participants in this Special Meeting, let me express my sincere appreciation to Mr. Hoy for his warm words and good wishes. We share with him the hope that the purposes of this meeting will be successfully achieved.

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

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Following the tradition of the Commission we will proceed with our sessions from now on in the absence of the members of the press, for whom a press release will be issued at the end of our meetings.

We have representatives here of three organisations, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, the Fauna Preservation Society and the World Wildlife Fund. These organisations are represented here by Mr. Fitter and Major Greenwood. None of these organisations has previously been invited by the Commission to send observers, and I should, therefore, ask for your opinions with regard to these organisations and their representatives being allowed to be present in the meeting of the Commission.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I should like to move that these organisations be allowed to attend as observers.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Who wishes to second this proposal? That is seconded by France. The observers from those organisations will, therefore, be present at our meeting.

I should like now to welcome new commissioners who are attending the meeting of the Commission for the first time. Mr. Sherwin is deputising for Mr. Settle of Australia. Mr. Tienstra has recently been appointed in place of Mr. Lienesch of The Netherlands. Mr. Atkins is deputising for Mr. O'Halloran of New Zealand. Mr. Holler has recently been appointed in place of Mr. Sjaastad of Norway. Mr. Tame is here in place of Mr. Gardner of the United Kingdom. Dr. McHugh is deputising for Dr. Kellogg of the United States of America.

I should like also to welcome the representatives of the countries and the various international organisations who are present here as observers. From FAO we have Mr. Popper and Mr. Holt, from Chile, Captain P. Carvajal and Senor D.S. Benadara, and from the International Society for the Protection of Animals we have Major Priestly.

I should like to welcome on behalf of the Commission all the new commissioners and observers whom I have just mentioned.

We will begin our work by calling the roll of the commissioners and other members of the delegations from our countries, and I will call upon the Secretary of the Commission, Mr. Wimpenny, to do this.

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

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation) I would like to suggest that we adopt the Agenda for the Special Meeting. The Agenda circulated with the Secretary's letter of 21st April is provisional and subject to adoption by the Commission. Its adoption should be formally moved and seconded. At the time of writing, no amendments or additions had been suggested by Commissioners, and if any are received between now and the Meeting, a revised Agenda will be prepared and circulated at the Meeting. Commissioners will know that it has not been possible on this occasion to follow the 60-day Rule for the despatch of the Agenda under Rule XII of the Rules of Procedure, and that if this Rule is followed, it will preclude decisive action of the Special Meeting on the alteration of the Schedule. Any such action would need to await the Seventeenth Annual Meeting, the Agenda for which allows consideration of amendments of the Schedule in respect of, inter alia, the Antarctic catch limit, and season. I should like to know, Gentlemen, if anybody has any amendments or additions to that Provisional Agenda previously circulated.

I understand that there are no additions or amendments to that preliminary Agenda, and if so, I should like to know if we can adopt the Agenda of our Special Meeting.

Dr. Sprules, Canada, moves the adoption of the Agenda and it is seconded by Japan, so the Agenda is agreed. (Agreed).

Gentlemen, there is no pattern for a Special Meeting, and the Chairman asks the Commission how they wish the Meeting to be arranged, whether, for example, they wish to hold plenary sessions throughout, or work in committee at any time. In this case, I should like to remind them that Mr. Wimpenny, our Secretary, told us that there will be no separate accommodation for a committee meeting, apart from the main conference chamber, after Tuesday, 4th May. What are your opinions on this point? I would like to repeat my question, shall we work in plenary sessions, or is it necessary to establish some kind of committees? If my understanding is right, I believe that it is not now necessary to establish special committees, and maybe at some time later it will be necessary to do this, but we will decide on that later. Am I right?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (United States): Mr. Chairman, it appears to us that this is a satisfactory arrangement, and we agree with you.

The CHAIRMAN: (Interpretation): Is that seconded? The proposal moved by Dr. McHugh of the United States and seconded by Dr. Sprules of Canada is adopted, so we shall work in plenary sessions, and if it is necessary to establish committees we will do it later.

Mr. Wimpenny, our Secretary, now proposes that we should have a break for coffee.

(The Meeting adjourned at 11.40 a.m.)

(The meeting reconvened at 12 noon.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, we now continue with our work. Everything is going right up to now and I hope everything will be right in the continuation of our work.

I understand that Mr. Popper, from F.A.O. wants to make a statement on the general policy of F.A.O. on the matter of our Special Meeting. I give the floor to Mr. Popper.

Mr. F.E. POPPER (F.A.O.): Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen - I am most grateful for this opportunity to address this Special Meeting of the International Whaling Commission on behalf of the Director-General of F.A.O. This is likely to be a meeting of the greatest importance to the future of the whaling industry and of whale stocks. It could also be an historic meeting in relation to the future exploitation of the living resources of the sea in general.

The Director-General and the governing bodies of F.A.O. have followed the work of the Commission with great interest and are in full agreement with its aims. The problems of exploiting the world's whale resources, and particularly those of the Antarctic, have rightly attracted wide attention. The Antarctic whaling industry is a striking example of joint exploitation of common property resources by a number of nations. The whale resource is particularly vulnerable and therefore the need for co-operation in the interests of rational utilisation is great. It is perhaps fortunate that the animals on which the industry depends have also great popular appeal. I say that this is fortunate because, as a result, world opinion becomes alerted not only to the specific problems with which you deal but also to the similar problems that arise in most of the great fisheries of the oceans. What your Commission might accomplish, or fail to accomplish, with respect to whaling will be a potent factor in what other international bodies, concerned with other oceanic resources, might be able to do elsewhere. The world at large, therefore, has a keen interest in seeing your Commission succeed in its task.

As you are aware, the Director-General of F.A.O. was most pleased to make available the services of one of the expert staff members of the Organisation, Mr. Holt, when your Commission decided in 1960 to form a special committee of scientists to work with your own Scientific Committee on an assessment of the Antarctic whale stocks. As a result of the work of these committees your Commission has had before it proposals which, if carried out, might have allowed the stocks of baleen whales to begin to recover from the severe over-exploitation to which they have been subjected in the past and eventually to attain levels at which they might have ensured the continuation of the whaling industry on a sound basis. Unfortunately, as you know, it has not been possible for the Commission to have regulations promulgated and observed that would have implemented these proposals.

The activities of the whaling fleets during the last few seasons have further and seriously aggravated the depletion of the whale stocks, contrary to all sound principles of conservation and rational utilisation of renewable resources.

Since the Director-General felt that F.A.O. should not seem to be associated with activities so much at variance with the proper discharge of the Organisation's constitutional responsibilities for the conservation of natural resources, he decided that the arrangements that had been mutually agreed and under which F.A.O. would have continued on behalf of your Commission the assessments begun by the Special Committee could not proceed. However, recognising that your Commission was still endeavouring to reach a solution of its problems in keeping with the principles of conservation and rational utilisation -- and the holding of this Special Meeting is excellent evidence of your intentions -- the Director-General recently arranged for a group of scientists specialised in marine stock assessment to make an analysis of whale catches during the 1964-65 Antarctic season and of the consequences of them on the whale stocks and to examine the effects that various possible conservation measures might have in the circumstances. This analysis was based on detailed statistics most kindly supplied by the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics. The result of the work of the group has been made available to the Secretariat of your Commission and is now before you in IWC/SM/3. It is the Director-General's hope that you will find this report useful in your deliberations this week. An important feature of the report is the new assessment of the status of the stock of sei whales.

Two of the three members of the group who prepared the report are present at your meeting and if it proves desirable to prepare scientific appraisals of the likely effects of any proposals that may be put to the Commission I am authorised by the Director-General to offer our assistance in the preparation of such appraisals in the course of this meeting.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion may I convey the earnest hope of the Director-General and of the governing bodies of F.A.O. that this meeting of your Commission may succeed in agreeing on effective measures for the conservation and rational utilisation of the whale stocks. Such action would be extremely encouraging to those concerned with other important stocks of living resources in the oceans which also are in danger of depletion at a time when the rapidly rising demands for proteins to feed the world's population make the fullest possible use of these resources imperative. Any further delay or failure in dealing effectively with the Antarctic whale stocks would also endanger future international agreement on the conservation of other living resources of the seas. Member nations of F.A.O. have indicated that in that event they might wish to ask the Director-General, in view of F.A.O.'s constitutional responsibilities, to call for a direct consideration of these problems by appropriate F.A.O. bodies. Accordingly, I am not only to convey to you F.A.O.'s best wishes for the success of this meeting but also to reiterate F.A.O.'s willingness to assist your efforts in every possible way.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Popper. I think we shall note that statement and thank Mr. Popper for the proposals made in this document.

We now come to the points on our agenda.

Before considering proposals for restriction of catch and restoration of the whale stocks in Antarctic waters (Point 4) the Commission will no doubt wish to hear a review of the latest statistics from Mr. Vangstein. Mr. Holt of F.A.O. might then be invited to introduce document IWC/SM/3 on the effect of the 1964-65 Antarctic catch on the stocks. There is provision for both reviews under agenda item 3. Is there any objection to that procedure? (Agreed)

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Bureau of International Whaling Statistics): Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few remarks on the catch in the last Antarctic season.

With the exception of the Dutch floating factory, William Barentz, the same floating factories operated in the last season as in the previous season, namely 15 floating factories. These factories used fewer catches than in the 1963-64 season. The catching period was on average shorter, because several of the Japanese and Soviet Russian factories ceased operations before April 7, having got their individual quota.

The catch activity expressed in catcher day work was about 14 per cent. lower than in the 1963-64 season. The catch in BWU per catcher day was about the same as in the last two seasons, namely, about 0.40 units. The catch result in the last season was therefore not less than expected, but, on the contrary, somewhat better.

However, if we look at the catch broken down by species and catching areas the catch result is not encouraging.

The catch of fin whale per catcher day decreased by about 40 per cent. On the other hand the catch of sei whales increased by about 200 per cent. About 20,000 sei whales were caught or about 12 per cent. more than in 1963-64. It is unlikely that the stock of sei whales has increased. The higher catch of sei whales is due to the fact that the expeditions concentrated mainly on sei whales in catching fields where sei whales were more abundant. A part of the very high decrease in the fin whale catch may be due to the same reasons. In South Georgia the catch of fin whales decreased by only 10 per cent. compared with the season 1963-64.

About 50 per cent. of the catch in BWU was taken between 40°W and 60°W. The remaining part, about 3,500 units, was taken in the area from 40°W and eastwards to 60°W, compared with about 7,500 units in the season 1963-64.

If the maximum catch in the last season had been 4,000, as proposed last year, it is probable that about 4,700 fin whales and about 10,000 sei whales would have been caught. If the maximum catch had been 6,000 units, which also was proposed at the last meeting of the Whaling Commission, it is probable that about 5,900 fin whales and 15,800 sei whales would have

been caught, while there were caught 7,300 fin whales and about 20,000 sei whales. Last-mentioned maximum catch would have resulted in a catch of fin whales smaller than the catch calculated by the scientists on the basis of a maximum catch of 4,000 units and 1,400 fin whales and about 4,000 sei whales would have been saved.

From South Georgia, Japanese companies, as in the 1963-64 season, operated from two shore stations and caught about 500 fin whales and about 500 sei whales and converted to BWU about the same catch as last season, 340 units.

More details of the catch last season will be found in the preliminary report prepared by the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics, which has been distributed to the Commissioners and advisers.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you very much. As we agreed, gentlemen, I shall now give the floor to Mr. Holt, of F.A.O.

Mr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As Mr. Popper has said, F.A.O. has continued the work begun by the Committee of Four and, specifically, has considered the effects of the last season's pelagic whaling in the Antarctic on the stocks and the consequences to the recommendations and conclusions of the Committee of Four presented to the Commission last year. We have been able to do this through the very kind co-operation of the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics, Mr. Vangstein having sent us advance information, and F.A.O. convened a small group of scientists consisting of myself, Mr. Gulland, who was a member of the Committee of Four and Mr. Boerema, a Dutch scientist on the F.A.O. staff in Rome; and we have prepared the report, SM/3, which is before you. That report is based upon catch statistics given to us in detail only up to the end of February, with some summary statistics for the end of the season. These were the only figures available to us at a time at which we could have got a report to this Commission meeting. A summary of that report has also been distributed at this meeting as an addendum to SM/3, and this morning there has also been distributed a document with errata to SM/3, containing some corrections which we have found after the report had been sent to the Secretary of the Commission. I am sorry that there were some typing errors in the original version sent to the Commission, but I am sure you will understand that in order to get the assessment to this meeting, which is earlier than the normal annual meeting of the Commission, we had to work in rather undue haste: but since we prepared the report we have been through it quite carefully and have, I think, picked up any errors we made at that time.

As you have the corrections before you I will not refer to them now, but I must say that some of the corrections to figures are really rather important and it is essential that the revised figures are considered and not those given in the original document.

The first thing I should like to say about this is that, since we prepared the report, we have had from the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics the detailed statistics for the entire season. We have examined these since we prepared the report which has been distributed, and we have found that the assumptions as to the way in which this season would progress in its final month which we made at the time of preparing the document SM/3 have been more or less borne out. The conclusions which we have reached and presented to you in this document are, therefore, unchanged when we take account of the final statistics of the season. I have here a draft of a document which we shall, if necessary, be able to offer to the Secretary to supplement document SM/3 with revised tables giving figures for the full season, but it should be understood at this time that these make no substantial difference to the conclusions we have drawn in our report.

As you know, there was rather less effort put into pelagic whaling last year than in the previous season. The catch in blue whale units was also less than in the previous season and less than is accounted for merely by the reduction in whaling effort. This is, of course, because the stocks are at a lower level than they were in the previous season. In passing it should be noted that the catch of blue whales was reduced to negligible proportions, and so our assessment was confined entirely to a consideration of the fin and sei whales.

The Committee of Four predicted last year the decline in the catch per unit effort of fin whale which could be expected. We found, in the 1964/1965 season, that the catch per unit effort was even less than we had predicted, and the Working Group of F.A.O. looked rather carefully into the reasons for this. This excessive decline in the catch per catcher day of fin whales was associated, as Mr. Vangstein has said, with a very large catch of sei whale. The Committee of Four had predicted that the catch of sei whale could be substantially increased, but we had made no attempt to estimate by how much it might increase.

The increase in sei whale was accomplished by a shift, essentially, in the geographical distribution of the whaling effort, although that shift cannot entirely account for the actual numbers of sei whales caught. There was also, even within geographical areas, a clear intention to seek sei whales wherever they might be, even in preference to fin whales. On the whole, however, by taking account of the shift in the geographical distribution -- which we have done, as described in the paper, by a method which was not used by the Committee of Four but which is a common practice in fisheries assessment work -- one can re-examine the fin whale data.

Our conclusion is that the results of the 1964/1965 season substantially support the analysis made by the Committee of Four. Apart from the extent of shift on to the sei whale there was nothing in the 1964/1965 season which in any way tended to contradict the assessments and predictions made in the previous year.

The sustainable yield of fin whales is now of the order of 4000 whales and we have no more to say about this than the Committee of Four had to say previously. The catch in the 1964/1965 season was higher than the sustainable yield, so that the stock was still further reduced. However, the sustainable yield of fin whale is now a little less than it was a year ago, but not very much less. We think that we now have a better estimate of the situation with respect to the sei whale stock. You may remember that previously the Committee of Four made some very rough attempt to appraise the situation and concluded that the sei whale stock was somewhere in the range of size between 20,000 to 60,000 or 70,000 whales. This was a very broad range of estimate, but nevertheless the Committee of Four felt sure of the order of magnitude of the sei whale stock based on a consideration of pieces of data of different kinds and from different sources. The fact that the sei whale is now almost a preferred species, certainly not a species that is

avoided, in fact allowed us to obtain a better estimate of sei whale stock from the catch per unit effort figures of the 1964/1965 season. The F.A.O. group concluded that the stock at the beginning of the season was of the order of 55,000 whales, which is more or less in the middle of the range that the Committee of Four estimated for this stock.

The F.A.O. group then went on from this conclusion to attempt to make some estimate of the sustainable yield of the sei whales. Admittedly the evidence was not so good as that which we had for the fin whale, but nevertheless we felt fairly sure that the sustainable yield of sei whale could not be greater than 4000 whales at present, and was much more likely to be of the order of 3000 whales. It so happens, too, that we believe this to be the order of magnitude of the maximum sustainable yield of sei whales, because the catch of the 1964/1965 season had the effect of bringing the sei whale stock down to something like half its initial size, and we think to a level which is approximately that which would sustain the maximum yield of sei whales.

The catch of nearly 20,000 sei whales in the 1964/1965 season was, of course, greatly in excess of this sustainable yield, but I should like to make it clear that this in itself was not a bad thing, because the sei whale stock was in a totally different situation from that of the fin and, even more, of the blue whale. That is we believe that the size of the sei whale stock, at the beginning at least of the 1964/1965 season, was bigger than that which would sustain the maximum yield of sei whale. The effect of the season was to bring the stock down to a level at which it had a greater net productivity and could sustain a greater yield. However, we also conclude that any further reduction in the sei whale stock will now bring down the yield that it can sustain. In other words, it is about at its optimum level and further catches exceeding around 3000 sei whales will reduce the stock, and reduce it to a level at which it can sustain smaller yields than 3000.

It is also true that, because of the very rapid movement of whaling effort on to the sei whale, there is still a relatively large recruitment of the young sei whale coming in, but of course this will not continue for more than a very few years. Exactly what will happen in that period we cannot predict without more detailed data on the age composition of the sei whale stock.

The F.A.O. working group then went on to consider in advance of this meeting the possible consequences of the kinds of conservation measures which might be proposed. We could, of course, do no more than refer to the kinds of measures which were proposed at last year's meeting of the Commission, none of which were adopted by the Commission.

As the Committee of Four said last year, when it was recommending that there should be limits set for each species and not just in blue whale units, what happens with a catch quota only in blue whale units cannot be precisely predicted, because the catches of the different species depend upon the way in which the fleets choose to allocate their effort to the species. If the criterion of a quota such as we tried to define were such that it would not reduce the sei whale stock any further than it was reduced in the last season, and if it would permit the fin whales to begin to recover, we conclude that this could be done by not catching more than 4000 fin whales and not catching more than 3000 sei whales, which makes a total of 2500 blue whale units. Anything higher than that would lead to the reduction of either or both of those stocks. Even a limit of that size, of course, I must repeat, does not necessarily ensure that both stocks will be protected. It depends upon how the fleets allocate their effort to the two species. In general, however, conservation of the two stocks is likely to be achieved by a quota of 2500 blue whale units or less.

Finally, in our report we have reported briefly on a recalculation of the consequences of the other proposal which was before the Commission last year, the only other proposal which had the effect of conservation according to our calculations at that time. That was the proposal for a series of three

quotas in three successive years of 4000, 3000 and 2000 blue whale units. The Committee of Four concluded last year that the effect of such a pattern of quotas would be that, in the first year, rather more than the sustainable yield of fin whales was likely to be taken, but by the third year rather less than the sustainable yield of fin whales would be taken, so that that stock would at that time begin to recover. Now we have a slightly different situation and the consequences of such a quota are not quite the same as the Committee of Four predicted. This is because the sei whale has been reduced by about a third; its stock has been reduced considerably through the 1964/1965 season. The fin whale stock has been reduced a little more and, because another year has passed, the recruitment into the fin whale stock is also a little less. We do not have so much of the high recruitment of past years now to draw from. The consequence is that the pattern of quotas -- 4000, 3000 and 2000 -- would, if applied as from the 1965/1966 season, not have a conservation effect by its third year. A pattern of quotas of that kind would have to set rather lower levels of quota than 4000, 3000 and 2000 as proposed last year. We have not, in our report, tried to say exactly how much lower, because again the calculations do depend on the precise allocation of effort as between the fin and the sei whales, and before proceeding with any further calculations we wished to see whether, in any case, that was the kind of proposal which the Commission would be considering during this session.

As Mr. Popper has said, we are at your disposal to assist during this meeting in attempting calculations of the consequences of any proposals which may be put forward.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you very much, Mr. Holt, for your clear and very good report and for its presentation to the Special Meeting.

The time is now 12,40, and it is our intention to break for lunch at 1.00 p.m. What is the opinion of the meeting about opening the discussion? Shall we do it now, or after lunch? If there is no other proposal we will begin the discussion now. (Agreed)

We will begin the discussion and exchange opinions on the report from F.A.O. Who would like to speak on that?

/Mr. R.A. SHERWIN (Australia)....

Mr. R.A. SHERWIN (Australia): Mr. Chairman, you mentioned earlier that you thought that this Commission might decide to appoint some committees to consider this, and in all probability the Commission might wish to discuss, or have the views of a committee or a group to consider the Report of the F.A.O. on this subject. I understand that the members of the Committee of Four which operated for the Commission earlier are present in the delegations today, and the Commission may think it desirable to take advantage of their long experience and high standing to ask them to consider the F.A.O. Report and to comment on it to the Commission. I understand that as these gentlemen are all in the delegations today, their leaders might be asked if they could be made available, if the Commission so considers.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, Mr. Sherwin put a proposal to ask the Members of the Committee of Four who are present in the delegations here to look through the F.A.O. Report and then to present their comments on the Report to the Commission.

Mr. M. NITSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I raise my hand but this does not mean I am supporting the proposals made by the Australian delegation. I have something to say.

The Japanese delegation is ready to make some comments on the Report submitted by F.A.O., therefore we do not think it necessary to establish such a committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So the Japanese delegation is against such a proposal to establish a committee. Are there any other proposals? If there are none, I will consider the proposal of Mr. Sherwin as rejected.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, the Canadian delegation is fortunate to have acquired one of the original members of the Committee of Four, and speaking to the Australian proposal, Canada is quite prepared to have Mr. Allen work again in any way that is considered desirable by this Commission in reconstituting the Committee of Four. But I would say at this time that I should think that it might be a little premature for the Committee of Four just to consider the F.A.O. Report at this moment, and perhaps they can be of more service to the Commission at a later time when there may be some other proposals before us.

I should say in conclusion that we are prepared to offer Mr. Allen in any capacity that might be useful to this Commission, but on the other hand I think that if some of the countries, such as Japan, are prepared to discuss the F.A.O. proposal, this would be the most expeditious way to proceed with the meeting at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: (Interpretation): So Dr. Sprules is now of the opinion that there is no necessity to establish a committee from the members of the Committee of Four.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): At this moment.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Yes.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (United States): Mr. Chairman, one of the members of the United States delegation at this meeting is Dr. Douglas Chapman, who has been acting as Chairman of the Committee of Four for the past few years. The United States is willing to make Dr. Chapman's services available to this Commission in any capacity that the Commission would like; if at some time in the proceedings the Commission wishes to have the Committee of Four consider the scientific findings, then we will be very

CORRIGENDA

Page 7 line 18

- delete "catches" and insert "catchers".

Page 13 line 25 to Page 14 line 29

- delete and insert the following:-

"Now I would like to proceed with comments on the Report submitted by F.A.O. Although we had a time limitation, the Japanese delegation has carefully studied the Report prepared by the fishery division of F.A.O. and circulated under the heading of IWC/SM/3. We think that the Report of F.A.O. expressed the scientific findings upon the purely scientific viewpoint of the whale stocks in the Antarctic. We believe that this Report is especially valuable and must be considered carefully in view of the present situation that the whale stocks are now in danger. Therefore, in this sense I would like to express our sincere respect for the efforts conducted by the scientists.

However, after careful and detailed study we have some doubts and some comments on the Report. Firstly, I would like to express our comments on the fin whales. We are of the same opinion that the yearly catch in fin whales in the last season was lower than those previously predicted, and the reason for such a change having happened was because the expedition has concentrated more efforts on sei whales, and it is also due to the change in the fishing grounds.

Generally speaking, there is not much difference between our views and the Report of F.A.O. on the population size of fin whales, the sustainable yield and the forecast of the catch for next season. Although we admit that there are several differences of opinion and differences between the estimates of F.A.O. and the estimates made by our scientists, the difference is so small as can be considered as the errors which would occur from the insufficiency of the data and the present method of stock assessment.

Secondly, I would like to express our comments on sei whales. We believe that we do not have enough data and information to make an accurate estimate of stock on sei whales possible, and this has also been pointed out in the Report of F.A.O. itself. The F.A.O. Report estimates that the maximum sustainable yields of sei whales would be between about 3,000 and 4,000, but we believe that this figure could be rather an underestimate as a maximum sustainable yield.

The other point was that, until the season 1962/1963, most of the fishing of sei whales was carried on in the fishing grounds where mostly fin whales were abundant, therefore the sei whales caught by the fleets are only a part of the sei whale stocks in general. Therefore, in our opinion, 3,000 to 4,000 would be the lowest figure as the maximum sustainable yield.

As to the stock assessment, the Japanese are now making a very careful study on the sei whales by analysing data and information on age composition, the rate of natural mortality, fishing mortality and reproductive rate etc., including data of 1963/1964 and 1964/1965. This data is most valuable because the intensive fishing of the sei whale really started in those seasons.

Lastly, I would like to make some comment on the blue whales. In view of the drastic reduction of the ordinary blue whale in the Antarctic, we sincerely believe that the means to recover this stock would be its total protection. However, as regards pygmy blue whales, we still believe that the views expressed in the last meeting, namely the Sixteenth Meeting still stand, and are still correct.

All the things which I have just mentioned are a comment on the Report made by the F.A.O., but that Report also makes a proposal for the measures to be taken for the recovery of whale stocks. Maybe we have something to say on a future occasion on this, and we are carefully studying the proposals made by the F.A.O., as well and we may say something on them later."

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any other proposals, Gentlemen?

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I only wanted to say that Mr. Gulland is, I think, the other member of the Committee of Four, and the United Kingdom delegation would, of course, be very happy to make him available if at any time in the course of this meeting it were desired that this Committee should meet. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Tame. Are there any other proposals? So, if my understanding is right, there is no necessity now to establish a special committee, I think that the majority of the delegations present here are of this opinion and we can now open the general discussion on this point. Is that not so?

So now my request is that somebody should open our discussion.

Mr. M.MATSUOKA(Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, before making a comment on the Report submitted by the F.A.O., I would like to make it clear that we have no objection to referring this problem for consideration and study by the four scientists. I should say frankly that the Report submitted by the F.A.O. was only received when we left Tokio, therefore we did not have enough time to study it in Tokio, and we did not succeed in finalising our comments until this morning.

What we are worried about now is that if the Committee of the four scientists comes to different conclusions from the findings submitted by F.A.O., then we shall not have enough time in which to consider and study the Report submitted by the four scientists.

Now I would like to proceed with comments on the Report submitted by F.A.O. Although we had a time limitation, the Japanese delegation has carefully studied the Report prepared by the fishery division of F.A.O. and circulated under the heading of IWC/SM/3. We think that the Report of F.A.O. expressed, as before, the scientific findings and the purely scientific viewpoint of the whale stocks in the Antarctic. We believe that this Report is especially valuable and must be considered carefully in view of the present situation that the whale stocks are now in danger. Therefore, in this sense I would like to express our sincere respect for the efforts conducted by the scientists.

However, after careful and detailed study we have some doubts and some comments on the Report. Firstly, I would like to express our comments on the fin whales. We are of the same opinion that the yearly catch in fin whales in the last season was lower than those previously made, and the reason for such a change having happened was because the expedition has concentrated more efforts on sei whales, and it is also due to the change in the fishing grounds, and the conditions of the fishing grounds.

Generally speaking, there is not much difference between our views and the Report of F.A.O. on the population size of fin whales, the sustainable yield and the estimate of the catch for next season. Although we admit that there are several differences of opinion and differences in the estimates of F.A.O. and the estimates made by our scientists, the difference is so small as can be considered as the errors which would be caused by the insufficiency of the data and the present method of stock assessment.

Secondly, I would like to express our comments on sei whales. In sei whales we believe that we do not have enough data and information to make an accurate estimate of stock on sei whales possible, and this has also been pointed out in the Report of F.A.O. itself. The F.A.O. Report estimates that the maximum sustainable yields of sei whales would be between

about 3,000 and 4,000, but we believe that this figure could be rather an underestimate of the sustainable yield figure for sei whales, at its maximum.

The other point was that in the season 1962/1963, most of the fishing of sei whales was carried on in the fishing grounds where mostly fin whales were abundant and in the same fishing grounds the total amount of all stocks caught for the sei whale by the Japanese fleet is only a part of the sei whale stocks in general. We made the estimate that a 3,000 to 4,000 maximum sustainable yield would be the lowest figure, it would be an underestimate.

As to the stock assessment, the Japanese are now making a very careful study on the sei whales and they are making a scientific analysis of this data and information on composition, the rate of national mortality and recruitment, and national fishing and so on, both on the data of 1963/1964 and 1964/1965. This data is most valuable information, because the fishing of the sei whale has really started from that season.

Lastly, I would like to make some comment on the blue whales. In view of the drastic reduction of the blue whale in the Antarctic, we sincerely believe that the means to recover this stock would be the total protection of that stock. However, as regards blue whales especially, the population size of the pygmy whale, we still believe that the views expressed in the last meeting, namely the Sixteenth Meeting still stand, and are still correct.

All the things which I have just mentioned are a comment on the Report made by the F.A.O., but that Report also makes a proposal for the measures to be taken for the recovery of the whale stocks. Maybe we have something to say on a future occasion on this, and we are carefully studying the proposals made by the F.A.O. as well, and we may say something on them later.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, it is now time for lunch and we will break until 2 p.m.

(The Meeting adjourned at 1.10 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation):

(The meeting reconvened at 2.15 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, we will proceed with our work. Just before lunch Mr. Holt asked me to allow him to make some explanation of his report. I now give him the floor.

Mr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I only wanted to take the opportunity, before the discussion proceeded on this item, to make it quite clear to the Commission that the F.A.O. report does not contain any proposals for action by the Commission. I wanted it to be understood that it was not intended that we were making any proposals. We have tried to estimate the stocks and the sustainable yields, and finally we did attempt to calculate the consequences of one of the proposals that was before the Commission at its last meeting, but there are no proposals for action from F.A.O.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Holt.

In order to expedite our work I propose to combine the exchange of opinions on Item 3 of the agenda and on Item 4 (Proposals for restriction of catch and restoration of stocks in Antarctic waters. What would be the opinion of the Commission?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): The Canadian delegation could certainly agree with that proposal. It is essential that we begin talking and reach some conclusions with respect to Item 4, and in order to do this certainly we must keep in mind all of the information that has been made available to us under Item 3. Therefore I consider that these two items could be, and should in fact be, considered together.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you. Are there any other proposals or comments?

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): I also think it would be convenient, and would expedite our work, if those two items were discussed together. I therefore support your proposal, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The United States agrees with the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you. Is there any other proposal?

If there is no other proposal this procedure is agreed, and I ask you, gentlemen, to combine your views on the reports on agenda Item 3 with those on agenda Item 4.

Mr. DENISENKOV (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): The Soviet delegation appreciates the important work done by the scientists from F.A.O. on the analysis of the statistical data and preparation of the report on the

effects of pelagic whaling in the Antarctic on whale stocks during the season 1964-65, as well as on the present state of the stocks in question. We would like to thank the scientists for the work they have done.

To all the members of the Commission this report provides a sound basis for taking urgent measures on fixing quotas for protection and recovering of whale stocks. As is known, the Soviet Union has in the past repeatedly expressed its readiness to start to put into practice measures for the protection of whales.

One further point: we have at our disposal many new geographical details on fin whales, on which the estimates of their stocks are based but we have no such clear and sound basis on sei whales. For this reason the findings on sei whale stocks should be considered as preliminary and should be confirmed by future scientific surveys.

As to our concrete proposals, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to give the floor to Mr. Kolesnik, a member of the Soviet delegation, who, to save time, will read the proposals in English.

Mr. KOLESNIK (U.S.S.R.) Having concern over the conservation of whale stocks at a level which would secure a rational and steady catch, the Soviet Union has sought and is seeking co-operation in this field with all the countries concerned.

Convincing scientific data, as well as results of the expeditions' operations in the Antarctic, show that the intensive whaling has resulted in a sharp decrease in stocks of the main species of whales for the past decade, and especially for the last few years. So, according to the data given by the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics, 15,179 BWU were caught in the season 1953-54, whereas only 8,448 BWU were taken in the season 1963-64; that is, the efficiency of whaling went down by almost half. Still less comforting are the results of operations in the season 1964-65. According to the preliminary data, 6,984 BWU were caught in the season in question. Of course, such a situation cannot but cause serious anxiety.

The almost unanimous opinion of scientists is that if whales and whaling are to be preserved for future human generations whaling should be sharply reduced. First of all, it means the reduction of the efficiency of whaling and an appropriate decrease in the total quota for whale catch in the Antarctic.

Having in mind the above, the Soviet delegation puts forward, for the consideration of the Commission, the following proposal:

To reduce, commencing from the season of 1965-66, the number of the expeditions engaged in whaling in 1964-65 by not less than 50 per cent.; to cut down accordingly the total quota for catch in the Antarctic season of 1965-66 up to 4,000 BWU and not to increase this quota in the consecutive two seasons; to continue to carry out large scientific surveys of the state of whale stocks for the purpose of making more accurate estimation of the maximum sustainable yield.

- 17 -

Appreciating the fact that the question of the reduction of the number of the expeditions by 50 per cent. should be a subject of a special agreement between the countries engaged in pelagic whaling in the Antarctic, the Soviet delegation proposes that the Commission should make a necessary recommendation.

At the same time the Soviet delegation is authorised to declare that the U.S.S.R. is ready to assume such an obligation immediately.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this statement should be distributed, for the convenience of all delegations.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you very much, Mr. Kolesnik. Who will be the first to comment?

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway): I should like to make a few comments on the general situation as we see it, in the Norwegian delegation, at this time.

As you know, whaling in the Antarctic was started by Norwegian whalers sixty years ago. In 1925, pelagic whaling was inaugurated by the Norwegians. As pelagic whaling developed, the necessity of proper means for its regulation was recognised by the Norwegian Government, which enacted a rule on the regulation of whaling as early as 1929. From the time that pelagic whaling became an international industry it became apparent that international rules were called for. Norway consequently took the initiative in establishing an international whaling agreement in 1937 and 1938.

In 1944 a special whaling conference introduced a new principle, namely, that the total catch be limited to a certain number of BWU -- a principle which was embodied in the 1946 Convention. Norway has strictly adhered to this principle in formulating its whaling policy since the War, in order that the catching capacity should not be in disproportion with the yearly sustainable yield of the stock of whales.

Already at the 15th Session of the International Whaling Commission the Norwegian Commissioner proposed a global quota of 4,000 BWU for the season 1963-1964. The quota, however, was fixed at 10,000 BWU for that season.

At the 16th Session a great majority was in favour of a reduction of the global quota to 4,000 BWU for the season 1964-1965 and to 3,000 and 2,000 units in the two subsequent seasons. If these quotas had been accepted with a qualified majority, one might presume that this decision would have been subject to protest by some of the active whaling nations. The result would have been unrestricted catches, at least for the 1964-1965 season. Such a development would have been most unfortunate and, consequently, Norway voted against the proposal. Instead, Norway made a compromise proposal, based on 6,000 BWU. Unfortunately, neither the whaling nations nor the non-active whaling nations could agree to such a quota.

In the light of the failure of the Commission to fix a global quota, an initiative was taken by whaling nations to fix a global quota by voluntary agreement. As you know, the result of the negotiations was

that a total quota of 8,000 BWU was agreed upon as if it had been fixed by the International Whaling Commission. The Quota Agreement of 1962, establishing national quotas, is valid for the 1965-66 season. Such an agreement is essential also for the coming years, so long as the catching capacity of the whaling nations exceeds the number of whales which could be taken without decimating the stock of whales in the Antarctic.

This fact has been fully recognised by the Commission in passing a resolution in 1960, at its 12th Meeting. As you know, in that resolution the Commission points out that effective restrictions on the total catch depend on co-operation between the five nations engaged in pelagic whaling in the matter of quota distribution.

The Norwegian Government is convinced that a quota agreement is even more needed today than ever before, in the light of the further drastic reduction which has taken place since then in the stock of whales in the Antarctic. From an economic point of view, a certain commonly agreed quota must be preferable for the active whaling nations to a cut-throat competition with maximum material efforts.

In its Note of 28 November last the Norwegian Government stated its willingness to participate in the Special Meeting of the Commission in order to contribute to the entry into effect of realistic conservation measures. We did, however, base this assurance on the condition that the total quota was distributed between the whaling nations in a satisfactory way. In our view the Commission has a special responsibility for the establishment of a fair and equitable division of the quota, when we know that such quotas are necessary for the implementation of the basic principles of the Convention. Furthermore, it is the considered opinion of the Norwegian Government that effective regulation of whaling in the Antarctic should not be carried out without international inspection and control. This view is shared by the Commission, which in the 1960 resolution stated that the effective restriction on the total catch depended on the implementation of the international observer scheme. We earnestly hope that it will be possible for the international observer scheme, which for ten years now Norway has tried to bring about, to enter into effect as from the coming season.

Nothing can be more dangerous than to hide the fact that we might be faced with a possible unrestricted catch in the Antarctic and the breakdown of our Convention in the very near future. This imposes a special and serious responsibility upon the Commission in this very meeting. I can assure you that the Norwegian delegation is prepared to do its utmost to find a constructive solution to the problems now facing us, bearing in mind the great responsibility which Norway feels for the outcome of our deliberations and, as I emphasised at the beginning of my statement, we shall spare no efforts whatsoever to come to an agreement.

/The CHAIRMAN follows ...

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): This Special Meeting of the International Whaling Commission was convened in an extraordinary effort to find solutions to the problems that caused the 1964 annual meeting to end in failure. It comes at a most critical time in the history of world whaling. For several years now the total catch and the catch per unit of effort in the Antarctic have been dropping, in spite of every effort to improve the efficiency of operations. One by one the most valuable species have virtually disappeared from the fisheries or have been reduced to minor importance. The blue and the humpback whale are no longer important in the catch. The fin whale has been overfished seriously and soon will be equally scarce if corrective measures are not taken. Now the sei whale forms the bulk of the catch, but even this species is subject to such heavy pressure that this stock is rapidly decreasing also.

The scientific evidence is undeniable that the Antarctic whale resources are close to economic extinction. Special assessment of the Antarctic whale stocks by the Committee of Four and the recent preliminary report by F.A.O. on the effects of whaling on the stocks in the 1964/1965 season demonstrate clearly that Antarctic whaling is not under effective regulation. The scientists have been able to predict the course of Antarctic whaling with remarkable accuracy in the last few years however. It is the purpose of this Special Meeting to reach agreement on a method to bring whaling regulations into line with these findings. It was the declared intention of this Commission to achieve this objective not later than 1964, but we failed to live up to this intention at the last annual meeting.

To achieve this objective will require a drastic reduction in the catch in the 1965/1966 season. I am sure we all recognise this as a fact. Every member nation represented at this meeting must be prepared to agree to a substantial reduction in the catch, otherwise it would not have agreed to the meeting in the first place. The future of world whaling and the general cause of international fishery agreement will be influenced strongly by our actions in the next few days.

It remains only to discover a practical method of putting this intention into actual practice. Conservation considerations dictate that we put quotas into effect immediately which will prevent further over fishing and allow recovery of the stocks to begin. Whaling must come under strict control at levels which will permit rehabilitation of the resource, accompanied by planned expansion of whaling until the point of maximum sustainable yield has been reached. This, in effect has been the method by which successful management of the North Pacific fur seal resource is already achieved. We all recognise that a single quota based on blue whale units is an inefficient method of regulating a fishery that takes several species or stocks. Under such a scheme, unless the quota is set at or below the level of sustainable yield for the most sought after species or stock, this species may continue to be over exploited even though the overall quota is generally consistent with the overall level of sustainable yield.

The scientists have pointed out that a system of regulation based on blue whale units is not practical for a selective fishery like whaling. We consider that effective management of whale resources will not be fully achieved until each species or management unit is subject to separate regulation. Whatever the method of regulation, if we plan to be immediately responsive to the scientific conclusions for the 1965/1966 whaling season we must adopt a quota for the Antarctic of about 2500 blue whale units or less. This figure has already been presented in the F.A.O. report.

The argument has been raised before, and it will undoubtedly be raised again, that although such precipitate action may be reasonable from the scientific point of view, it fails to consider the economic realities of the situation. This would be a more useful argument if it were advanced with some recognition of the scientific facts. The quotas which have been agreed upon in the last few years have not been realistic quotas in the light of scientific or of long term economic principles. The United States proposal at the 1964 annual meeting was an attempt to resolve the problem by a

reasonable compromise between economic and biological considerations. This proposal was not adopted, of course. We must not adjourn this meeting until we have arrived at a reasonable solution to our problems.

The United States is prepared to discuss and to consider seriously any practical proposal which is consistent with conservation of the resource. We are confident that this is the objective of every nation present.

Before I close, Mr. Chairman, I should just simply like to say that there have been several proposals made already. Japan has raised some questions about the findings of the scientists and has suggested that she has some somewhat different interpretations. The U.S.S.R. has made a very definite proposal, and we have also heard from the Norwegian delegation. It appears to the United States delegation that this might be an appropriate time to ask the Committee of Four to examine these proposals and to report upon their effect on the stocks. If one or more of these proposals is consistent with the scientific findings and presents a scheme which, at the end of the planned period -- whatever it is -- brings the fisheries into line with the scientific recommendations, then I think we have a reasonable argument that we can consider.

We would suggest that, in making such a study, the Committee of Four might like to call upon scientists who are here on other national delegations, and we would suggest that they be allowed to do so at their discretion.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you very much, Dr. McHugh. I hope you will not object if your proposal with regard to the establishment of the Committee of Four is considered later after we have heard the comments of other delegations.

Does anyone else wish to make a statement?

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway)(Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I should like to make some supplementary comments on the proposal put forward by the delegation of the Soviet Union.

So far as I can see, the most important part of the Soviet proposal is the limitation of the total catch. It can be argued that one should have a double protection both with regard to the number of expeditions and to the number of whales to be caught. My first reaction is that it is probably most natural that the nation which sends out expeditions should itself decide the number of expeditions to be sent out. I should like to add, however, that we would consider the Russian proposal favourably.

We consider that the Commission should be actively engaged in finding a solution to these problems with regard to the quota distribution. When we discussed the matter of a quota in the Norwegian delegation we came to the conclusion that we should take the scientific findings as a basis.

The F.A.O. working group has put forward calculations which indicate that we must reduce the number of blue whale units to a certain extent if the stocks are not to deteriorate further. We do not doubt that these estimates are the most accurate which can be made at the present moment, but I should like to ask the representative of F.A.O. how accurate these estimates are and whether we can think in terms of a safety margin of plus or minus 10 per cent or 15 per cent.

I should like to end my statement by stating that Norway is prepared to vote for the proposal which was originally put forward, namely quotas of 4000, 3000 and 2000 blue whale units for the next three years. I must stress, however, that we must adhere to the principle of a quota agreement for the corresponding seasons, because the present quota agreement is now only valid for one season.

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan)(Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for giving me a chance to express my views.

As I told you this morning, we have reached a conclusion about the analysis made in the F.A.O. report, but we have still not considered the effect of the total catch limit as suggested in that report. The Russian delegation has just made a new concrete proposal and we have just heard the comments of the Norwegian delegation and the proposals made by them. We are not, therefore, at this stage, ready to make any concrete proposals for the total catch limit in the coming season, or on the proposals made by the Russian delegation, the Norwegian delegation or the F.A.O. report. It may be that we shall be able to express our views at tomorrow's session.

I should like to express our position clearly again. As you know, the Japanese Government has co-operated in reducing the quotas and the total catch limit in the past few years, in spite of great difficulty and many sacrifices on the part of the whaling industries concerned. I should like to say that the Japanese side is ready to reduce the quota *quite drastically* in the coming season. We can also say that we are ready to reduce the quota in the season following the next, even though this reduction may call for great sacrifice and ~~cause~~ many difficulties on the part of the industries. We are ready to co-operate with other nations so that we can take measures to ensure the recovery of the whale stocks in the future.

Perhaps, therefore, we may express our views and comment on the proposals made with regard to the total catch limit in the coming season. We believe that it would be better to refer these problems to the Committee of Four after we have discussed it fully with the delegations of the other countries concerned.

Mr. P. GRIBELIN (France): Mr. Chairman, I should like to make rather a different proposal. I agree with the United States proposal that there should be a discussion by the Committee of Four on the scientific considerations which arise. However, my first impression is that the Russian proposal is realistic and takes into account social, economic and scientific points of view. It is realistic and reasonable so far as the next season is concerned, but in regard to other seasons I agree with the Norwegian proposal to reduce the quota to 3000 and later to 2000 blue whale units. I think that this suggestion provides a good basis for the discussion of our problems. There is a proposal by the F.A.O. to discriminate the species by quota, but this problem is somewhat unclear. In the last session we did not discuss this question and it may well present some difficulty. We have to bear in mind these problems of discriminating among species within the quota, and then there will be other scientific or technical problems. I think that we have at the moment a good basis for discussing this grave question of the limitation of the catch.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I should like to make just a brief comment. It appears to us that we may not be able to have a complete discussion of these matters until we have had an opportunity to hear the scientists' evaluation of certain proposals which have been made this afternoon. I do not believe, for example, that the Scientific Committee has commented specifically on the proposal advanced by the U.S.S.R. It would be very helpful to have some evaluation of the effect of this proposal on the stocks of whales in the Antarctic. While we are not to shut off discussion now, we think that at some stage before our discussion is complete it may be necessary for the Committee of Four to meet and provide us with additional background information.

The CHAIRMAN:(Interpretation): I should like now to return to the proposal put forward by Mr. Sherwin of Australia and seconded by Dr. McHugh, Mr. Tame and other Commissioners, to refer to the Committee of Four scientists the consideration of those definite proposals which have already been made. Has anybody any objection to this?

Mr. I.F. DENISENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): The Russian delegation feels that it would be more useful to establish the committee of six countries, in such a way that the three countries engaged in pelagic and Antarctic whaling would be represented as well as three non-active countries.

/That will allow us

That will allow us to arrange for a committee of six to combine, during their work, the two points of view, that is the economic side of this question and the scientific side.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): If I understood right, that was another proposal to establish a committee of six which will consist of three representatives from pelagic countries and three representatives from non-pelagic countries. Are there any other proposals?

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan)(Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, the Japanese delegation fully agree with and support the proposals made by the Russian delegation to constitute a committee of six, that means three pelagic whaling countries and three non-pelagic whaling countries, and we will support and fully agree to defer this problem to that kind of committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Matsuoka. The proposal has been seconded by the Japanese delegation.

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway): And by us.

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

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, the Canadian delegation has no objection to establishing a committee of any size to consider the knotty problems which are before us. However, before it is necessary to make a final decision on this matter, I would like to be very sure what the terms of reference are for this committee. If we are going to mingle science and economics, as was proposed, I think perhaps the people who would be appointed to this committee would be somewhat different. We try, in Canada, as much as possible to keep our scientists thinking of scientific matters alone, and when we are concerned with economic or political matters we try to find another group of people to consider these matters. I do not think that the Canadian representative on the Committee of Four, Mr. Allen, would feel competent to take part in discussions which were of an economic nature, but he certainly is prepared to operate with fellow scientists in analysing the scientific data which has been placed before the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Sprules. I think that one proposal does not exclude the other. What do you think about that?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I began my remarks by saying that I am in favour of the original proposal. I would just like to have very clearly before me the objectives or references that are being put before this committee, that is all.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, since in my statement I mentioned the word 'economics', perhaps I should clarify what I had in mind. I was not intending to suggest that we should in any way deviate from the scientific considerations, and I thought I had made it clear that the United States proposal to refer this matter to the Committee of Four was very definitely a matter of determining what were the scientific consequences of any of the proposals that have been made at the meeting so far, and we are certainly not interested in discussing any proposal that is not in line with the scientific findings.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any other proposals, Gentlemen? If there are none, then we have two proposals now before us.

Mr. KOLESNIK (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, the Soviet delegation would like to make some more comments with regard to the creation of the committee of six. In our opinion, scientists repeatedly made known their point of view, and just now we have considered the Report presented by F.A.O., and we have at our disposal now the data by the Committee of Four. For this reason, the proposals which have been tabled at this meeting have been given to a small group of scientists for consideration, but we doubt whether a scientist would be able to make the rather different findings from the findings which they have just presented.

Our task is to find some reasonable compromise which will take into account on the one hand scientific data, and on the other hand the economic views of those countries which are engaged in active pelagic whaling. At present we may say that the proposals which two countries engaged in active pelagic whaling have just tabled for our consideration and for the consideration of the Commission come very near the proposals made by the scientists. Thus, that discrepancy which had been noted during the last year between the findings of the scientists and the interests of industry at present is smaller. Proceeding from this, the Soviet delegation think it would be expedient to give proper consideration to all proposals which have just now been made, and to all future proposals which may be made during our work at this session, and this consideration could be given by the committee of six, that is a balanced committee which would consist of scientists and the people engaged in economy.

Replying to the question put by Dr. Sprules of Canada, we think that these terms of reference of the committee of six might be the consideration both of scientific data and economic interests.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I have a question to put to Mr. Kolesnik. Is your proposal a new one or is it an amendment to the first proposal? Secondly, do you object to the first proposal about the establishment of a committee of four, or do you think it is possible for two committees to work at the same time?

Mr. KOLESNIK (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, at this present stage we are discussing the question of the expediency of taking one proposal, that is the creation of the Committee of Four, and the second proposal is the committee of six or taking both proposals together. At least, until the present moment no one has spoken against the creation of the committee of six; on the contrary, this proposal to create a committee of six was seconded by the delegation of Japan and the delegation of Norway. For this reason, may I ask you not to close the discussion on this question and to ask some other delegates to speak on this point.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Kolesnik, but it is not clear to me. There are now two proposals under discussion; .. no one delegation is against any one. Are you against one of them?

Mr. KOLESNIK (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation): Our delegation does not object to further work by the Committee of Four, although we do not see any further point in continuing the further work with regard to findings. At the same time, we insist on further discussion with regard to the committee of six.

The CHAIRMAN: (Interpretation): There is no necessity to insist on this proposal, because nobody objects to it.

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, as far as I can see, there is no fundamental difference between these two proposals. In the Addendum to document IWC/SM/3, which is a summary of the F.A.O. Report, it states: "...to be sure that the stocks were not further reduced the series of quotas would have to be somewhat lower than the values of 4,000, 3,000 and 2,000 blue whale units proposed at the Sixteenth Meeting."

This means that the scientists fear that it could be a somewhat lower figure certainly than the figures of 4,000, 3,000 and 2,000. Could we not do it in this way? Let the four scientists look into these figures and say what they mean, then the committee of six could use this material as a point of departure for further discussion. I assume that there is no need for a lengthy analysis by the scientists of this question.

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, we do not think there is any fundamental difference to establish two committees, one is the Committee of Four, and the other is a committee of six. Therefore, the Norwegian delegation suggested that the committee of six might study the Report to be submitted, to be considered by the Committee of Four. That is one way of proceeding at the conference.

Another way is, for example, the Committee of Four might consider Agenda No. 3, and the committee of six might consider and discuss Agenda No. 4. Therefore, we should not think too much about establishing the one committee, there are many ways of proceeding at this conference and discussing things.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): To summarise this, there are two proposals to which nobody has any objections.

/So the first proposal

So the first proposal was to establish a Committee of Four scientists to analyse new data and the proposals of the countries made here and as it has already been put forward and seconded I ask you, again, does anybody disagree with this proposal?

There is no objection to the establishment of the Committee of Four.
(Agreed)

There was a second proposal, put forward by the Soviet delegation and seconded by the Japanese and Norwegian delegations, that we should establish a Committee of Six -- three pelagic countries and three non-pelagic countries. Is anybody against that proposal?

There is no objection, and that proposal is agreed, too. (Agreed)

If my understanding is correct, the Committee of Four will consider all the problems arising on Point 3 of the agenda and the Committee of Six will discuss and consider all the proposals made here on Point 4 of the agenda.

Mr. HOLLER (Norway) (Interpretation): I have only one question, on clarification of the Russian proposal. I understood the Russian proposal to be to the effect that the Committee of Six would discuss not only the total quota but also the question of the distribution of that quota.

Mr. D.N. KOLESNIK (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): The Soviet delegation has said nothing with regard to the fact that the Committee of Six should be engaged on the question of redistribution of quotas. That question is up to the three pelagic countries. Our proposal is that the Committee of Six should consider the proposals tabled just now with regard to the total quota, both in the light of scientific data and having due regard to the economic side.

The CHAIRMAN (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Are you satisfied, Mr. Holler, with that explanation by Mr. Kolesnik?

Mr. HOLLER (Norway) (Interpretation): I am satisfied with the explanation but I do not really agree. I think there is such a relationship between the total quota and the national quotas to be established that the Committee should also consider this question, if it is necessary, with regard to the establishment of a total quota.

Mr. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): The Japanese delegation agrees with the statement made by the Russian delegation. The problem of the national quota would be a problem purely for the three countries concerned; therefore this problem can be discussed only among the three countries concerned.

Mr. HOLLER (Norway) (Interpretation): I should like to ask a question of the other members of the Commission. If we find that it is difficult to agree on a global quota without at the same time agreeing on national quotas, would it not then be natural for the other members of the Commission to contribute to an agreement on the division of the global quota, if that is necessary, in order to safeguard the principles of the Convention?

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, in accordance with the traditions of our Commission, Mr. Secretary now proposes that we break for tea, in order that the Commissioners may have a chance to exchange opinions on the establishment of committees. Mr. Wimpenny is, as usual, a very good man to help the Commissioners.

(The meeting adjourned at 3.40 p.m.)

(The Meeting reconvened at 4.05 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I call the meeting to order.

We have considered the Reports under Items 3 and 4 of the Agenda, and we have decided to establish two committees, a Committee of Four, and a Committee of Six. We have not come to any definite conclusion on the kind of problems to be discussed by the Committee of Six. Point 4 of the Agenda has to do with proposals for restriction of catch and restoration of whale stocks in Antarctic waters. We can identify this with the point on total catch in the Antarctic and on reducing the intensity of effort in catching.

The Norwegian delegation has proposed that the Committee of Six should consider the problem of the distribution of national quotas, but the Soviet and Japanese delegations are against this proposal.

I should like to know the opinion of the meeting on this point. Does the Norwegian delegation insist on this proposal?

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway)(Interpretation: I put that question because I wanted to know the reaction of the non-active whaling nations to this proposal. However, I did not get any answer to it. I should first like to hear if anyone wants to comment on our proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Do I understand that Mr. Holler wants to listen to the opinions of non-pelagic countries on this point? Gentlemen, we are waiting for your comments on this point.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I believe that the terms of the Convention under which we operate prevent the Commission from considering whaling quotas based on national quotas. Therefore, I think that the Commission as a whole may not be authorised to consider national quotas. However, I would go one step further and say that, as far as the Canadian delegation and the Government of Canada are concerned, anything that will bring order and agreement into the Antarctic whaling situation based primarily on the scientific evidence will be favourably considered by Canada. We should be prepared to stretch any one of the Articles of the Convention if that were what was required to reach this objective.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The United States delegation is in somewhat the same position as the Canadian delegation in that this is the way in which our Government also interprets the Treaty. However, as you all know, we are most anxious to do everything we can to arrive at a reasonable agreement at this meeting. While we cannot discuss these matters officially, we shall be glad to discuss them unofficially in any way that seems to offer an opportunity to help.

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway)(Interpretation): Since we have learned that the two other active whaling nations do not wish to discuss this question, it goes without saying that Norway cannot discuss it alone. In the present situation the Norwegian delegation has to accept the fact that discussions must take place between the active whaling nations. We would prefer that they should take place as early as possible, preferably tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any other opinions on this point? If my understanding is correct, Mr. Holler considers that this problem can be discussed among the three nations concerned, either in the Committee of Six or in a separate meeting. Are you now ready to withdraw your proposal?

Mr. KOLESNIK (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): I may have misunderstood the Chairman, but the opinion of the Soviet delegation is that this is a question which is within the competence only of the three countries which are engaged in pelagic whaling in the Antarctic. That is why this question cannot be discussed either in the Committee of Four or in the Committee of Six. In this sense Dr. Sprules and Dr. McHugh have interpreted the Convention correctly in pointing out that this question is not one which can be discussed inside the framework of the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Kolesnik's understanding of my resume is not quite right. The Norwegian proposal has been withdrawn and this proposal will, therefore, be a matter of discussion between the three countries concerned.

Gentlemen, what should be the order of our meeting? I think that it would be quite good if the committees were to meet, bearing in mind that at 6.30 p.m. we are all invited to a reception by the Government of the United Kingdom. Our task now is to appoint the Committee of Six. There is a proposal to include in the Committee of Six, apart from the three pelagic countries, Japan, Norway and the U.S.S.R., a representative from the United States of America, a representative from Canada and one from France. Are there any other proposals on the composition of this Committee? I will give you time to think it over. -

If there are no comments, I take it that the Chairman's proposal is quite acceptable to everybody here. Who is in favour of this proposal?

Mr. I.F. DENISENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): The Soviet delegation fully agrees with this proposal. We think that the proposed composition of the Committee of Six is quite satisfactory and that we should be able to find some solution.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Will someone second this proposal?

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): The Japanese delegation fully supports the composition of the Committee of Six which has been suggested by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Since there are no further proposals or comments, my proposal, seconded by the Soviet delegation and the Japanese delegation, is accepted?

/Are there any

Are there any objections if I ask Mr. McHugh, of the United States, to be a convenor of this Committee?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I have an objection. The reason is that I was going to ask Mr. Herrington to represent the United States on this committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So now you are proposing the personal composition of the Committee, and from the United States delegation the member proposed is Mr. Herrington. If that is so I shall ask Mr. Herrington to be convenor of the Committee of Six. I hope he will not object?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): To make certain that Mr. Herrington does not object, I will accept for him.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): That is agreed. (Agreed)

I now ask the Commissioners for Canada and France to appoint persons from their delegations to the Committee of Six.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I shall be very pleased to serve on the Committee of Six.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Sprules. What of the French delegation?

Mr. P. GRIBELIN (France) (Interpretation): Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Now the non-palagic countries - Japan?

Mr. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): Japan will be represented by myself.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Norway - Mr. Holler?

Mr. HOLLER (Norway): I have the honour to propose Mr. Holler.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The Soviet delegation?

Mr. I.F. DENISENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): The Soviet delegation proposes Mr. Sukhoruchenko.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It is a great honour for me to be the representative of the Soviet delegation. I shall be present there.

We now have the full composition of the Committee of Six. I propose that the two established committees, the Committee of Four and the Committee of Six should meet. Are there any objections? I see no objections, so that is agreed. (Agreed)

Now, how shall we proceed tomorrow. Shall we begin with the work of the committees, tomorrow morning, or with a plenary session to consider the views of the Japanese delegation?

Mr. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, the Japanese delegation would like to make a proposal on the total quota in the plenary session tomorrow, if possible.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): What is the opinion of the Commission upon that point?

Mr. I.F. DENISENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): The Soviet delegation seconds the proposal made by the Japanese delegation.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So the Soviet delegation seconds the proposal that tomorrow morning we begin our work with the plenary session. Are there any other proposals. Then we shall have our plenary session at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, and we shall consider the matter of our subsequent procedure tomorrow.

Mr. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): The Japanese delegation wishes to have the plenary session at 11 o'clock instead of 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The request of the Japanese delegation is to begin at 11 tomorrow morning instead of 10. Do the committees begin their work tomorrow before the plenary session?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): We certainly agree with the Japanese proposal to hold the plenary session beginning at 11. The Committee of Six could hardly, I think, meet before 11, or we would very likely not have Mr. Matsuoka in attendance. However, I think the Committee of Four could meet at the time that Committee found they had time available - either tonight, during the cocktail party, or early tomorrow morning.

There is, however, one thing that we should reach agreement on before we leave this meeting this afternoon and that is the precise terms of reference under which the Committee of Four will operate. As I understand it at the moment, the Committee of Four is to look at the reports and the data submitted under agenda item 3. During this afternoon's session there has been at least one concrete proposal made by a delegation - the Norwegian delegation - a proposal for a whaling regime over the next three years. In addition, the Soviet delegation made a proposal which at least referred to next year and set upper limits on the following two years. My question to the Commission is this: is it the wish of the Commission to have the Committee of Four look at these two new proposals from the stand-point of the scientific data available to them, so that they might be able to produce a summary which would indicate to the best of their knowledge what would happen to the whale stocks in the Antarctic region if either one of those proposals was given serious consideration by this Commission? If it is not the wish of the Commission to have the Committee consider anything but the material outlined in agenda item 3 I think this should be made clear to the Committee of Four so that it will not be wasting its time on other matters. I think this is a simple matter: it is just a question of the Commission's telling the Committee of Four precisely what it wants the Committee to do - if it is to consider something more than just the data submitted under item 3.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): When the United States supported the proposal for a meeting of the Committee of Four we had in mind more than just consideration of items (a), (b) and (c) under item 3. We proposed also that this Committee should consider the proposals made by two or more countries here today - the Soviet proposal, the Norwegian proposal and any other suggestions or proposals that have been made.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. McHugh. Are there any other proposals, gentlemen?

So I understand this point to be agreed, that the Committee of Four will consider all the points, (a), (b) and (c) of item 3 and bring some kind of opinion before the Commission. If the Committee of Four has some additional proposals I think it would be very good for the Commission to consider those proposals.

Any other opinion?

Mr. W.C. HERRINGTON (U.S.A.): I am not sure whether events have caught up with this, but my suggestion would be that when the Commission has received its proposals the Committee of Six should fix a meeting with the Committee of Four to consider what each will do, since there is a relation between the responsibilities of the two committees. This can be taken up tomorrow, at the time we finish receiving all the proposals from the various delegations.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you Mr. Herrington.

We ask the Committee of Four to meet, either this evening or tomorrow morning, and the Commission adjourns until tomorrow morning at 11 a.m.

(The meeting adjourned at 4.40 p.m.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

SPECIAL MEETING

Session of Tuesday, 4th May, 1965.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I call the Third Plenary Session to order, we will proceed with our work. Yesterday we achieved some progress in our work and I hope that this morning we will continue with this. Who would like to speak first in this Session?

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan)(Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, as I promised you at yesterday's Plenary Session, I would like to express our views on the total catch limit and also some other points.

First of all, I will explain about the total catch limit in the Antarctic; frankly, the Japanese delegation have decided drastically to reduce the total catch limit in the coming season from last year to 5,000 blue whale units. Although this decision will bring great difficulties to the Japanese whaling industry in many respects, we have decided to accept it as an unavoidable sacrifice to the industry from the viewpoint of achieving the recovery and orderly development of the industry.

However, after having carefully studied the Report of F.A.O., and having also taken into account the proposals made by the Russian and Norwegian delegations, we have fully recognised the necessity and the responsibility on us to co-operate closely with other nations in the recovery of whale stocks in the Antarctic. We had a very lengthy discussion this morning and we have changed our original ideas and decided on the following proposals.

Our proposal is that the total catch limit in the Antarctic would, in the coming season of 1965/1966 be 4,500 blue whale units, in 1966/1967, 4,000 blue whale units, and in the season of 1967/1968 it would be 3,500 blue whale units. These figures might be subject to change, in view of the situation in whaling in the Antarctic, but I would like to make these as a kind of guiding principle, and a target for the total catch limit.

These figures were based upon the idea that we should make the average size of the total catch in the coming season about 4,000 blue whale units, and in this sense we have something in common with the Russian proposals, but our idea is to reduce the total catch limit gradually in the three years, and we believe that this kind of reduction might be more reasonable in view of the present whale stocks, and to the benefit of the whaling industry.

Then I would like to express several views in connection with whaling in the Antarctic. In order to secure the above-mentioned reduction, it is necessary, we believe, to implement fully from the coming season the International Observer Scheme which has already been agreed upon among the countries concerned, but which has not yet been started. We would like to say that we, the Japanese delegation, are ready to promise to implement this system completely and fully in the coming season. In this connection, we would like to request the co-operation on this matter by the Russian delegation, because if one nation does not participate in this Scheme, the total Scheme will be of no value.

With regard to the distribution of the total catch, we believe it is important to do this in accordance with the quota agreement which is now in force. As the total catch limit is reduced it is quite natural that the number of expeditions will be reduced automatically from an economic point of view. There may also be a difference in the efficiency of the expeditions in the Antarctic. There is, therefore, no need to reduce the expeditions in accordance with the international agreement, because this problem of how far to reduce the expeditions is purely a matter for each country to decide freely and independently.

I should like to repeat that there are many differences between the economic structures of different countries. There is, therefore, no need to decide upon the reduction of expeditions in accordance with an international agreement; it is purely a matter for each country to decide freely. That does not mean that Japanese expeditions are not going to be reduced in the coming season. Of course, as the total catch limit is reduced the numbers of expeditions will naturally be reduced so far as Japan is concerned also.

As to the problem of limiting the catch by species, it is needless to say that such a system may be desirable from a purely scientific point of view. However, it is not practicable and would be very hard to accept. We believe that this opinion is shared by the other two pelagic whaling countries.

I should like to call the attention of the member countries on this occasion to something I have said before. The reduction of the total catch limit in future seasons could involve great difficulty and sacrifice on the part of the Japanese industry. In this connexion I should like to ask for your understanding and sympathy with regard to this problem. In Japan at the moment we have three companies engaged in Antarctic pelagic whaling. This industry is a large one and has become the most important and significant domestic industry in manufacturing and exporting whale oil, as well as in supplying protein resources to the nation.

Japan is at a disadvantage because of the fact that its whaling industry started very late as compared with those of other nations. The Japanese expeditions came into the arena rather late and, because of this, the Japanese whaling industry has not yet completed the redemption of the huge investment involved. The redemption figure still outstanding amounts to about fifteen million dollars. Moreover, this industry provides employment for a great number of people, over 50,000. Therefore, although it may be easy for other nations which have already repaid their investments to stop whaling immediately, it is very difficult for the Japanese industry to reduce whaling drastically or to stop it. Very serious problems such as bankruptcy and unemployment might result.

Bearing these difficulties in mind, the Japanese Government has decided, in view of the present whale stocks, to enforce this great sacrifice on the part of the Japanese industry so that we can co-operate with other nations to achieve the maintenance and the recovery of the whale stocks. In view of all I have said I should like to ask other member countries for their understanding of the present situation of the Japanese industry, which is very peculiar, and to show a co-operative attitude in this regard. As I have said, the Japanese whaling industry faces great difficulties, but in spite of this we have decided to reduce drastically the quota of the total catch. I should like to ask all of you to understand the special circumstances under which the Japanese industry now exists, and the firm determination of the Japanese Government in spite of these difficulties which face the industry to reduce the quota to the extent which I have just indicated. I should like to ask you to consider and to support the proposals which I have just made for the total catch limit.

Thank you very much indeed for your kind attention.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you very much, Mr. Matsuoka, for your clear and definite expression of the views of your delegation.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The United States is very pleased to note that there seems to be general agreement that the whale resources in the Antarctic are being over fished, and that something must be done about it. Our position is very clear; we recognise this fact and it is our intention to try to arrive at an agreement which will halt the over fishing and, if possible, begin to restore the stocks to a higher level of productivity.

Last year, as you will remember, we made a proposal at the annual meeting in Sandefjord to the effect that a three-year arrangement might be possible based on a quota in the first year -- that is the whaling season just past -- of 4000 blue whale units, to be followed by quotas in the next two years of 3000 and 2000 blue whale units respectively.

/It was our understanding

It was our understanding at that time that the scientific analysis of the data collected by the Bureau indicated that this would halt over-fishing of whale stocks in the Antarctic and would possibly begin to restore the stocks. We would like to point out that one of those three years has passed and the fishery was not regulated, and the catch was larger than 4,000 BWU. Therefore, if we were to adopt the same position again this year we would have to ask for a somewhat more rapid reduction of the quota.

We are extremely interested, however, in reaching agreement with all member nations this year. therefore we are modifying our proposal somewhat and are proposing a two-year arrangement. Recognising that one of the three years proposed last year has already passed, we suggest that a quota of 3,000 BWU for the coming season be followed by a quota of 2,000 BWU for the succeeding season.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. McHugh. Are there any other views?

Mr. DENISENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Responding to the statement made by the Japanese delegation with regard to control, I should like to state that the U.S.S.R. is ready to do everything possible to take all measures with regard to the arrangement of an observation scheme for whaling in the Antarctic for the forthcoming season and to do that on the basis of principles stipulated in the Agreement on the International Observation Scheme of 1963.

We are much disappointed by the statement made by the Japanese delegation, that the question of the reduction of total number of expeditions is an internal question for each country to decide. Our delegation cannot agree with such a statement, because a whaling effort depends on the number of whaling expeditions. The Soviet delegation would like to stress once again that the reduction of the total number of whaling expeditions is of vital importance with regard to the preservation of whale stocks, because in that way we will be able to obtain an automatic reduction of total effort and the number of possible infringements. We think that the report which we heard yesterday means the same thing - it calls for the reduction of total effort and the reduction of expeditions.

It was Japan which agreed, according to the Agreement of 1962, not to increase further the number of expeditions, and we would like to ask why the Japanese delegation thinks that such a measure as a reduction of the total number of expeditions is just not acceptable to it.

We hope that the Japanese delegation will reverse its position and agree to co-operate with the Commission and the other delegations on this question.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you very much, Mr. Denisenko. Are there any other views on the point under discussion?

Mr. HOLLER (Norway) (Interpretation): I should like to make some comments on the viewpoints which have now been presented.

With regard to the number of expeditions, the situation is as follows: It is clear that the different nations use different methods when they calculate future operations. Norway had four expeditions last seasons and so had the Soviet Union; but Norway had 36 catches while the Soviet Union had 65. This means that the total capacity is dependent upon the number of expeditions and the number of factory ships and also on catches.

I cannot see any reason for introducing a system of double restrictions - limitations - as proposed by the Soviet Union.

If we look at it from the point of view of the International Whaling Convention the situation is as follows: It must be sufficient for the Commission to have two criteria - a quota limiting the number of blue whale units and a system of international observation ensuring that these restrictions are effective. If this is adhered to, the principles and intentions of the Convention are also adhered to. It must be for the individual countries to decide to what extent they will limit the number of factory ships according to the Convention. The point is that the different countries have different backgrounds and we see no reason to take these criteria into the Convention. According to the Convention it is the same whether you use two factory ships and 50 catches or four factory ships and 25 catches (just to give an example).

I should like to say that we understand very well the difficulties of the Japanese delegation in this situation and I should like to take the opportunity to say that the Japanese proposal, which involves a drastic reduction compared with previous years, in my view makes an important contribution to the aim and objectives of this meeting.

We, for our part, have distributed a proposal which we made yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Holler. Are there any other views?

Mr. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): Referring to the question raised by the Russian delegation, on the expeditions, I should like to repeat and make our position clear, as follows:

/We are not saying

We are not saying that the Japanese Government will not reduce its expeditions in the coming season, but we believe that we must reduce the expeditions in the coming season freely and we must decide freely. As I said before, in view of the difference in the economic structure and also the expense of the expeditions as well as the different backgrounds of each nation, I believe it is important that each nation should decide freely in what way and how far to reduce expeditions in the Antarctic in the coming season. Therefore this is not a subject to be discussed by international agreement or something like that, this should be decided freely by each nation with autonomy as to how far and in what way to reduce expeditions.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Who would like to speak next? I understand that this exchange of opinion has been enough to enable us to proceed to the next step in our work unless there are any objections. (Agreed).

Before taking our Secretary's proposal to break for coffee, let me proceed to the following proposal: there seems to be a desire to begin the work of our Committees with the Plenary Session as a whole, the Commission as a whole. There will be a combined session of the Committee of Four and the Committee of Six, in order to link the work of both the Committees. Are there any objections to this proposal? If there are no objections then that is agreed. (Agreed).

The next announcement is that the sessions of the Committee of Six will be open for all those who wish to participate, in other words every delegation or Commissioner who wishes may participate in the work of the Committee of Six, even if they are not members of the Committee. We will now break for coffee.

I am sorry, Gentlemen, there has been a misinterpretation, I meant that the meeting of the Committee of Six will be open, and members of the Commission may attend but they may not participate unless they are members of the Committee of Six.

(The Meeting adjourned at 11.50 a.m.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

SPECIAL MEETING

Session of Wednesday, 5th May, 1965.

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

The CHAIRMAN: (Interpretation): Gentlemen, we will now proceed with our work, I declare the Plenary Session open. Unfortunately, the Committee of Six have not yet finished their work; I have been studying the problem as to whether to delay our Plenary Session, or to open this Session to discuss points 5, 6 and 7 of the Agenda, and allow the Committee of Six to meet again to finish their work so that we can meet in plenary tomorrow.

As regards the work of the Committee of Six, I can now tell you that the results of that work are quite hopeful, so I propose that we should work in Plenary Session now, and consider items 5, 6 and 7 of the Agenda. Have you any objections to this proposal? There are no objections, so this is adopted, and as regards the time of tomorrow's Plenary Session, we will decide this question later.

Now we come to point 5 of the Agenda, the financing of the Special Meeting. It is necessary for the Commission to consider at this Special Meeting the financial problems arising from this Meeting, and the likely deficit in the ordinary budget. This question can be considered at the Seventeenth ordinary Meeting; bearing in mind, however, that the holding of the Special Meeting falls in the current financial year ending 31st May, and that the Commission accounts have to be drawn up as of that date, it would be helpful if the Commissioners could now give a decision on two points. Firstly, the Special Investigation for 1964/1965 has not been carried out, and the contribution of £850 needed to be diverted from the ordinary budget to the extraordinary budget could be retained in the ordinary budget in order to relieve the deficit. The problem before us is, can we leave this sum of £850 in the extraordinary budget, or can we transfer it from the extraordinary budget to the ordinary budget. This is the first question. Secondly, if the Commissioners agree to a contribution being made from the extraordinary budget to the ordinary budget towards the cost of the Special Meeting, then the Antarctic pelagic whaling countries who contributed to the funds in the extraordinary budget should be asked whether they have any objection to the use of the funds for the Special Meeting.

I would like to know the opinions of the Commissioners, and also the opinions of the governments of Japan, the Netherlands, Norway and the United Kingdom about this problem. The U.S.S.R. Government have already stated that they have no such objections. You have at your disposal the note by the Secretary on this point.

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I can say on behalf of the United Kingdom that we have no objection to the funds being diverted as was suggested, for the purpose of meeting the costs of this Special Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: So the United Kingdom agrees to this proposal.

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway): Norway agrees to this proposal.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Japan also agrees.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Japan agrees too, what about the Netherlands?

Professor Dr. E.J. SLIJPER (Netherlands): Because the Commissioner is not here, I cannot speak for the Netherlands Government, I can make a telephone call to him tomorrow, and tell you his decision tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So unfortunately we may not have the opinion of the Netherlands just at the moment.

Professor Dr. E.J. SLIJPER (Netherlands): Not just at the moment, but I expect they will agree.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So we shall hear the final opinion of the Netherlands tomorrow, but we hope that in a preliminary way we have decided this problem favourably. I would ask Mr. Wimpenny, our Secretary, whether he is satisfied with that decision?

The SECRETARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very. I would add, however, that there is still outstanding the permission that is being sought to retain the £850, which the Commission authorised some two years ago to be transferred to the extraordinary budget in order to carry out the special scientific investigations. I think we have heard our Chairman say that this year there was no expenditure on the special scientific investigations, and there is that permission to be obtained from the Commissioners.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I would move that we authorise the Secretary to retrieve the £850 which we authorised him to transfer from the ordinary to the extraordinary budget.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Sprules, Mr. Fujita of Japan seconds this proposal. If there is no other proposal, it is agreed. (Agreed).

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, there is one other point in my Memorandum which perhaps might be borne in mind, it will be seen from my estimate of the position at 31st May this year that I am expecting a deficit in the ordinary budget of somewhere about £1,500 or £1,600, and this shows that we are running, as an organisation, with very little margin financially. The deficit shown in the ordinary budget, of course, does not include the unfortunate slow payment of some of the contributions; if all of the contributions had been paid up to date, this deficit would not have occurred. But in spite of very strenuous efforts to obtain these late payments, to bring them up to date, the Commission has never been able to take this action successfully, and I think that this might be a suggestion for the Seventeenth Meeting, when it takes place, to look at the financial position again with a view to a possible increase of the annual contributions made by the contracting governments.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Secretary, so the proposal has been put forward by the Secretary, who will second it?

Mr. R.A. SHERWIN (Australia): I wonder, I would be very pleased to second this proposal of the Secretary's that the matter should be considered at the Plenary Session of the Seventeenth Meeting. But I wonder whether in the meantime a further approach to the countries concerned may be justified, in the hope that some of the arrears may not be outstanding at the time of the Seventeenth Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I would like to support the additional proposal put forward by Mr. Sherwin that we should apply to the governments concerned to pay their contributions, and if possible before the Seventeenth Meeting. Are there any further proposals? Then we will consider this problem agreed, and point 5 of the Agenda is closed. We shall consider the question of the deficit at our statutory meeting.

We now come to point 6 on the Agenda, press release. Do the Commissioners wish to have a press release at the end of the Meeting? Perhaps we should transfer this question to tomorrow's Plenary Session after considering point 4 of the Agenda. As far as I, as Chairman, am concerned, I think that in any case we should have something to give to the press, bearing in mind especially that we are sure of favourable results of our Special Meeting. I will now ask for your opinions on this, Gentlemen.

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway): Mr. Chairman, I agree with your proposal, I think it would be useful to have a press release, and I think it would also be preferable if somebody could start to make a draft, based on the assumption that there will be some agreement in the Committee of Six. We have to have a draft before the Meeting tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I am in full agreement with your proposal, and I just think that it is a little early to draft the press release now. Therefore, according to our custom, let me propose that we invite the Secretary to make a draft statement, with my help as Chairman. Do you agree to this proposal, Mr. Holler?

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway): Yes, of course.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you. Who will second this proposal?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I second this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Marco of Argentina, and Mr. Denisenko of the U.S.S.R. also second. As I understand it, there are no other proposals, so this is agreed and we will now invite the Secretary, Mr. Wimpenny, to draft the press release. (Agreed). We have now finished with point 6 on the Agenda.

Then we have reached point 7 of the Agenda, any other business. There is an invitation from F.A.O. for our Commission to send an observer to the Forty-Fourth Session of the F.A.O. Council which will open in Rome on 21st June, 1965. This is the week immediately preceding the Commission's Seventeenth Meeting, and it may not therefore be convenient for the Commissioners to attend the F.A.O. meeting. I would like to inquire whether any Commissioner does in fact intend to go to the F.A.O. Council Meeting on his own behalf, and if so whether he would be willing to act also then as the Commission's observer. May I conclude that nobody has any intention of going to that F.A.O. Council Meeting? Perhaps somebody has some kind of proposal on this point. If not, then as usual when I am in a difficult position I ask Mr. Wimpenny, our Secretary to help me, and I will now apply for his help.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, this is becoming almost an annual ritual, this attempt to post me to Rome, but I am afraid that on this occasion I shall be on duty in connection with the Commission of which you are Chairman, the time of the meeting coincides almost to a day with the beginning of the Scientific Meeting in June, in London, so I am afraid I shall not be able to help in this connection.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Wimpenny, has anybody any other ideas? So taking into account the very serious

problems that will come before our Seventeenth Meeting, unfortunately we shall probably not be able to send an observer to that Forty-Fourth F.A.O. Council Meeting. Can I consider that agreed, if there are no other opinions? Who will second this proposal not to send an observer from our Commission to that F.A.O. Meeting?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, do I understand correctly that the Commission has received an invitation from F.A.O.?

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Yes, that is right.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Then I agree that the Secretary should simply acknowledge this very kind invitation and indicate that it will not be possible for any representative of our Commission to attend, so I would second your proposal, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway): I will also second it.

The CHAIRMAN:(Interpretation): There is no other proposal, so this is agreed. (Agreed) We will then ask Mr. Wimpenny to send F.A.O. our official message on this point. That has dealt with this item on the Agenda, but there is one more point under item 7.

At the request of Mr. Pike, the Chairman of the Working Group on the North Pacific Whale Stocks, the report of the Group's recent meeting in Seattle has been circulated at this meeting of the Commission as document IWC/SM/8. This report contains a recommendation that the Commissioners of the countries concerned, Canada, Japan, the Soviet Union and the United States of America should find the opportunity during this Special Meeting to discuss the North Pacific whale stock position. It is up to the Commission to decide whether any discussion on the North Pacific whale stock should take place during this meeting, or should be deferred until the Seventeenth Meeting in June. There is, of course, a provision on the Agenda for the June meeting for discussion of the Working Group's report and for protective measures for the North Pacific stocks. If it is decided to discuss the matter, at this meeting, I will probably suggest its introduction under item 7. This problem is included in the preliminary agenda of our statutory meeting under point 12, North Pacific whale stocks, which includes the report of the Working Group on this problem, and I should like to propose that we should discuss this question on the whole at our forthcoming meeting. But if the Commissioners of the four countries concerned are willing to consider this problem during this Special Meeting, I am ready to support this proposal.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, the United States had not come to this meeting expecting to discuss this matter, and therefore we have not really studied the report of the North Pacific Group. However, we might have an opportunity to study this report later on this afternoon, and perhaps this evening, and we would have no objection to discussing it in a preliminary way at the Plenary Meeting tomorrow if there is time.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): With reference to this matter, at the time of the Seattle conference some countries did not present the data, and we would like to know if all the countries have already presented the necessary data in order to deal with this matter.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I am rather inclined to agree with Mr. Fujita's statement. The North Pacific whaling countries will be in a much better position to discuss proposals for the North Pacific at a little later date, provided that the Committee itself receives all the basic data required to analyse the condition of the stocks. I have heard informally that this data will be made available within the next perhaps week or two, to the Committee, and if this is so, I should think that our discussions would be best carried on at some convenient time during the June sessions.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): The meaning of our question was whether all the countries have already presented their data or not. According to Dr. Sprules' statement, the data will be available after one or two weeks, but I would like to know whether the data has already been presented or not.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Who can answer this question?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): I should like to say that on the Committee, at the time of the Seattle meeting, the U.S.S.R. had not presented the data, therefore I would like to know whether the U.S.S.R. has already presented the data or not.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): This is a question for the U.S.S.R. delegation, Mr. Denisenko.

Mr. I.F. DENISENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen, within the next ten days we will arrange to send all the rest of the data for the last three years.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): As the data has not been fully presented yet, it is therefore rather early to discuss this matter at this meeting. As Dr. Sprules stated previously, my Government is considering collecting the full data and after that we will discuss this matter in the next meeting, after careful consideration by scientists.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Well, I now have a question for Dr. McHugh. Are you ready to withdraw your proposal to discuss or consider this problem in the Plenary Session at this Special Meeting, and to transfer this discussion to our forthcoming meeting?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Yes, we agree.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I would like to clarify some points on the presentation of data. As far as I know, the necessary material and the necessary data of the U.S.S.R. was presented in Seattle, excluding the three past years. This material for the past three years is under preparation, and I am sure that it will very soon be put before the members of the Working Group. Now I think we can agree to the proposal put forward by Dr. Sprules to discuss all these problems later in June, and we can ask the Commissioners from the United States, Japan, Canada and the U.S.S.R. to meet before or during the Seventeenth Meeting of our Commission. Is everybody in favour? (Agreed). We have already discussed and finished our talks on item 7 of the Agenda, there is now one more statement by Mr. Wimpenny.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to disappoint you, but during the course of this Plenary I received an urgent telephone message from the University Federation for the Welfare of Animals asking if we will be good enough to allow them to send an observer. They appear to have been advised of this meeting a little late, but I think we should consider this request favourably, because some years ago when we were carrying out an investigation into the problem of cruelty in the capture of whales, we had a sub-committee, and this particular body was kind enough to send their top physiologist to sit on the committee. I think some Commissioners may remember that the proceedings of the committee were quite efficient and satisfactory, in that they produced a straight answer to the problem that we put before them. I would think, Mr. Chairman, that the Commissioners might consider this request favourably; at any rate, that is my recommendation, and feeling about it.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): What are the opinions on this proposal? Dr. Sprules has no objections and he supports this proposal.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I will second Dr. Sprules' proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any other opinions? If not then this proposal is agreed. (Agreed). Are there any other questions for the Commissioners, Mr. Wimpenny?

The SECRETARY: No, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if, returning very briefly to this North Pacific problem, we could ask the Secretary, if, in drafting the Agenda, he could so word the item with regard to North Pacific investigations that action could be taken by this Commission if some recommendations for regulation could be agreed to at the coming session.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, it is now too late to include in the Agenda for the Seventeenth Meeting any further provisions than are already contained in it. But I think that it may be that Dr. Sprules has not seen a copy of the provisional Agenda, as it does include an item on this specific question of any action in the Pacific necessary as a result of the investigations by the North Pacific Group.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Dr. Sprules, are you satisfied with Mr. Wimpenny's explanation?

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

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Then the subject is exhausted. Are there any other questions or problems? There are no other questions, so we may close our Plenary Session at this stage, and recommend that the Committee of Six proceed with their work. I would like to put a question to Mr. Herrington, the Chairman of the Committee of Six. How much time is necessary for the Committee to finish their work?

Mr. W.C. HERRINGTON (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the Committee of Six meet in this room fifteen minutes after the adjournment of the Plenary Session. I would also request that the Committee of Four meet with us. As to how long it will take to complete our work, I hope it will be finished this afternoon, but I could not give you the time, it may be six o'clock, eight o'clock, or ten o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Herrington. Gentlemen, are there any objections to arranging our next Plenary Session for tomorrow at 11 a.m.?

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan)(Interpretation): The Japanese delegation proposes to support the suggestion made by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you. If there are no other proposals or suggestions, we will adjourn now until tomorrow at 11 a.m. for our closing Plenary Session.

(The Meeting adjourned at 3.30 p.m.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

SPECIAL MEETING

Session of Thursday, 6th May, 1965.

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

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, I declare the plenary session open.

We are now approaching the end of our work, but the main problem has not yet been resolved. As you will remember, we established two committees, a Committee of Four and a Committee of Six, and they have already finished their work. I should like to give the floor now to the chairmen of those committees so that they can put the results of their work before the plenary session. Is there any objection to that proposal? If not, I think it would be better to listen first to the report of the Committee of Four and then to the report of the Committee of Six.

If there are no objections to this procedure I will give the floor to the chairman of the Committee of Four, Dr. Chapman.

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (U.S.A.): The Committee of Four has prepared a report which you have had in document IWC/SM/13. This summarises the evaluation which we made of the several proposals that were presented at the earlier plenary sessions. We were asked for some additional explanations in connexion with this report, and they have been given in an additional document of explanation which has now been circulated as IWS/SM/13 addendum 2.

I can only summarise the results that are expressed in those tables. Of the four proposals that we considered -- the Japanese proposal, the Norwegian proposal, the U.S.S.R. proposal with regard to 50 per cent effort, and the U.S. proposal with an additional year -- the second and fourth proposals bring the catch in blue whale units below the sustainable level by the end of the third season, though some readjustment would be necessary in the sei:fin ratio. The second, third and fourth proposals would make the catch of fins below the sustainable catch by the end of the third year. The first proposal would be unsatisfactory for both of these species in terms of bringing the catch below the level of sustainable catch. Therefore, if the first proposal were adopted, and if the catch quotas were to be brought below the level of sustainable catch after 1967/1968, some further substantial reductions would have to be made.

We have also answered some questions that were raised with regard to the differences in times of recovery to the level of maximum sustainable yield under the assumption that after 1967/1968 catches would be zero.

Our comments in respect to these questions are in the last paragraph on page 4 of this addendum 2. I shall be glad to answer any questions if anyone has a further point on this report.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Chapman. Are there any questions on this report? If my understanding is correct there are no questions to Dr. Chapman on his report.

We now have to decide whether to discuss the report of the Committee of Four or to go on to the report of the Committee of Six. What are your proposals, Gentlemen?

Mr. P. GRIBELIN (France): I think we should go on to consider the report by the chairman of the Committee of Six.

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

If there are no objections to this proposal, I will give the floor to Mr. Herrington.

Mr. W.C. HERRINGTON (U.S.A.): I must, first of all, apologise for the sketchy nature of my report. The Committee of Six has worked hard and long, and completed its final meeting just a few minutes ago. We had five meetings from Tuesday through this morning at which we considered the four proposals submitted to the Committee by the plenary session. They include the proposal by the U.S.S.R., the proposal by Norway, the proposal by Japan and the proposal by the United States.

We also considered the related problems that had been mentioned in the plenary sessions. These dealt with the question of having quotas by species, the question of country quotas, and the implementation of the observer scheme.

We met with the Committee of Four to receive their report, particularly with respect to the effect of the several proposals on the stocks of fin and sei whales. The members of the Committee of Four also sat with us during further meetings so that they could be available to answer questions which came up in the course of our discussions.

As instructed, the Committee considered both the biological problems, conservation problems, and economic problems that would develop from the application of quotas at different levels.

After rather extended discussion of the four proposals two new proposals were submitted, one by the Soviet Union and one by the United States, in an effort to find some common ground upon which all could agree. Unfortunately, and it is a sad conclusion, we were not able to find any proposal which could be supported by all. There is no question that all members gave their most sincere efforts to find such a solution, but for reasons which I am sure were beyond their individual control it was not possible to come to complete agreement.

Since we could not accomplish our primary job of finding an area of agreement, we then considered the several proposals and voted upon them in order that we might be able to report to you whether any of these had majority support and to what extent this support could be mustered. Of the six proposals, four received a majority vote. I will outline the substance of each proposal and then give you the vote on those which received majority support.

You will recall the Soviet proposal provided in two parts, firstly that the total quota for the next season would be 4,000 blue whale units, with no increase during the following two years. The second part of the Soviet proposal related to the reduction in the number of expeditions by 50 per cent. These were considered separately.

The second proposal was by Norway, it was that during the first season the quota be 4,000 blue whale units, during the second season 3,000, and during the third season 2,000.

The third proposal was by Japan that during the first season the quota would be 4,500 blue whale units, during the second season 4,000, and during the third season 3,500 units.

The fourth proposal by the United States was that during the first season, the blue whale unit quota should be 3,000, and during the second season 2,000. The compromise proposal submitted during the course of the discussions in Committee Six, I believe has been circulated to you.

The fifth one was proposed by the U.S.S.R., and the sixth one by the United States, and since you have copies before you I will not attempt to describe them.

The proposal which received a majority vote, that by Norway, received four in favour and two against. That by the United States received three in favour, two against and one abstention. Then, considering the two attempts to find compromises, the proposal by the Soviet Union received two in favour, one against and three abstentions. The final proposal by the United States received five in favour and one against.

I will not attempt to go into the arguments pro and con, or the reasons why certain countries could or could not support the different proposals, I think that this must be up to the individual countries to do, and in any event, I have not had enough time, following our meeting, to do an adequate job of trying to summarise the pros and cons. We then considered these related problems: first, the question of quotas by species. In view of the additional complications that this gave, while we were trying to find an answer to our basic problem of a global quota, the Committee did not pursue the question further of quotas by species. I expect this can be taken up at some future time when we have made more progress in the final solution for the basic problem. The question of country quotas was discussed briefly, we were informed that the three pelagic whaling countries planned to take this up amongst themselves at a later date. The question of the Observer Scheme was discussed briefly, and again we were informed that the three pelagic whaling countries expected to consider this among them at a later date. In connection with this, Japan informed us that she is prepared to meet with the other pelagic whaling countries before the June meeting of the Commission, provided global quotas for the next three years are agreed to at this meeting.

Mr. Chairman, I think that very briefly covers the results of some very extended discussions, and some very sincere attempts to find a solution to our problem, and I do not think it would be useful if I attempted to go into more detail on this. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Herrington. Are there any questions for Mr. Herrington? I understand that there are none on the report, and everything is clear to all the participants of our Special Meeting. Does anybody wish to comment on the report?

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some comments on the report, but I would not wish to do so

before any members of the Six had added their comments, if they wish to do so, to those of the Chairman. I notice that the Japanese delegate held up his card at the same time, and if you think it desirable that he should speak first, I would be quite agreeable to that.

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (interpretation): In connection with the report made by the Chairman of the Six, Mr. Herrington, I would like to have an opportunity to clarify the position of Japan. However, I entirely leave the timing of my presentation on the Japanese view to the decision of the Chairman. The reason why I asked the Chairman to decide when I should make my clarification of our position, is that the timing of this presentation might be better perhaps after some decision has been made on the report of the Six, or perhaps it might be better before any decision is made on the report of the Six. Because of this, I entirely leave it to the discretion of the Chairman when I speak, the timing is entirely a matter of procedure, therefore I would ask the Chairman to suggest when I should make my comments.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Matsuoka, it is a difficult question for me as Chairman, it depends on your wish. If you wish to make a statement before the decision, it is all right. If you want to make a statement after the decision, it is up to you.

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): Then I will take this opportunity of clarifying the position of Japan once again on various problems.

The delegation of Japan put forward our own proposal to the Plenary Session, but that proposal did not obtain acceptance in the Committee of Six. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity of clarifying our position once again, for the better understanding of the members of the Commission. I am convinced that it has already become clear to every member of the Commission that our delegation came to this Special Meeting with a very firm determination to take the best possible measures for the restoration of whale stocks in the Antarctic, including a drastic reduction in the size of our whaling industry. With this firm determination, we have presented a proposal to carry out a drastic reduction of the total catch limit from 8,000 blue whale units in last season, to 4,500 blue whale units in the coming 1965/1966 season, with further reductions for the following two seasons, namely 4,000 blue whale units in the 1966/1967 season, and 3,500 blue whale units in the 1967/1968 season. If our proposal is adopted we on the Japanese side will be forced to reduce our present seven expeditions by two or three for the coming 1965/1966 season, and a further reduction of expeditions is envisaged during the course of the following two seasons. Thus, we are prepared to put up with possible unfavourable effects on our whaling industry, for example the creation of unemployment of skilled workers who have been specially trained for whaling, and a considerable loss in our huge investment.

Our proposal also demands sacrifices on the part of our national economy, for example a decrease in the export of whale oil, and a decrease in the production of whale meat, which has been such an important part of the food supply of the Japanese people. Thus, the Japanese proposal can be said to contain the maximum concessions which the Japanese government is able to make. Further, I think it is clear to every member in this Commission that as regards the problem of protection of whales in the Antarctic, our proposal expresses a great step forward which, I think, has been well understood by our friends in this room. Our proposal contains no possible means by which the whale stocks could be totally exterminated; on the contrary, our proposal gives a good chance of recovery for the whale stocks to full strength in the future. I repeat that it is entirely possible, even under Japan's proposal, that the whale stocks can reach their optimum level in the future.

This being so, I am not denying that under our proposal the tempo may be slightly slower for attaining the optimum level, but the scientists have said that the difference in the time lag is very small. Yesterday morning, at the Committee of Six, I raised several questions to the scientists who are members of the Committee of Four, concerning their calculations on the analysis of whale stocks so that I can fully accept the results of their calculations, but on some very important items the reply of the scientists did not give me full satisfaction. Because of the reasons which I have mentioned, I feel deeply that I regret that our proposal could not get enough support in the Committee of Six, but I would take this opportunity of repeating again that the government of Japan has the firm determination to exert further efforts for the protection and recovery of whale stocks in the future. Thank you very much.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to Mr. Matsuoka's statement, and I am left with the feeling that there may have been something inherent in the Japanese proposal which was not understood at least by the Canadian delegation during the period of our deliberations. Because of Mr. Matsuoka's reference to the time of the eventual recovery of the whale stocks to a level of optimum yield under the various regulatory regimes which were proposed, I am wondering, and in fact I would like to ask the Japanese delegation, if, when they proposed the formula which was considered at this meeting, they were assuming that there would be a period after 1967/1968, when there would be no pelagic whaling in the Antarctic. Could I put this question to the Japanese delegation, please?

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan)(Interpretation): I fully understand the points in the question raised by Dr. Sprules, and the difference of the time lag to reach the optimum level calculated by the scientists is based on the full stop of whaling after four years. Our present proposal concedes that we are prepared to make a great reduction in the size of the whaling industry within the coming three-year period, but we are prepared to continue to reduce the size of the industry, and the same sort of trends will be continued in the future, after three years.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Matsuoka, be so kind as to answer my question: I would like to know if I understood correctly from the interpretation that you are prepared to reduce the number of expeditions down to two or three?

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan)(Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, for the government of Japan, where the economy is based on free enterprise, the government is not in a position to enforce the reduction of expeditions, but the reduction of the total catch limit will naturally induce the reduction of expeditions.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Matsuoka. Are there any other Commissioners who wish to speak to this point? If my understanding is right, there is nobody who wishes to speak on this subject, so I will give the floor to Mr. Tame, of the United Kingdom.

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I would like first, I think, to ask a question of the Japanese delegation; as I understood it correctly, they are saying that their proposal does not end at three years, but they are contemplating that there would be further reductions in the quota after three years. I think it would be interesting to know whether the Japanese delegation can now say that it would be their intention in fact that the quota should be reduced below the sustainable yield. It seems to me that the essential thing here is that at some stage the quota should be reduced below the

sustainable yield, otherwise we are continually chasing the stocks of whales down without ever giving them a chance to recover. Before I make any further extended statement, Mr. Chairman, could I ask this question?

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, as to the question raised by the British Commissioner, I am prepared to answer that the government of Japan will continue to make efforts to reduce the total catch limits with consideration of the necessity for the protection of whale stocks, as well as of the necessity for the whaling industry, and these efforts will be continued, to find a proper balance between the two needs. The policy will be conducted in the direction which the British Commissioner has just mentioned.

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I would now like to make some comments on the reports of the Committee of Four and the Committee of Six. I think I ought to start by saying that I am sure the Commission are extremely indebted to these two Committees and to their Chairmen, for the hard and patient work that they have devoted to their problems over the last two days. Mr. Herrington's very modest report - modest, I mean, in length - was, I am sure, in inverse proportion to the time, trouble and patience that he and the members of the Committee of Six have spent on the examination of these proposals. It is, of course, disappointing that the Committee of Six has not been able to prepare an agreed report, but I think it is extremely useful to have had this discussion of these four or more proposals. I think the United Kingdom's general position was made clear by my Minister when he opened this conference, we feel that this is perhaps the last opportunity for the Commission to grapple successfully with the question of the whale stocks in the Antarctic, and we feel that there must be no further delay in adopting definite proposals which will bring the total quota down below the sustainable yields, according to the best scientific evidence that we can get.

The United Kingdom appreciates that this does entail a sacrifice by the pelagic whaling countries, and we are very conscious that the offers which have been made by the different countries represent sacrifices and have economic consequences which are bound to be unpleasant. The alternative, however, is not that there shall be no sacrifices, but that sooner or later the sacrifices will come, willy-nilly. The economic disadvantages which have been referred to are really unavoidable unless courageous steps are taken to reduce the total quota below the sustainable yield.

The United Kingdom had no preconceived ideas about the best way of securing this result, we were quite ready to accept the thought that there should be no immediate reduction of the magnitude necessary to achieve the whole result in one year, and we were very interested and very willing to go along with the various ideas which have been put forward for phasing the necessary reduction in the quotas. When we look at the report of the Committee of scientists, however, and I am looking now at paragraph 15 of that report, it appears that only two of the first four proposals that that Committee was asked to comment on achieve the result which I said the United Kingdom regarded as desirable. The second proposal was the Norwegian proposal that the quotas should be 4,000, 3,000 and 2,000 over the next three years, and the fourth proposal was the United States proposal that they should be 3,000, 2,000 and 2,000 over those three years.

I think that I would just like to make a brief comment on the Soviet suggestion that effort might be cut by 50 per cent, although this is not by itself sufficient to secure the desired result, I think it is, if I may say so, an interesting suggestion in principle. It has certain distinct economic advantages. There are economic

advantages about reducing the effort rather than applying the reduction only to the catch, but it seems that at any rate the practical difficulties prevent the immediate adoption of this, I do not know whether it is a thought which might be worthy of further study.

However, on the basis of the scientists' report, Mr. Chairman, it seems that these two proposals are ones which the United Kingdom might have voted for, that is the second and the fourth proposals. I understand, however, that the United States proposal has been amended, or rather that a further proposal has been put forward by the United States, in an attempt to secure agreement, and we find this a particularly interesting proposal. The proposal is, as I understand it, that there should be a quota of 4,000 blue whale units for the Antarctic season of 1965/1966, and that all members of the Commission should agree to recommend to their governments that they support further reductions for the 1966/1967 and 1967/1968 seasons which will assure that the quota for the 1967/1968 season will be less than the combined sustainable yields of the fin and sei stocks. Without going too closely into the actual wording of this at the moment, this is an idea which we in the United Kingdom would find acceptable in that it does accept, as the objective for three years, the reduction of the catch below the sustainable catch.

I do not, of course, know precisely why this compromise proposal was made, but I think it is reasonable at any rate that it is not necessary to settle the actual figures at this meeting, as long as we can have the principle clearly established, and this does give the scientists a little more time and the opportunity of using more up-to-date data in reaching the figures for the later years.

So I think I can say, Mr. Chairman, that this too is a proposal which the United Kingdom would be prepared to support.

If I could just finally make a few comments on the suggestion by the Japanese delegation, we appreciate the difficulties of the Japanese in this matter, and we do very much appreciate the determination that has been expressed by them to take the necessary measures for the conservation of stocks. We appreciate too that their proposal involves further reductions after the third year, and the figure for the third year is not the final one. All the same, I am afraid that this proposal does not quite meet with our criterion, because when I asked the Japanese delegation if they accepted the principle that the quota should ultimately go below the sustainable yield, the answer was that commercial considerations as well as conservation considerations would have to be taken into account, and this, therefore, does not, I think, meet the United Kingdom's criterion that there should come out of this meeting a clear determination to get the total catch down below the sustainable yield. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, that is all I wish to say at the moment.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could clarify for Mr. Tame and maybe other delegations the reasons why the United States put forth its compromise proposal. We were aware that the scientific data for sei whales did not allow conclusions quite as precise as the scientific data for fin whales, and I will remind you that the Japanese delegation raised this question also. It appeared to us that the essence of our responsibility here was to arrive at an agreement which would bring the regulations of this Commission into line with the scientific findings. As Mr. Tame has already said, it is not necessary to state precisely what the quotas would be in the second and third years of a three-year scheme, but simply to try and arrive at wording that would represent a definite commitment by all the member countries to indeed bring the regulations into line with the scientific findings. It appeared to us that the wording of our compromise proposal, the one which was given to you this morning,

would achieve these objectives. I might add that by submitting this compromise proposal we were, therefore, in effect dropping our previous proposal which was more stringent, and which recommended a suggested quota of 3,000 blue whale units the first year, and 2,000 blue whale units thereafter.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation) : Who would like to speak next? If there is no one who wishes to speak, let us discuss the question of what kind of decision we are prepared to adopt. In Mr. Herrington's report it was said that six proposals were presented, two of those proposals were in favour, and one proposal was half a majority. All the other proposals had a minority. Shall we take a vote on all the six proposals?

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to inform you that the Norwegian delegation is prepared to withdraw its proposal in favour of the United States proposal which achieved the maximum votes in the Committee of Six.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, I have already said that the United States is willing to withdraw its first proposal, the proposal which suggested a quota of 3,000 blue whale units in the coming season, and a quota of 2,000 blue whale units in the succeeding season. I would just like to reiterate that withdrawal, and point out that we now are presenting the compromise proposal which has already been referred to.

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, the position of the delegation of Japan is that our wish to reach an agreement if possible remains unchanged. We have before us several proposals presented by each delegation, and I wish to have time for further consideration of each proposal. So I would like to have an adjournment of some time.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Before deciding your proposition, I would like to give the floor to Mr. Marco, from Argentine. Mr. Marco withdraws his wish to speak. There was a proposal put forward by Mr. Matsuoka to adjourn for some time.

If I understand it right,^o there is no objection to this proposal, so we shall have a recess for ten minutes.

(The Meeting adjourned for 15 minutes).

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, I have a suggestion, do you agree that we should work without a recess for lunch? I think it should not take too long to finish our work. Are there any objections to finishing our work before the lunch recess? Then we will continue. Who else among the participants in our meeting would like to say something about the procedure for voting?

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan)(Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, before going into procedural matters, I wish to have a last opportunity to make our position clear. After carefully considering the various proposals presented to this meeting, first of all I will now withdraw our proposal, but the withdrawal of our proposal has a condition. We are prepared to withdraw it on condition that the figures mentioned in the United States proposal which was circulated this morning be changed to 4,500 blue whale units in the second line of the paper. That means that if the figures of the total catch limit for the coming season of 1965/1966 be changed from 4,000 blue whale units to 4,500 blue whale units, we are prepared to accept the United States proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, bearing in mind the proposal of Mr. Matsuoka, which is of great importance, I should like to propose myself that we adjourn for lunch so that the Commissioners may have the opportunity of discussing this problem once more.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree that we need lunch, but just before this, in order that we may give the most serious consideration to the new Japanese proposal, I would like to ask if this is beyond any doubt the only change that they could accept in the U.S.A. proposal. The reason why I ask this question is that certainly the Canadian delegation, during lunchtime, with the insertion of 4,500 blue whale units in the second line of this proposal, would have to make some suggestions for different and more precise wording in the last paragraph of the U.S. proposal.

Now, if it is impossible to reach agreement with such a change that would make the last paragraph much more definite and binding, then it would mean that we in the Canadian delegation could eat lunch with a minimum of work, otherwise we will have a great deal of thoughtful consideration to give this. Simply, Mr. Chairman, would the Japanese delegation be receptive after lunch to other small changes in this draft or not?

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): The proposed Japanese amendment to the United States proposal is only a change of figures of the total catch limit for the next season, which is in the second line of the United States proposal, and I cannot accept any other amendment in the phrasing of the United States proposal.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, if the United States were to consider seriously the Japanese proposal, we would also have to have the assurance that the wording would be such that we recognise it as a definite commitment by all member nations to bring the quota into line with the scientific findings in not more than three years. It is possible that the present wording would contain this assurance, but we would have to review it to be certain that this is so.

I wonder if, instead of adjourning for lunch at this time, perhaps we could have another short recess to examine this question, and then see if we could have some kind of arrangement which could be agreeable to all nations. We might save a great deal of time by doing it this way.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): There is a second proposal to recess now for a short time, just for ten or fifteen minutes. Are there any objections to this proposal? If there are no objections, we shall adjourn for ten or fifteen minutes.

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to remind all the members of the Commission that the Japanese amendment to the proposal is the last proposal of Japan, and because of the importance of this, I think we should continue our work after a short recess, in spite of our great hunger.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So we will recess for ten or fifteen minutes.

(The Meeting adjourned for 15 minutes)

(The Meeting reconvened at 1.40 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, we resume after one more adjournment.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Japanese delegate a question, please?

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Please do.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Are we to understand that Japan considers, with this one change from 4,000 to 4,500 blue whale units, that this is recognised, with the present wording, as a positive commitment by Japan to bring the overall quota down below the level of sustainable yield in not more than three years?

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): What I propose is only an amendment in the figures, and we are prepared to accept all the other wording. That is our position.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Thank you, Mr. Matsuoka.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): What is the attitude of the Delegations party to the Committee of Six about our voting procedure? As you know, the Norwegian Delegation and the Delegation of the United States withdrew their first proposals in favour of the final compromise proposal of the Committee of Six.

Mr. E.F. DENISENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen, proceeding from the intention to reach general understanding, with regard to the necessity for efforts to be made at this Special Meeting for some decision to be taken, the Soviet Delegation is ready to withdraw their first proposal in favour of the proposal which has gained a majority in the voting of the Committee of Six. Thank you.

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

The result of our discussions will be as follows; there is only one proposal left, that of the Committee of Six, and this is the final proposal of the United States. The results of the voting in the Committee of Six were as follows; five in favour and one against. The Japanese Delegation has agreed to withdraw their first proposal, bearing in mind that the figure 4,000 in the final U.S.A. proposal will be changed to the figure of 4,500. This is a new proposal which was not considered in the Committee of Six.

I should now like to propose that we vote by turn on the two proposals; first the proposal which is the final version of the compromise proposal of the United States and, secondly, the last proposal of the Japanese Delegation.

Are there any objections to this procedure?

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I propose that we vote first on the Japanese amended proposal; that is the proposal of the United States, only with the figure of 4,500 blue whale units instead of 4,000.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Holler. As the amendment was put forward by the Japanese Delegation, according to our Rules, perhaps it would be better to vote on the proposal of the Japanese Delegation as an amendment to the proposal of the United States' Delegation.

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I think we should proceed with the voting in accordance with the suggestion made by the Norwegian Delegation.

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

Are there any other comments? The proposal of the Norwegian Delegation is seconded by everybody here, as I understand it. Are there any proposals to vote on all the other proposals considered by the Committee of Six? No one insists on this procedure, so it is agreed to vote on the two proposals. Thank you, Gentlemen.

I intend to put to the vote the proposal of the Committee of Six with the amendment of the Japanese Delegation, that means changing the figure of 4,000 to 4,500, and all the rest of the text is unchanged.

Would Mr. Wimpenny be so kind as to call the roll on this amendment?

The SECRETARY: May I, before I call the roll, ask you to reply, "Yes", "No", or "Abstain", as I call out the names of the countries.

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

There are nine who abstain and four who say yes; four in favour and nine abstentions, therefore the Resolution is carried.

The CHAIRMAN: The results of our voting are clear to everybody, I hope.

I now intend to put to the vote the second proposal, that is the proposal of the Committee of Six, which was agreed by the majority of the Committee. Would Mr. Wimpenny be so kind as to call the roll on this proposal?

The SECRETARY: I will now call the roll, according to your instructions.

Argentina	Yes	Netherlands	Yes
Australia	Yes	New Zealand	Yes
Canada	Yes	Norway	No
Denmark	Yes	South Africa	Yes
France	Yes	U.S.S.R.	Yes
Japan	No	U.S.A.	

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): It is not clear to the United States just exactly what we are voting on, and I would like to have a review of this. Are we voting on the United States' proposal, as amended, or are we voting on the United States' proposal in its original form?

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Dr. McHugh, as far as I understood it, you withdrew your first proposal from the United States, and now only one proposal is left from the United States, which was the proposal tabled before the Committee of Six. This is the proposal I propose to vote on, the final version.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Is this as amended or in its present form, as written?

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote the proposal which was agreed in the Committee of Six by five in favour and one against.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I think we need someone much more versed in parliamentary procedure than I am, but we have just voted on a group of words that contain a figure of 4,500. We have canvassed every nation and the position of the nations is clear. We are now being asked to vote on exactly the same group of words with a figure of 4,000 in it, and it strikes me that we cannot possibly submit to our Governments two identical proposals with two different sets of figures. It seems to me that we were following fairly standard procedure when we voted on an amendment, and the amendment, I take it, has been adopted in that there were no votes against and there were four votes for. So I think that automatically the United States' proposal is no longer a matter for the consideration of this meeting. But I should certainly like to hear from our United Kingdom colleagues, perhaps, who originated this parliamentary procedure. (Laughter)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Would Mr. Tame of the United Kingdom be so kind as to explain this position?

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): I certainly would not claim to be an expert on parliamentary procedure, but I think the normal practice in the United Kingdom would be exactly as Dr. Sprules has just announced it. In other words, that one would first vote on the amendment and, if that was carried, then one would vote on the original resolution as amended, and if that was then carried the unamended resolution would not, in fact, be put to the vote because the resolution would have been amended. I think, therefore, that Dr. Sprules' interpretation of this is entirely consistent with United Kingdom practice.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, this was exactly the reason for my question. I was not trying to make things difficult. We agree with Dr. Sprules and Mr. Tame in our interpretation of the procedure as it should be. Thank you.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I am not sure if I can clarify this, but I am going to try again.

I think what we just voted on was a change from 4,000 blue whale units to 4,500 blue whale units, on a piece of paper that had been presented originally by the United States. The vote that was just taken indicates the acceptance by four nations, with the other nations abstaining, of this change in the figure in the piece of paper. I think it is necessary for you, Mr. Chairman, to call for one more vote which is on the piece of paper with the agreed amendment now in it.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, is everybody agreed with the explanation which Dr. Sprules has given to the meeting?

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): I think the explanation given by Dr. Sprules is quite right.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): There are no other comments?

If I am right we shall now put to the vote the proposal of the United States with an amendment just adopted. In order not to have any misunderstanding I should like to ask Mr. Wimpenny, our Secretary, to read the proposal before us with the amendment.

The SECRETARY: This is the proposal which we are now to vote on:-

"The International Whaling Commission recommends to the Governments party to the International Whaling Convention a total quota of 4,500 B.W.U. for the Antarctic season of 1965/66. The Commission recognizes that this quota will not in the 1965/66 season reduce the catch below the sustainable yield as determined on the basis of scientific evidence available, which is incomplete at least in regard to sei whales. This quota is agreed to as a transitional limit to assist the pelagic whaling industries to adjust to the reductions required to begin rebuilding the whale herds. All members of the Commission agree that they will recommend to their Governments that they support further reductions for the 1966/67 and 1967/68 seasons that will assure that the quota for the 1967/68 season will be less than the combined sustainable yields of the fin and sei stocks as determined on the basis of more precise scientific evidence."

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Is that proposal clear to everybody?

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway) (Interpretation): This proposal is absolutely clear to the Norwegian Delegation and we will vote in favour of this proposal. I would like to point out that this is a compromise we have achieved after long and arduous negotiations. It is clear to all the Delegations that the Japanese Delegation, in particular, has been in a very difficult situation, and they have made a contribution to reaching an agreement here. I would, therefore, ask the other members of the Commission to take a positive point of view on this proposal. Thank you.

Mr. H.G. MARCO (Argentina): Mr. Chairman, our Delegation will vote in favour of the proposal made by the United States at this meeting. This is not because we feel it is the best one, but because it is the one that is most reasonable from all our points of view. Our position is that we wish to restrict the catch more, as proposed by the United States Delegation a few days ago. We appreciate that this quota is near the limit scientifically established to ensure the recovery of stocks, and we shall endeavour in every way in the future to ensure a greater reduction in the catch, and try to find a solution which would give even more protection to the whales.

This is all I want to say, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (United States): Mr. Chairman, it is not quite clear to me whether you are now polling the countries in order, but if it is possible I would like to make a very brief statement on behalf of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Please do.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The United States is prepared to vote "Yes" on this proposal, as amended. I want to point out, though, that this is on our understanding of the wording of the proposal. We understand that this wording means that within the period of three years the members of this Commission are pledging themselves to adopt regulations that are in line with the scientific findings, in order to prevent further over-fishing of the whale stocks in the Antarctic.

This is our understanding of the wording, Mr. Chairman, and we are prepared to vote "Yes" on this basis.

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

Mr. R.A. SHERWIN (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that we appreciate very much the efforts that have gone to reach this stage. We are supporting the proposal, and I would like to say that our understanding is the same as that of the United States, which has just been stated.

Mr. D.N. KOLESNIK (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I think you just asked for a vote on this Resolution, but the voting was interrupted and Delegates have started to make comments on the matter. We feel it would be more in accordance with the usual procedure to first finish the voting and then give an opportunity to all the Delegations to make comments.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I think that discussion on this point is quite natural because I, as the Chairman, made a mistake. My first impression was that the proposal for an amendment made by the Japanese Delegation and put to the vote was lost, and that is why I decided to vote on the second proposal. This was my mistake, I had a wrong count of the votes. I now see that there were four in favour, none against and nine abstentions, so the amendment of the Japanese Delegation was adopted. I now wish to put to the vote the whole proposal with the amendment. That is why I think it was right that we delayed our voting. I am very sorry for my mistake, I am afraid I was a little inattentive.

It is now my intention to put to the vote the proposal which Mr. Wimpenny has just read, with an amendment which has already been adopted. Is everybody in agreement with my explanation?

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, several other Delegations have made short statements on their position and I would like an opportunity to do the same. I do not wish to hold up the vote and if it would be more convenient I will do it afterwards. It will only take two minutes, in any case.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Please go ahead, Mr. Tame.

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): I just wish to say, as we shall not now be voting on the United States' original proposal, that the United Kingdom would, I think, have preferred that proposal. We voted for the Japanese amendment, because we recognised that the Japanese Delegation had made very great efforts to put forward a proposal that would be generally acceptable, and in the interests of getting general agreement we were prepared to support the Japanese amendment and to vote for the United States' proposal as now amended.

I would just finally like to say that our understanding of this proposal is as set out by Mr. McHugh. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): As far as I understand it, this proposal was seconded by the Delegations of Argentina, Norway and the United Kingdom.

Mr. R. B. ATKINS (New Zealand): I should like briefly to state the view of the New Zealand Delegation on the proposal which is before us. First of all, we welcome the constructive spirit in which pelagic countries have approached the discussions at this Special Meeting. The proposal in its present form, however, allows for a higher catch level in 1965/66 than New Zealand would have wished to have seen adopted, and in our view it is all the more vital that from 1967/68 the quota

should be brought below the scientific estimate of sustainable yields in terms of the final sentence of this draft recommendation. We share the understanding of the American Delegation on this point. New Zealand is, however, prepared to vote in favour of this recommendation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Atkins. Are there any other comments? If there are no other comments I will put this proposal to the vote, and I will ask the Secretary to call the roll.

The SECRETARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will now call the roll.

Argentina	Yes	Netherlands	Yes
Australia	Yes	New Zealand	Yes
Canada	Yes	Norway	Yes
Denmark	Yes	South Africa	Yes
France	Yes	U.S.S.R.	Yes
Japan	Yes	U.S.A.	Yes
		United Kingdom	Yes

The vote is carried unanimously. (Applause)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): This proposal is adopted unanimously.

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, let me take this opportunity of expressing my deep gratitude to all the members of the Commission who have voted in favour of the amendment of Japan. As the head of the Japanese Delegation I can assure you that on my return home I will report the result of this Special Meeting in full detail to my Government. Thank you very much.

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to know whether there would be any objection to making public this unanimous decision at once.

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

Are there any other statements? As there are no other statements it seems we have successfully completed our main problem.

There are some questions, as Mr. Herrington stated, which will provide work for the Committee of Six. These questions are as follows; first, the distribution of quota by species, second, the distribution by national quotas and, third, the international observer scheme. As Mr. Herrington told us, there was a decision taken by the Committee of Six to transfer all these questions to the joint meeting of the three pelagic countries, which will take place here in London on 24th June, four days before the opening of the annual meeting of the Commission. Are there any comments on these points?

As Mr. Herrington stated, at the final meeting of the Committee of Six the Japanese Delegation made a statement that they are prepared to meet with other pelagic countries, having in mind that the quota will be adopted for three forthcoming seasons. We have agreed upon the quota and I think our agreement about the meeting of the three pelagic countries is in force. I hope that the Commissioners from the three countries concerned will meet on 24th June here in London. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): I understand that at this Special Meeting it has been decided to fix the total catch limit only for the coming season, and this fact does not destroy the conditions which Japan put forward for the holding of the three-countries meeting.

I understand also that the Norwegian Government will extend invitations in the future to the three countries who are meeting, and we shall give most favourable consideration to this. That is our position.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Matsuoka. Are there any other statements on this subject?

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): There have been several references to the three pelagic countries, but I think I am right in saying that the present quota agreement was arrived at by five countries, including the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. I have not had time to take the instructions of my Government on this, but we are, in fact, making financial contributions to the Commission on the basis of being a pelagic country, and I think I must reserve the position of my Government in relation to the possible right to attend this meeting.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you very much, Mr. Tame. I have spoken about three countries only, the meeting of the three countries here in the Committee of Six. The agreement between five countries is in force and that is why I think all the five countries will participate in the meeting.

Professor E.J. SLIJPER (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, I must make the same reservations as Mr. Tame, on behalf of the Netherlands' Government.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Professor Slijper. So it will be quite right if on 24th June five countries meet together.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, it is not of very serious import, but I think that your summary may not be quite correct. It is my understanding of Mr. Matsuoka's reply that Japan does not think that they would attend a June 24th meeting in London to discuss national quotas.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Sprules. As far as I understand it, this is not only a question of national quotas, but some other questions which should be considered by the pelagic countries.

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, the Government of Japan wishes very strongly to implement the international observer scheme, and I hope that in the agenda of the three-countries meeting the programme of the international observer scheme will be included. In that case we shall try our best to attend the proposed meeting of the three countries, in spite of the distance handicap, as Japan is located so far away.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Matsuoka. I have already mentioned the questions which we are to consider at that meeting, which include the problem of the international observer scheme. Are there any other statements on this subject? We can take note that on 24th June the pelagic countries will meet and discuss all the problems arising from these discussions. With your permission we can finish this question.

As you may remember, yesterday we had not finally adopted our decision on point 5 of the Agenda, that is the financing of the Special Meeting. Mr. Wimpenny is very worried about this decision. Yesterday at our plenary session the Delegations from United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R., Japan and Norway agreed to cover the cost of our Special Meeting from the sum which was left from the past year, I mean the sum of £850 for special investigations. The Delegation of the Netherlands reserved their opinion on this point, and I am now applying to the Delegation of the Netherlands regarding this subject.

Professor E.J. SLIJPER (Netherlands): I have the pleasure to announce that the Netherlands Government agrees.

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

Gentlemen, it is with great pleasure that I can tell you that all the Items on the Agenda of our Special Meeting are exhausted.

Are there any other supplementary problems?

Mr. K. HOLLER (Norway) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I would only request the Secretary to give us his assistance in arranging the meeting on 24th June. We have the impression that the meeting will be larger than we had thought originally on the Norwegian side.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Holler. That was a question to Mr. Wimpenny; would you be kind enough to reply?

The SECRETARY: I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that if the Commissioner for Norway will let me have an idea of the number of people he is expecting at the meeting I can try and arrange suitable accommodation in the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food; but I shall have to communicate with him or with the Embassy by letter on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Wimpenny. I should like to ask Delegates of the five pelagic countries to let Mr. Wimpenny know later about the number of persons in their Delegations who will be meeting in London.

Are there any other problems or questions arising here?

Mr. F.E. POPPER (F.A.O.): Mr. Chairman, you were kind enough at the beginning of this Session to allow me to say a few words on behalf of the Director General and the governing bodies of F.A.O., and I feel that I should, at the conclusion of this meeting, again say a very few words.

First of all I should like to say that I am sure the Director General and the Council will be most pleased to hear of the results of this meeting, in the sense that it has been possible to reach unanimous agreement on a course of action which may be considered as a step in establishing a regime in the Antarctic whaling that would arrest the depletion of the stocks and eventually lead to their restoration to levels of higher yields, in accordance with the principles of conservation to which F.A.O. is committed. How far and how quickly this will take place will, of course, be decided at further meetings of your Commission, and I note that in the Resolution that was adopted there is reference to quotas being fixed that will assure that the quota for 1967/68 will be less than the combined sustainable yields of fin and sei stocks, as determined on the basis of more scientific evidence. In this connection

I wish to offer again any assistance that F.A.O., through its scientific staff or otherwise, may be able to give to your Commission in collecting and presenting such evidence, if it were desired by your Commission. As you know, some provisional arrangements were agreed upon in September, 1963, and these might well be reviewed and, possibly, revised, if you so desire.

As we heard in the last session, it will not be possible for the Commission to be represented at the next session of the F.A.O. Council, since your own meeting will overlap with that session of the Council. But I hope that if F.A.O. is invited to be represented we will, nevertheless, be able to send someone to maintain liaison between F.A.O. and your Commission, so that any arrangements that may have to be entered into for further collaboration on the scientific side can be facilitated. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Popper, for your statement, and for your kind suggestions about further help to our Commission. We are very grateful for the help from F.A.O. and we shall be grateful to you in the future should any further help be necessary for the Commission.

Are there any other statements, Gentlemen?

I believe Mr. Wimpenny has a statement about the Press release.

The SECRETARY: I think you are mistaken, Mr. Chairman, it was a question.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): If there is no statement from Mr. Wimpenny I would like to remind you that yesterday we agreed upon the proposal to leave the Press release to Mr. Wimpenny then consult on the text and give this to the Press. Maybe there are amendments to this proposal? There appear to be no amendments, so this decision of the meeting is still in force.

For the last time I ask if you have any further announcements or statements?

As there are no supplementary statements may I say a few words, Gentlemen. At our meeting we have had very successful results and we have unanimously adopted the decision which is best for everybody. There is no doubt that some Delegations had more progressive proposals than the one we adopted here, but our decision which has been made here today is quite a progressive one too. This decision will help us in future not only to stop the decrease in whale stocks in the Antarctic, but it will do something to increase the stocks. I do not think it would be wrong if I could say here that in future all the Commissioners and our Commission will take more progressive measures to fulfil our task.

On behalf of all the participants of this Special Meeting, I should like to express my sincere thanks to the United Kingdom Government for their hospitality and for providing such good accommodation for our meetings. I should like to ask Mr. Tame, the head of the United Kingdom Delegation, to give our sincere thanks to his Government.

I should like to thank the instigators of our Special Meeting for their initiative, for, as everybody knows, the results of our meeting have been quite successful. I should also like to thank all the Delegations and all the participants of our Special Meeting for their active work and for their efforts which have helped us to achieve these results.

I should also like to say that it gives me great pleasure to express my sincere thanks to all the technical assistants who have made everything possible for the success of our work. I should like to thank our Secretary, our respected Mr. Wimpenny, and all his assistants for creating such good conditions for our work. (Applause)

Thank you, Gentlemen. Is there anybody else who wants to say something to our Special Meeting before we close?

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I feel that I must defend myself against the accusation of being really any help to the success that has attended this meeting. I am sure that what you, Sir, have been kind enough to say is really - if you only knew - not the truth, not exactly. You have succeeded in spite of rather than because of anything that I have done!

On the other hand, I am very much indebted to my own staff, Miss Kirby and those in the back room at the end, who have managed in not too easy circumstances. We have been constricted here to a very small number of rooms, much smaller than we have usually. I think certainly by their ability and, as I say, in spite of any faltering that I have been guilty of - I think I have been guilty of less this meeting than is usual - this meeting has gone remarkably well, and I thank you all very much indeed for your forbearance and patience at times when we have felt, for various reasons, that we have failed you.

Thank you very much indeed, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, I think we should confirm my thanks to our Secretary and to all his staff. (Applause)

Mr. M. MATSUOKA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity of expressing my deep appreciation for the striking ability of the Chairman, Mr. Sukhoruchenko, in his handling of the Commission. I also wish to express my heartfelt appreciation for your strong determination to reach an agreement in the Commission, in spite of the many difficulties.

I also wish to express my thanks for the marvellous contributions made by the Chairman of the Committee of Six, Mr. Herrington, as well as to Dr. Chapman, the Chairman of the Committee of Four.

May I also join in the expression of thanks made by the Chairman to the staff of the secretariat, Mr. Wimpenny, Miss Kirby and all the other assistants who have made our discussions so smooth. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you very much, Mr. Matsuoka.

I think, Gentlemen, that it would be your unanimous opinion that I should express our warmest thanks to our scientists, Dr. Chapman, Mr. Holt, Mr. Gulland and Mr. Allen, and to all the scientists engaged in whaling problems. (Applause)

If there are no further statements, allow me at this stage to declare that the Special Meeting of the International Whaling Commission is closed. May I wish you all successful work and the best of health. (Applause)

(The Meeting closed at 3.05 p.m.)