

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSIONEIGHTEENTH MEETINGSession of Monday, 27th June, 1966In the Chair: Mr. M. N. Sukhoruchenko

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, I would like to ask for your attention.

May I call the Eighteenth Meeting of the International Whaling Commission to order and declare it open. For me, as well as for the other Commissioners, it is a sincere pleasure to have the opportunity to see again all my colleagues, the Commissioners and the members of their Delegations.

I have the special pleasure of presenting to you and greeting on your behalf and on my behalf, our Minister, Mr. James Hoy, who is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food for the United Kingdom. Let me give the floor to Mr. Hoy, who wishes to welcome the Delegates.

Mr. J.H. HOY (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food):

Mr. President, I am delighted to welcome you all to London again on behalf of the United Kingdom. The previous occasion on which I had the honour of addressing this Commission was at the start of your Special Meeting in May of last year, and I was very pleased to learn later of the considerable progress that the meeting had made. I hope that this is a good omen for the success of the very critical deliberations in which you will be engaged this week.

Last year you succeeded in agreeing to a reduction in the Antarctic pelagic catch limit to 4,500 blue whale units; this means that in the course of only four years you have reduced the limit more than three-fold. Even more important, you accepted the need for further reductions in the next two seasons, that will ensure that the 1967/68 catch will be below the scientifically assessed maximum sustainable yields of sei and fin whale stocks. Thus, after many years, the Commission is now in sight of the objective of the 1946 Convention. The objective was to provide for the proper conservation of whale stocks and thus make possible the orderly development of the whaling industry. This indeed is a cause for satisfaction; although I am sure that no one concerned with whale conservation will feel complacent. The total catch will have to be very substantially reduced before the sustainable level is reached, and still greater reductions will be necessary to allow the stocks to build up. So your declared undertaking to achieve these reductions in two years is no light one. Until it is achieved we cannot be said to have reached even the turning point towards recovery of the whale stocks. Unless it is achieved the sacrifices which have so far been made will have been made in vain.

If I mention particularly the problem of the Antarctic deep sea catch it is because that is the biggest single problem with which you will have to deal, but I realise that there are many others on your Agenda. With the progressive restriction of pelagic operations, the operations of land stations have assumed increasing significance. Your task is not made easier by the absence from the Commission of some countries whose land station operations represent a substantial taxation of the stocks that you are trying to protect. I understand too that the reports of your scientific advisers show the need for stronger conservation measures in areas remote from the Antarctic, which has occupied so much of your attention in recent years.

IWC/18/18

I have said enough to show the seriousness of the problems which will be engaging your attention this week. Let me also say that the actions you have taken in the last two years encourage me to believe that you will not lack the resolution to deal with these problems.

We in the United Kingdom will wholeheartedly support whatever measures may be necessary to secure effective conservation of the stocks and to preserve for mankind a resource which, if properly managed, will yet again be of immense value.

Mr. Chairman, it only remains for me once again to extend, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, a very warm welcome to London and I do hope that in spite of your heavy Agenda you will have time to see something of our capital, and may I hope that you will also be fortunate enough to have weather which is a little better than it is this morning; although I have one consolation in making a comparison, for when I left Edinburgh it was raining ten times as hard as when I arrived in London. All I can say is let us be of good hope.

I hope the Conference will be very successful indeed, despite the serious problems which confront you. But I hope, at the same time, you will find a little spare time to have a look around and see what can be seen in this our capital city.

Mr. President, thank you very much. (Applause)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, on behalf of all those participating in the work of the Commission, I would like to express my gratitude to you, Mr. Hoy, for your warm words of welcome and your wishes for the success of the work of the Commission. We have a great deal of work to do, but I would like to express a firm belief, on behalf of all those present, that all Items on the Agenda will be discussed and solved. If this is so then the weather in London will certainly improve!

Once more, Mr. Hoy, I would like to express my gratitude for your warm words. Thank you very much. (Applause)

(Mr. Hoy then left the meeting)

(Members of the Press then left the meeting)

I would now recommend that according to previous procedure we should proceed with the work of our Commission without the members of the Press. If that is the wish of the Commission, then at the end of our meeting as usual a Press release will be organised which will be submitted to the members of the Press. If there are no objections, I would like the Press representatives to leave the hall; however, it seems that they have already done so. (Laughter)

Gentlemen, I would like on my behalf, as well as on behalf of the Commission to greet those Commissioners present here for the first time at this meeting in such a capacity: from Norway Mr. Knudtzen, from the Argentine Mr. von der Becke, from France Mr. Taillart, from the Netherlands Mr. Meyer and from New Zealand Mr. Cotton. I apologise if I have missed somebody because I have had no further data from the Secretariat.

Let me also on behalf of the Commission greet those present at our meeting as Observers from other countries and other organisations: from F.A.O., Mr. Holt, from I.C.E.S. Professor Ruid, from Chile Captain Carjaval and Commander Parodi, from the Fauna Preservation Society Major Scott, from the World Wildlife Fund Mr. Bourne, and from the International Society for the Protection of Animals, Mr. Scott. We are very pleased to see those Gentlemen at our meeting.

I would like to propose that we proceed with the work of our meeting by calling the roll of the Commissioners and other members of delegations of all the countries. As I think all of you know, the respected Mr. Wimpenny is now ill and I would like to express our sincere regret about this. Dr. Mackintosh has been kind enough to express his willingness to take the place of Mr. Wimpenny at this meeting, and I would now like to ask Dr. Mackintosh to take a roll call of delegates and make announcements about the distribution of conference documents and general arrangements for the meeting.

The ACTING SECRETARY: Gentlemen, I will take the roll call first.

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

The ACTING SECRETARY: Gentlemen, I am asked to make one or two announcements.

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

I took Mr. Wimpenny's place at very short notice, only a day or two ago, so if I go astray or get into a tangle I hope you will make due allowance. Perhaps I should say when I get into a tangle. I am very happy to do the best I can during this week, but I am at present only Acting Secretary, and we do not know quite yet what arrangements will be made later. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

We have now to adopt the agenda. In accordance with rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure, the agenda was circulated more than sixty days in advance of the meeting. As you know, unless they are already included in the agenda, no items involving amendments to the schedules or recommendations can be proposed at the meeting, under article 6 of the Convention. Items not affecting the schedule or article 6 of the Convention can be added at the meeting if the Commission agrees, and can be included in the agenda. Thus, the order of the items can be changed.

In accordance with the above said, do you have any amendments or additions to the proposed draft agenda? Can I take it that there are no alterations or additions to the proposed draft agenda?

(The adoption of the agenda, being proposed by the Soviet Delegation and seconded by Dr. McHugh, U.S.A., was agreed)

The proposed draft agenda is now our formal agenda. Thank you, Gentlemen.

We will now proceed to item 3 of the agenda, Appointment to Committees. It is necessary for us to organise new Scientific and Technical Committees. Let me remind you that, in accordance with rule 18 of the Rules of Procedure, all Commissioners present, or their representatives, have the right to appoint to the Scientific and Technical Committees the members of their delegations. I will therefore ask the Acting Secretary, Dr. Mackintosh, to poll Commissioners for representation on these two committees. Commissioners who wish representation should then nominate their members.

/The ACTING SECRETARY: We will poll...

IWC/18/18

The ACTING SECRETARY: We will poll for the Scientific Committee first.

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

We will now poll for the Technical Committee

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

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Mackintosh. We now have two active committees.

It is also necessary to nominate five Commissioners for the Finance and Administration Committee. Our usual practice is to ensure that representation on that Committee is from non-whaling countries, countries concerned only with land station whaling and Antarctic pelagic whaling countries. Having in mind the representation at the last meeting, I should like to propose the following nominations. At the Seventeenth Meeting of the Commission the following countries were members of the Finance and Administration Committee: Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and the United States. For the Finance and Administration Committee at the Eighteenth Meeting of the Commission I should like to propose, from the non-whaling countries, Mr. Taillart, the representative of France, from countries carrying on whaling from land stations the representative of South Africa, Mr. De Jager, and the representative of Australia, Mr. Setter, and from countries concerned with Antarctic pelagic whaling, the representative of Norway, Mr. Knudtzon, and the representative of Japan, Mr. Fujita.

If there are no objections, can I take it that the Finance and Administration Committee will consist of those members? (Agreed) The Finance and Administration Committee is, therefore, appointed. In accordance with established practice, the Technical Committee and the Finance and Administration Committee will hold their meetings during the Meeting of the Commission. The meetings of the Scientific Committee have already taken place, and the result of those meetings will be reported to us in accordance with item 7 of the agenda.

Gentlemen, let me proceed to the 4th item on the agenda. I understand that the problems covered by item 4 of the agenda are to be referred to the Finance and Administration Committee just nominated. If there are no objections we will take such a decision. No objections? (Agreed)

We will proceed with item 5, The International Observer Scheme. As you know, the International Observer Scheme has been discussed at the meeting of the representatives of the countries parties to the agreement of 1962/1963, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Wall. The work of that Committee, as far as I know, is not yet finished, so I should like to propose that we listen to a report by Mr. Wall, or any other substitute person, at the next meeting of the Commission. Are there any objections to that, Gentlemen? (Agreed) As there are no objections the proposal is agreed.

Item 6 of the agenda, Review of previous season's catches. With regard to this item, it seems expedient to me to ask Mr. Vangstein for his comments on that, as head of the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics. If Mr. Vangstein does not object I will give the floor to him.

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): It should, I think, no longer be necessary to occupy the Commission's valuable time with any oral review of whaling activity in the past year. The Commission has received our statistics concerning the catch in and outside the Antarctic. Moreover the F.A.O. Committee has in its report made comments on the operations in the Antarctic last season. But as a "Review of previous season's catches" stands on the agenda, I will nevertheless make some brief remarks.

Let me first of all thank the representatives of the countries which had pelagic expeditions in the Antarctic last season for the sending in of the monthly reports and for the quick dispatch of the final reports after the close of the season. Thanks to this, we were able to send to the F.A.O. Committee as early as April 20th a detailed survey of the operations in the Antarctic last season. Besides this we have had time to prepare the usual reviews.

Also, in respect of whaling outside the Antarctic, we have received from the members of the Commission who engage in whaling, the usual statistical information. But from one Chilean company we have not received any report, and from the company which operates from Peru we have not received statements of the sex and size of the captured whales.

In the Antarctic 10 factory ships were operating, as compared with 15 in the previous season. Thus the factory ship capacity was reduced by about 33 per cent, whilst the catching activity, measured in catcher day's work, was reduced by about 25 per cent. The diminished catching activity is due principally to the lower global quota which was fixed, namely 4,500 units. Approximately 4,000 units were taken. In other words, the catch amounted to the global quota which was proposed by the Scientific Committee at the last meeting, and which was also the principal proposal of the majority of the members of the Commission.

The catch of fin whales was about 2,500 animals. Thus the catch of this species in the last two seasons is considerably lower than had been anticipated by the Committee of Four, in the event of the proposal for a global quota of 4,000 and 3,000 units for 1964/65 and 1965/66, respectively, having been accepted. Said proposal was, as will be remembered, made at the meeting in Sandefjord in 1964. Some of the pelagic countries could not accept this proposal, and they agreed to limit the catch to 8,500 units. In spite of the serious disagreements which have occurred between the majority of the Commission and certain whaling countries with respect to the global quota, the catch of fin whales has been brought down to a level at which the restoration of the stocks may already have commenced. I refer in this connection to the F.A.O. report; but this has taken place at the expense of the sei whales.

Last season there were taken about 17,600 sei whales. Respecting the effect the large catch of sei whales in the last two years has had on the stocks of this species, I again refer you to the report of the F.A.O. Committee. The large catch of sei whales is due to the fact that the expeditions have to a much larger extent than formerly concentrated on the taking of this species.

Approximately 60 per cent of the total catch was taken in Area II and 20 per cent between 0° and 30° East. 70 per cent of the total catch of blue whale units was taken between 40° and 50° South Latitude, compared with about 40 per cent and 20 per cent in the two previous seasons. Before 1960/61 season practically no catch was taken between 40° and 50° South Latitude.

/The Catch of blue whale units.....

The catch of blue whale units per catcher day's work fell from 0.40 to 0.31. There was a considerably larger catch of sperm whales in the balcen whaling season than in the previous seasons. The ten expeditions operating this last season captured about 3,600 sperm whales, whereas the 15 operating in 1964/1965 took about 3,200.

The open season was from December 12th to April 7th, but the Japanese expeditions and some of the Russian expeditions ceased operations before April 7th because they had caught their quotas. The average catch period was 117 days, and this is approximately the same as for the four previous seasons.

The average size of the sei whales was last season 48 feet which denotes a decline of 1.3 feet in comparison with the previous season. The average size of fin whales was approximately the same as the 1964/1965 season, namely 65.8 feet.

With regard to the catch in fields outside the Antarctic, it is the fields in the Northern Pacific which predominate. Catch and production in these fields are now approximately equally large as in the Antarctic. For the rest, I refer you to the statistics distributed.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Vangstein. Does anybody wish to make any comments? If none of the representatives wishes to make any comments at the present time, I think we should note this and return to it during the work of the Commission on the problem and that report. What are the proposals concerning the report? There is a proposal that we should note it. If there are no objections to that, we will note the report.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZEN (Norway): With your permission, I would be very glad to speak on point 5 on the agenda, the International Observer Scheme. In the first place, I would refer to paragraph 20 in the Chairman's Report of the Seventeenth Meeting of the Commission. I will not quote that Resolution, but I can summarise it: it expresses the necessity for an Observer Scheme for the pelagic whaling, and it stresses that it would be most harmful if the old Observer Scheme should expire without having been implemented at any time.

The Chairman said just now that a meeting of the 1962 Quota Agreement was proposed also to discuss the Observer Scheme, but as a member of that group, I can state that it has not been mentioned at all. If we have a later meeting in plenary, I am quite certain that any representative at that meeting will, at that time, state that this Observer Scheme has not been mentioned at all. To date the negotiations has been too complicated, therefore I would like to suggest that this Plenary Session ask the Technical Committee, if the International Observer Scheme is not on the agenda of the Technical Committee, that it be placed on it and given due consideration.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Perhaps you are not fully aware, Mr. Knudtzen, of what was discussed, I apologise. This problem was discussed at the Commissioners' meeting in Tokyo last year, and it will be discussed further at the meeting of the Commissioners of the four countries engaged in the Antarctic pelagic whaling operations. Afterwards, the decisions taken by such a meeting would be dealt with at the Technical Committee meeting. I think the problem is now clear. Due to the wish expressed by Mr. Knudtzen, this problem will be dealt with by the Technical Committee.

May we now proceed to item 7 of the agenda. This is the Report of the Scientific Committee; I would like to remind the Commissioners present that the Scientific Committee began its work on 20th July, and the main problems discussed there were the following: assessment of whale stocks; comments on the results of the previous season; economic state of the measures for regulating the whaling due to item 12 of the Agenda. I have been informed by Dr. Mackintosh that the Report of the Scientific Committee has not yet

been received.

I should like to ask Dr. Chapman whether he would like now to inform the Commission of the results of the Scientific Committee meeting.

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, the Scientific Committee report was adopted by the Committee on Friday and has been informally available over the weekend but, as you have stated, it has not yet been distributed in its final form, and undoubtedly some members have not yet seen it. I should be glad to make a few comments on it if you wish, or these could be deferred until all members have a copy and have had an opportunity to read it.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Dr. Chapman, I would prefer you to make those comments now because, in any case, the report would be referred to the Technical Committee later on, and the Technical Committee would proceed with its work before the second plenary session. Thus, Gentlemen, I should like to propose that we hear Dr. Chapman's comments now and that the report be distributed later on. You will thus be in a position to make closer acquaintance with the items included in it. Are there any objections to that proposal? May I take your silence as a sign of agreement? In that case, I should like to give the floor to Dr. Chapman.

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (U.S.A.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Scientific Committee has made fifteen recommendations to the Commission, but I will discuss only a few of these.

First, concerning the Antarctic, we have stated that the best estimate for the present sustainable yields for the whole Antarctic is as follows: fin whales, 4,500; sei whales, 4,500 to 7,500. In terms of blue whale units this means a total of 3,000 to 3,500.

The Committee also recommends that the Commission should consider setting quotas sufficiently below the level of the sustainable yield, so that the very valuable fin whale stocks can begin to be rebuilt rather than be simply maintained at the present low level. With this in mind, they recommend that the Commission consider the suggestion of the F.A.O. Assessment Group, which may be discussed later by them, that complete protection be given immediately and for some time in the future to fin whales, so that catching would be limited to sei whales for the present. The Committee has studied this and given some examples of how this might affect the future of both the fin and sei whale stocks. This would, of course, be carrying out the idea of what actually happened during the past season, when the expeditions reduced their catch of fin whales very much and concentrated very heavily on the sei whale stocks, as Mr. Vangstein has already pointed out.

Considering the North Pacific, the North Pacific Working Group have, of course, met independently both in Honolulu in February and in London in the previous week, and they have made a number of recommendations concerning the North Pacific which have been under the study and consideration of the Commissioners of the North Pacific. These recommendations, in brief, are that the taking of humpback whales should be prohibited for at least one more year in the North Pacific, and that there should be no change with respect to blue whales which are now protected. For fin whales it is recommended that catches should be held below the estimated sustainable yield - 1,800 for the entire North Pacific - and that as far as possible catches within areas should be held below their respective sustainable yields. The catch of female sperm whales should not be permitted to rise significantly above the present level. No recommendations are made in the taking of sei whales or male sperm whales.

Concerning sperm whales, the Committee found itself in a situation where it had little additional information on sperm whale stocks and the effect of catching on sperm whale stocks throughout the world, with the exception of the North Pacific, where the North Pacific Working Group had made some assessments. The Committee therefore recommends that the F.A.O. Assessments Group be asked to make an assessment of the sperm whale stocks, particularly in respect to those on pelagic grounds, and it also recommends that national groups begin or continue analyses.

There is one more recommendation I should like to refer to. The Committee recommends the prohibition of the catching of blue whales, which is now effective south of 40 ° south latitude, be extended to the whole of the southern hemisphere. I believe this point was also put up by the Committee on Land Stations for the southern hemisphere.

I should be glad to amplify any points or answer any questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Chapman. I should like to ask whether any commissioner wishes to comment on the report at this stage of the work, or whether commissioners would prefer to do so after the main points of the report have been considered at the Technical Committee meeting. I should only like to remind you that whatever procedure is adopted, at some stage the report should be formally accepted by the Commission as a whole. Do you object to the proposal to transfer further discussion on that item to the next plenary meeting, when it will have been already discussed at the Technical Committee meeting? If there are no objections, we will return to discussing that item at the next plenary meeting after it has been discussed at the Technical Committee meeting.

Item 8 of the agenda is the "Special Scientific Investigation of the Whale Stocks".

The joint IWC/FAO Working Party on Antarctic Whale Stock Assessment met in Seattle in 1966, and their report has been circulated as IWC/18/7. Participating at the meeting of that group were Mr. Allen, Dr. Chapman, Mr. Gulland, and from F.A.O., Mr. Boerema and Mr. Holt. Since the Working Party had no chairman at its meeting, I should like to ask Mr. Holt or Mr. Gulland to comment on the report of that committee.

Mr S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.) Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think I need say little about this report of the Joint Working Party, since I understand that it was considered by the Scientific Committee of the Commission last week and that account has been taken of our findings. As Dr. Chapman did not refer to these findings specifically, however, perhaps I should review briefly the summary which is given on the first page of document IWC/18/7.

The meeting of this Joint Working Group was concerned only with the baleen stocks in the Antarctic. We first looked at the question of land station catches, making some suggestions as to the consequences of taking land station catches into account in establishing the Antarctic pelagic quotas as agreed by the Commission at last year's meeting.

We then looked at the question of the sei whale stock, and I should like to say that the estimates given in this document IWC/18/7 have been superseded by the report of the F.A.O. group which met early in May, which has also been taken into account by the Scientific Committee in its discussions. The reason for this change is that the F.A.O. group, at its meeting in May, was able to take account of the data concerning the 1965/1966 season which were kindly supplied to us by the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics under the agreement reached last year, by which F.A.O. would undertake a review of the previous season's catches and their effects on the sustainable yields of the Antarctic baleen whale stocks.

If I may, I should like to return to this matter in a few moments, and pass on now to document IWC/18/7. The Joint Working Group in Seattle made an analysis of marking data for fin whales which had not been possible in such detail previously. This analysis confirmed the estimates of mortality rates, and hence of stock size and sustainable yields, which had been made in previous assessments. So the review of the marking data simply confirmed the figures which the Committee of Four, and subsequently the Scientific Committee, had been working on.

We had little new to say about blue whales, but we did look again at the effects of variations in catch rates between expeditions of different nationalities. It may be remembered that, in the previous year, we had looked at these differences, and had taken some account of them in making our estimates of stock size and the rate of depletion of the stocks.

As a consequence of this revision of the data, we agreed that it was not necessary to change the indices of abundance of whale stocks which had previously been put forward. We did, however, see that it would be very important to take account of differences in catch rates by expeditions of different nationalities in the future as the number of expeditions declines and a change in the balance of numbers between different nations takes place.

The last matter which we considered was the possible review of the arrangement of the statistical tables produced by the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics. The suggestions which the Joint Working Group had made had been made to the Bureau through Mr. Vangstein, and were also, I believe, considered by the Scientific Committee of the Commission last week.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer at this point to what is essentially the second stage of this assessment. F.A.O. produced a paper, which was sent to the Secretariat at the last moment, and this was the report of the Working Group consisting of Mr. Boerema and Mr. Gulland who met in Rome early in May to analyse the 1965/1966 season catches. This report is entitled, "Report on the Effects on Whale Stocks of Pelagic Operations in the Antarctic during the 1965/66 Season and on the Present Status of those Stocks." In the form in which I have it, it is an F.A.O. document. That is, it is the report of F.A.O. to this Commission on the assessment made under agreements between our two organisations. I think that this report also was taken into account by the Scientific Committee last week, and copies are now available from the Secretary.

If the Chairman wished, I could give a brief summary of the findings in that report also which are, I think, the definitive ones at this time.

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (U.S.A.): On the question of the distribution of the F.A.O. report, it was distributed to the Scientific Committee and was considered by them, but I am not sure that it has been distributed to the Commissioners.

The ACTING SECRETARY: Just in case anybody is not clear about this, we have the F.A.O. assessment report, IWC/18/7, and this has been distributed. However, there is a second one covering the 1965/1966 season which is almost ready and will be distributed as soon as possible

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

If there is no objection, I should like the Technical Committee to keep in mind the results in that report, as well as the recommendations of the further report which was prepared on the basis of the results of the 1965/1966 season. Are there any other proposals? (Agreed)

I think that it would be expedient if it were possible for Mr. Holt to make a more extended comment at the meeting of the Technical Committee, if he would.

Mr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any objections to such a proposal? (Agreed)

It is almost time for us to adjourn, although we have not succeeded in dealing with the agenda items in the first half of the plenary session. However, that is perhaps not my fault since we began our work a little late. I propose to adjourn now and we will meet again at 2.30 p.m., when we will work for approximately an hour. After that, the Technical Committee will start its meeting. Is there any objection? (Agreed)

(The Meeting adjourned at 1.00 p.m.)

(The Meeting reconvened at 2.35 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Good afternoon, Gentlemen. I feel sure that you have had enough time for a good lunch, and I feel confident that our further discussions will proceed with greater speed than before.

Under item 8 of our agenda there is a sub-item (c) Arrangements for continuation of the stock assessment work. Before solving that problem I would think we should hear the opinion of the F.A.O. representative concerning this subject, and we should also like to hear the opinion of our Scientific Committee on that matter. As Dr. Holt is not present at the moment I would like to give the floor to Dr. Chapman.

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, the Scientific Committee did not discuss at its meeting the question of continued assessment; however, it had made its views on this point very clear at the previous two or three meetings.

I think the Scientific Committee is quite well agreed on the need for continued assessment for baleen stocks in the North Pacific as well as in the Antarctic, and as I indicated to you before lunch, the Scientific Committee took special note of the situation with regard to sperm whale stocks, and indicated the need for assessment there. So I think I can say with assurance that we should like to have continued the assessment by the F.A.O. group for the Antarctic baleen whales and would, as I repeat, recommend that assessment be started by the F.A.O. group with respect to sperm whale stocks.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

What would be the proposals of the Commissioners on this subject? I hope that the Technical Committee, when discussing the problem of the scientific investigation of the world stocks, would have in mind that recommendation of the scientists.

Are there no other proposals, Gentlemen? If there are no other proposals we will proceed to item 9 of the agenda.

As you know, last February in Honolulu there was a meeting of the Sperm Whale Sub-Committee; their report was considered, as we know, by the Scientific Committee, and it is likely that it will be included with the Scientific Committee Report as an annex. I would like to ask the Chairman of the Sperm Whale Sub-Committee, Mr. Gambell, to give us his comments on the report.

Mr. R. GAMBELL (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, the report of the Sperm Whale Sub-Committee meeting in Honolulu has been distributed by the Secretariat in advance of this meeting, and for this reason has not been included in the report of the Scientific Committee.

The main results of the meeting in Honolulu were first of all to take note of considerable advances which have occurred in the whole field of the understanding of the biology of the sperm whales as a species. There is still need for considerably more work to be done, but a great deal has been learnt since the first meeting of the Sperm Whale Sub-Committee in Seattle in November, 1963.

The main recommendations which the Sub-Committee made to the Scientific Committee, which have been endorsed by that Committee, are first of all the

urgent need for more marking of sperm whales to be carried out, particularly to delineate stocks, to estimate the rates of movement and also as a check on age determination methods. Age determination is one of the key problems still remaining to be solved, and there is continuing work in hand in this connection, concerned with standardisation of age readings from the teeth of sperm whales. There is considerable agreement already, and it is just a matter now of making sure each country is assessing the age of the whales which they sample in exactly the same way.

We recommended to the Scientific Committee also, and this you have heard of already, that what we called an international group or a special group should be set up to make overall assessments of sperm whale stocks, particularly those exploited on pelagic whaling grounds, and the Scientific Committee has now decided that this special group should, in fact, be the F.A.O. group.

In addition to the special group concerned with grounds exploited by a number of different nations quite definitely, we should also like to encourage national assessment groups to continue their assessments of their own local resources, in terms of land station catches. The international group and the national groups should work in close collaboration, with exchanges of data and exchanges of ideas on methods of analysis and so on. The data available at the present time is rather limited, and so we have asked that all those countries concerned should take immediate steps to make available for the coming season, and as far as possible for past seasons, the data necessary for adequate assessment work.

One other item of particular concern was that we should understand the social structure of sperm whale populations, because of the possibility of there being numbers of males which are surplus to the reproductive needs of the population as a whole, and therefore making a part of the population which is expendable from the population's point of view, but therefore that much more useful from the whaling aspect. We need to know more about the whole structure of sperm whale schools, and we ask that special permits should be granted, by the countries concerned, allowing whole schools of sperm whales to be taken, in order that this aspect of their structure should be more thoroughly understood.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation). As there are no

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): As there are no other proposals, I would like to suggest that this matter should be referred for consideration by the Technical Committee, and I would like to ask the Technical Committee to consider the question of sperm whales in the light of the Report of the Sperm Whale Sub-Committee and the Report of the Scientific Committee, as well as in the light of the other papers on that aspect. Are there any other proposals on that matter? May I take it if there are no other proposals that this one is carried? (Agreed)

May we now proceed to Item 10 of the agenda, North Pacific whale stocks; a sub-item is the Report of the Scientific Committee. Briefly, on the history of this problem, as is known, the North Pacific Working Group on the North Pacific whale stocks was organised due to the request of the Commission during its Fourteenth Meeting in 1962. It comprises the representatives of Canada, Japan, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. The results of the work carried out by the Group were submitted to the Commission at its annual meetings in 1963 and 1964 as an annexe to the Report of the Scientific Committee. In February, 1966, the North Pacific Working Group carried out its next meeting in Honolulu; later on it met before the annual meeting of the Commission, and at that meeting of the Scientific Committee this matter was discussed and Dr. Chapman mentioned it in his report to the Commission. Is there any further necessity to ask Dr. Chapman to comment on that matter or not? My understanding is that those present are of the point of view that it is not necessary to ask Dr. Chapman to comment again on this matter.

Concerning sub-item (c) of Item 10 of the agenda, that is the Report from the Commissioners of the North Pacific whaling countries, I would like to mention to you that at the Seventeenth Meeting of the Commission, it was decided that the Commissioners of the North Pacific whaling countries would gather to discuss the problems arising from the whaling operations. The Commissioners and their advisers met in Honolulu in February, and Dr. McHugh served as Chairman. Later on, those Commissioners met in London last week to discuss the same problem. As far as I know, the work of that North Pacific Commissioners' Group is not yet finished. I would like to ask Dr. McHugh what his ideas are about whether it is necessary to discuss the work of the North Pacific Commissioners' Group at this plenary session, or to refer it to the second plenary session.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, I think it would be too early to talk in detail about the work of this special Group of Commissioners because, as you have already said, we have not completed our work, and therefore it is not possible to say exactly what our recommendations will be. Therefore, I would like to follow your suggestion and refer this matter to the second plenary session, when I hope that we will have completed our work.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I would like to point out that in any case that matter, before the Commission will take any decision upon it, should be discussed in the Technical Committee. However, as we have accumulated several such problems including the International Observer Scheme, it seems that it would be necessary to have a small special meeting of the plenary session before the Technical Committee finishes its work. At such a plenary session, with your permission, we could hear the comments of Dr. McHugh. Are there any objections? (Agreed)

Then let us proceed to Item 11 of the agenda, land stations. As was known before this meeting, since the 20th June there has been a special meeting of the special group on land stations, and representatives of the Argentine, Australia, New Zealand, and United Kingdom participated in it. If the Commissioners would not mind, I would like to ask Mr. Tame who was the head of that meeting to put forward his comments on the results achieved.

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you said, the Committee met last week, and the first thing that I think the Committee noted was that there are now only two members of the Commission which are actively interested in land station operations - the United Kingdom and South Africa. The group was advised that it was not possible for the Commission to fix a separate catch limit for land stations, as this was not in accordance with article V ii (c) of the Convention, and the group came to the conclusion that the best method of regulating the land station catch was by asking the two countries concerned to continue the voluntary limitations that had already been adopted by those countries for land station catches.

The group took note of certain special features of land stations as compared with pelagic expeditions, and came to the conclusion that it might not be necessary for these two countries to do more than continue the undertaking that they had already given, that the catch limits should not be increased beyond the 1964/5 figure, or the average over the three seasons, 1963, 1964 and 1965. They realised, however, that they could not express a final view on that until they knew the Commission's views about the total catch limit for the coming year. It was therefore considered that the precise undertakings to be adopted by these two countries would have to be reviewed in the light of the Commission's views about the total overall catch.

As regards the Observer Scheme, again the group felt that it could not make very much progress without knowing whether an Observer Scheme was going to be continued by the pelagic countries and, if so, what form it should take. Once again, however, both of the countries with an interest in land stations expressed their desire and willingness to participate in a suitable observer scheme.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I should also invite the attention of the Commission to the remarks that the group made about land station operations by countries which are not members of the Commission. The group had before it figures relating to Peru and Chile, which showed that these two countries were now operating from land stations to a very much larger extent than in the recent past at any rate, and that their catch was now something like half of the total catch from land stations in the southern hemisphere. Moreover, quite a considerable proportion of this catch was of blue whales and humpback whales. Although I think there may be some doubt as to whether the blue whale stocks are entirely the same as those inhabiting the Antarctic regions, the group nevertheless felt that this was a very serious situation, and that the Commission ought to try and get the co-operation of Peru and Chile in limiting the land station operations. Otherwise there was a danger that the work of the Commission might be nullified. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Tame. Perhaps some of the Commissioners wish to make comments or express opinions now, or shall we transfer this matter for the Technical Committee's consideration? I understand that Mr. Setter supports the proposal to put this matter for the consideration of the Technical Committee. If there are no other proposals that is carried.

Let us proceed to item 12 on the agenda, economic studies of whaling regulations. I should like to remind you, Gentlemen, that at the Seventeenth Meeting the Scientific Committee recommended that a group of economic experts be organised, and that that group should be comprised of economists and experts in the type of problems of the whaling industry, but not currently employed in it, and that that group should be appointed to carry out investigations and studies of whaling operations from the economic point of view. This problem was included into the agenda of the Scientific Committee as item 4. It is covered by item 12 of the agenda of the annual meeting of the Commission, and it is to be discussed at the plenary session. As I understand it the Scientific Committee has not adopted any further recommendation on that problem. I think it would be expedient to transfer this problem for the consideration of the Technical Committee. Are there any objections? As there are no objections the proposal is carried. Thank you, Gentlemen.

Item 13 on the agenda is Infractions. If there are no objections from Commissioners, I should like to propose that this matter be referred to the Technical Committee, for the careful consideration of all national reports of infractions. Are there any objections to that proposal? Then we are agreed to give that to the Technical Committee. Are there any further proposals?

Concerning item 14, Report of the Technical Committee, I should like to propose that this be considered and adopted after its work is finished. I would propose that the same procedure be adopted for item 15, the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee.

We now come to item 16, Gentlemen, the Seventeenth Annual Report.

/The draft was prepared.....

The draft was prepared by the Secretary of the Commission, Mr. Wimpenny, and circulated to the countries as IWC/18/5. I should like to hear the comments, amendments or other points of view of the delegations concerning the draft report. We might take the report paragraph by paragraph and, after that, the document will be formally put to the plenary session. Does anyone wish to take the floor?

Dr. Mackintosh is not quite sure that all delegations are in possession of the draft report.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): We have not received a copy of the report, and I understand that Canada and the Netherlands are in the same position.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): In that case, I would propose that we might consider this draft report at our last plenary session. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

If we can turn now to item 17, "Amendments to the Schedule", I should like to remind you first of all that all proposals for the amendment of the Schedule should first be referred to the Technical Committee. I should like to ask the Technical Committee to give the exact wording of any amendment that it recommends.

If there are no other views on item 17, "Amendments to the Schedule", that will be referred to the Technical Committee. (Agreed)

Is it agreed that all other items on the agenda, that is items 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22, shall be considered at the last plenary session? (Agreed)

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): I should like if I may to make a short comment on item 17 (e), "Schedule Paragraph 8(a) - Blue whale unit catch limit in the Antarctic". As you will know, the active pelagic whaling companies have come together here in London to discuss the distribution of the total global quota fixed for pelagic whaling in the Antarctic.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Excuse me, Mr. Knudtson, but the decision has been taken to refer that problem for consideration at the meeting of the Technical Committee. Will it be possible for you to express your point of view at the Technical Committee meeting in order that the initial discussion may be held there?

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): I am very sorry, Mr. Chairman, to have to bother you and the other Commissioners and advisers. I quite agree that this question of the blue whale unit catch limit in the Antarctic should be considered by the Technical Committee, but what I had in mind to suggest was that the plenary session might ask the Technical Committee to deal with this as the first item of its agenda, and perhaps the Commission could decide at the plenary session on this vital point of fixing the total pelagic global quota. That would expedite and facilitate the deliberations between the active pelagic countries as regards the division of the global quota which is to be fixed by the Commission.

That was my point. I quite agree that the question has to be dealt with by the Technical Committee.

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

We will close our plenary session now in order to give the Technical Committee an opportunity to meet today and proceed to its work. Tomorrow at nine o'clock there will be a meeting of the North Pacific Commissioners, and at 10.30 the Technical Committee will continue its work.

The ACTING SECRETARY (Administrative announcements)

(The Meeting adjourned at 3.15 p.m.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

EIGHTEENTH MEETING

Session of Thursday, 30th June, 1966

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

The Chairman(Interpretation): Good Afternoon, Gentlemen. May I call the plenary session to order and declare the second plenary session open.

Before drawing your attention to the agenda, I would like to give the floor to the Acting Secretary, Dr. Mackintosh, for an announcement.

The ACTING SECRETARY: This is quite a small point, but to save any possible confusion later I would say that one of the papers just circulated is the Finance and Administration Committee's Report, which you will see is marked IWC/18/4; this should be marked IWC/18/14, so would you please make the correction.

The Chairman(Interpretation): Gentlemen, if there is no objection, I would prefer to discuss the items in the order as listed in our agenda. May I take the common silence as the common approval? (Agreed)

Thus, I would like to draw your attention to item 5 of the agenda, the International Observer Scheme. This problem has been discussed at the Technical Committee meeting, and I would like to ask Mr. Setter to give his comments on the decision taken by the Technical Committee.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, as indicated in the report of the Technical Committee, under item 9 the Technical Committee examined the question of the International Observer Scheme. Whilst there was unanimous support in the Committee for the implementation of an observer scheme, there was some difference of opinion as to how such a scheme should be implemented. Some delegates were in favour of renewing the agreement which had been reached between the pelagic whaling countries, and for an observer scheme covering pelagic whaling in the Antarctic, whilst other delegates held the view that any scheme introduced should cover both pelagic and land-based whaling operations.

The Committee therefore recommends to the plenary session that an international observer scheme or schemes covering all whaling operations be implemented as soon as possible and, secondly, that a working group should be set up to draw up the details of the scheme or schemes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Setter. I have a question to you concerning the second item of the recommendation of the Technical Committee on that problem of the working group being established. What was the intention of the Technical Committee, had the Technical Committee in mind that such a working group should be appointed or organised during the meeting, or would it be up to the Chairman to make nominations?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, my understanding of the views of the Committee was that this working group should be set up following this meeting, at the conclusion of the Eighteenth Meeting of the Commission, and that the group should be set up by the Chairman of the Commission.

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

Gentlemen, would anybody like to make any comments on the decision taken

by the Technical Committee, or shall we accept this recommendation?

My understanding is that this problem was covered on a large scale at the Technical Committee meetings, thus there is nobody wishing to make any comments.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, as Chairman of the Technical Committee, I was somewhat unhappy at having to come back and make this recommendation to the plenary session without any concrete proposals therein. I think that we here are all agreed that an observer scheme should be implemented as soon as possible, but as I said, the Technical Committee could not agree on the steps to be taken to implement that scheme. As the Australian Commissioner, therefore, I should like to put a proposal to the Commission, and my proposal is, that we take a definite decision on the implementation of the observer scheme, and my idea is that we should recommend to the pelagic whaling countries that they take immediate steps to implement the observer scheme to apply to the pelagic whaling operations, and that we should then follow that up by the working party trying to develop a scheme that would be extended to the land-based operations.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore would like to move that the Commission recommend to the pelagic whaling countries that the observer scheme, as agreed previously, be implemented immediately. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): I should like to second the proposal put forward by the Australian Commissioner, and I should like to add that Norway, since 1955 has endeavoured to obtain an agreement for an international observer scheme. In spite of the fact that the Commission strongly requests the pelagic whaling nations to implement the international observer scheme, in the last season this scheme did not come into operation. Even if the agreement has now expired, Norway repeats its assurance from the Seventeenth Session to put the scheme into operation if the other two pelagic whaling countries are willing to do so.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The Proposal put by Australia was seconded by Japan)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Setter, although your motion has already been seconded, I would like to put a question to you. I would like to ask whether your proposal would not be in contradiction with the proposal recommended by the Technical Committee for the International Observer Scheme to cover all kinds of whaling operations thus including both pelagic operations and whaling operations conducted from the land stations.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I see no contradiction in the proposals. The Technical Committee has agreed that we should implement an Observer Scheme as soon as possible; the proposal is that the Observer Scheme should cover all whaling operations, but I do not think there is anything to stop us implementing that proposal in stages. The obvious first stage is to implement the agreement that has already been reached, and that is the reason why I have made the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Then I have one more question for you, Mr. Setter, as to whether you had an opportunity to discuss your proposal in the Technical Committee, or whether it is quite a new proposal.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, as Chairman of the Technical Committee, I tried not to take any sides in the discussions that were taking place at that meeting. The matter of the immediate implementation of this proposal was discussed and as reported in the Technical Committee Report, some delegations were not in favour of implementing a scheme for pelagic whaling only, but that the scheme covering all whaling should come in when arrangements had been made to do so. However, I think this Commission has an obligation to show its willingness to proceed along the lines towards an Observer Scheme; we already have a provision in the Schedule for pelagic countries to place observers on board other national vessels. We already have a provision in the Schedule to implement this Scheme, and I think that we as a Commission could quite easily make a recommendation to the pelagic countries to do so immediately. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Setter, so I understand that you prefer to raise the problem at the Plenary Session in order not to make the work of the Technical Committee more complicated.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Japan agrees with the Australian proposal from the practical point of view that the International Observer Scheme for the pelagic operations should be implemented first and that the scheme for the land stations operations should be discussed and studied and implemented after the International Observer Scheme for pelagic operations.

In fact, Japan made this proposal in the Technical Committee, and at the Plenary Session Mr. Setter, on behalf of the Australian delegation has made a proposal giving explanations in detail. I do not think this new proposal is in contradiction to the Report presented by the Technical Committee. Because of the reasons I have stated, I would like to support the proposal made by the Australian delegation.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I do not mean this personally, but I would just like to mention that since you have had long discussions during the Technical Committee meetings, I would like to ask you to be as brief as possible, as far as this is concerned.

Dr. L.G. LAFITSKII (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): The Soviet delegation is against the Australian proposal made by the Australian

delegation for the following reasons: first, this proposal made by the Australian d  legation is in contradiction with the recommendation of our Technical Committee Report, particularly in the wording of our recommendation where it says that a number of delegates are in favour of the International Observer Scheme applying not only for pelagic whaling but also for whaling carried out from land stations.

Secondly, if we extend this International Observer Scheme only for pelagic whaling, of course the catches from the land stations will be out of control.

The third point is that so as to implement this International Observer Scheme it is certain that every nation should take on the obligation of implementing the Scheme.

/Consequently, there should be

Consequently, there should be agreement on the International Observer Scheme, but now we have no such agreement as the agreement of 1963 has already expired. For this reason the Soviet Delegation will vote against this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Shall we continue to discuss that problem? Does no one else wish to comment?

On a question of clarification, how do you wish me to deal with your motion, as an amendment to the recommendation of the Technical Committee or as an addition to it?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): This is a proposal brought up under the agenda item by the International Observer Scheme. It would be quite acceptable, if the majority of the members of this Commission wished to make such a recommendation to the pelagic countries and wished to support the proposal that this could be done just as a recommendation from the Commission without amending any schedules or any proposals at all. It is just a recommendation to the pelagic countries to implement the Scheme, and it is up to the pelagic countries then to work it out together. However, I think that if the majority of the members of this Commission are of the opinion that we should make such a recommendation, we should take it as a recommendation of this Commission.

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

I understand, Mr. Setter, that you would not object if we were to put forward first a motion for the recommendation of the Technical Committee and then your recommendation supported by the Norwegian and Japanese delegations.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): No Sir, not at all.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): We will put the recommendation of the Technical Committee to the vote. Who is in favour, Gentlemen? Thank you. Is there anybody against the recommendation adopted by the Technical Committee? The recommendation of the Technical Committee is agreed unanimously.

I will now put the motion put forward by Mr. Setter and supported by the Norwegian and Japanese delegations and opposed by the Soviet delegation. The proposal is as follows:-

That the Commission would recommend for the Antarctic pelagic whaling countries the implementation as soon as possible of the International Observer Scheme, the previous International Observer Scheme.

Are there any comments on that? Mr. Setter?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): That covers the recommendation I made, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Since there were two seconders to that motion and one delegation was against it, I shall have to put it to the vote, if there are no objections to putting that proposal to the vote. Dr. Mackintosh, I should like to ask you to take a vote on the motion Dr. Setter put.

The ACTING SECRETARY: May I re-state the motion in case anyone is not clear. If I understand it correctly, it is:-

That the International Observer Scheme applicable to the pelagic whaling should be implemented as soon as possible.

Am I correct?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): My proposal was that the Commission recommend to the pelagic whaling countries that they implement the Scheme which expired in 1965/1966.

The ACTING SECRETARY: Recommends the countries...?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia):..to implement immediately the International Observer Scheme which expired in 1965/1966 season.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): In other words, the Scheme adopted by the agreement or agreements of 1962/1963?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Yes.

The ACTING SECRETARY: I will poll the Commission.

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

Those in favour: 10 Those against: 1 One abstention

The motion is carried.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So the motion is carried.

Let us then proceed to discuss the following items: we have already taken a decision on item 6. of the agenda and we will not return to the discussion of that item, therefore. I propose that we return to the discussion of item 7. of the agenda later.

I should, therefore, like you to concentrate your attention on item 8. of the agenda - Special scientific investigation of the whale stocks and in particular sub-paragraph (c) Arrangements for continuation of the stock assessment work.

The Technical Committee has discussed this problem and its decision is set out under item 12 of its Report. Mr. Setter, would you like to make any comments on the recommendation of the Technical Committee on that item.

Mr. C.G.SETTER: I think there are two...

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): There are two points to which I think attention might be drawn in the Report of the Technical Committee on this item. The first one was the reference to the need for very precise work to be carried out in relation to stock assessment, in view of the importance that will be placed on the estimates that will be made of the sustainable yields following next season's operations.

The other point that might be raised is the invitation from the Japanese Commissioner for scientists from F.A.O. and member countries to join an expedition to the Antarctic leaving about December this year, to carry out work on surveying the stocks in the Antarctic.

I think that both these points are important and, as you have said, the Technical Committee has joined the Scientific Committee in recommending that the stock assessment work be continued.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Does anyone wish to comment on this item? If there are no comments, under the Rules of Procedure this recommendation has to be moved and supported.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I move that the stock assessment work be continued as proposed by the Scientific Committee under the existing arrangements.

(The proposal was seconded by Dr. J.L. McHugh of the United States.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): If there are no objections, that recommendation is carried. (Agreed)

Let us now proceed to item 9 of the agenda. This item was covered under item 11 of the Technical Committee's report. I will ask Mr. Setter to comment on their decision.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): The Technical Committee examined the recommendations of the Scientific Committee on this subject and was in agreement with those recommendations. We simply endorsed the recommendations of the Scientific Committee. Those recommendations are set out in five parts in the report of the Technical Committee and, as Chairman of the Technical Committee, I would move that they be adopted. I will move those recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): What are the views of the Commission on the recommendations of the Technical Committee and the problems raised?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Canada would like to second the motion placed before us by Mr. Setter.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Is there anybody else?

(The proposal was also seconded by the U.S.S.R.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): If no one is against this proposal, it is adopted. (Agreed)

We will proceed now to item 10 on the agenda, which has been covered under item 10 of the Technical Committee's report. I have the problem of deciding to whom to give the floor, Dr. McHugh or Mr. Setter.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): There is no problem, Mr. Chairman. I think Dr. McHugh should deal with this one.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I do have a problem, because the report of the Group of North Pacific Commissioners has not been approved by the Commissioners yet. It is now in their hands for approval, and I think that the appropriate wording to consider is the wording in the report of the

Technical Committee. I will be very glad to go over that briefly, if you like.

The Technical Committee looked at the scientific assessment of the condition of the North Pacific whale stocks and reiterated its recommendations made at the Honolulu meeting in February with the exception of the recommendation concerning fin whales. The recommendations concerning the other species were that the five-year prohibition on killing blue whales in the North Pacific be continued, that the prohibition on killing humpback whales be continued for another year -- that is for 1967 -- but the Group saw no need for any further regulations on sei or sperm whale stocks in the North Pacific because there is no evidence at the present time that either of these stocks has been over-exploited. With respect to fin whales, we were not able to reach complete agreement. We were attempting to find a means of getting the catch of fin whales below the sustainable yield by 1969, but we were not able to work out a mechanism for this purpose. We propose to carry on our work by an exchange of correspondence, hoping that we may be able to resolve the question, and possibly hold another meeting prior to the 1967 season.

I think that is the gist of the conclusions of the Special Group of the North Pacific Commissioners, Mr. Chairman, and that is the gist of the summary of our report that appears in the report of the Technical Committee.

/The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation). Thank you, ..

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

Well, Mr. Setter, what is the proposal of the Technical Committee?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, the Technical Committee, following a verbal report from Mr. McHugh, as Chairman of the North Pacific Group, endorsed the proposal of the North Pacific Group that there should be no change in the existing ban on the taking of blue whales in the North Pacific, and the ban on the taking of humpback whales should be continued in 1967.

I think that we should move that this be the recommendation of this Commission, and I would so move, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Setter. I give the floor to Dr. McHugh.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The United States will second that Motion.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Who is also in support of that proposal? The Japanese Delegation, the Norwegian Delegation, also Canada. Thank you, Gentlemen. Are there any objections? As there are no objections the recommendation of the Technical Committee is adopted.

Now let us consider item 12 of the Agenda, Land Stations. My understanding is that the decision taken by the Technical Committee on that item was included in its item 3 of the agenda. Are there any comments from the Technical Committee to the decision taken?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, the views of the Technical Committee are set out in the report on page 3 of the Technical Committee report, and the Committee has recommended that the Chairman of the Commission should get in touch with the Governments of Peru and Chile directly, or through the special organisation of the United Nations, in order to establish contact for adopting the necessary measures on the regulations of whaling from land stations.

We have had considerable discussion on this question of the catches being taken at the land stations in Chile and Peru, and the Technical Committee felt that some action should be taken in an endeavour to persuade those countries to conform to the regulations as set out under the International Whaling Convention, and particularly in respect of the protection for blue and humpback whales. So that I would, therefore, move that the Chairman contact those two countries with a view to reaching agreement on the regulations of whaling in those areas.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Setter. Are there any further comments, Gentlemen on the proposal of the Technical Committee? Nobody wishes to take the floor. Have you any other proposals? Then who will second the Motion of Mr. Setter?

(The Motion was seconded by the United Kingdom, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.)

Thank you, Gentlemen. Are there any objections? As there are no objections the Motion is carried.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): There was one other matter under this heading that the Technical Committee examined, and it was in connection with the Report of the special group on land stations, and the indication by the Commissioners from the United Kingdom and South Africa that they would be willing to continue to restrict whaling operations from the land stations under their control. I think that this Commission should make a recommendation

to those countries to carry out that intentions. Therefore I would move, Mr. Chairman, that a recommendation go to the Governments of the United Kingdom and South Africa, to continue to impose the voluntary limitations on the catches from their land stations.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Well, Gentlemen, is this proposal clear for all? If it is clear for all who seconds the proposal?

(The Motion was seconded by South Africa and the United Kingdom.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any objections to the Motion? There are no objections, so the proposal is carried. Thank you, Gentlemen.

Item 12 of the agenda, Economic studies of whaling regulations. I would like to remind you, Gentlemen, that at the Seventeenth Meeting the Scientific Committee recommended the establishment of a group of economists, who were experts in the field of the whaling industry, provided that such economists were not employed in the whaling industry at that time. Such a group of economists, experts in the types of problems in the whaling industry, but not currently employed in it, should be established to study whaling problems from an economic point of view.

This proposal was discussed at the Scientific Committee meeting, but without taking any decision they referred it to the Technical Committee, and the Technical Committee has taken a decision, under item 13, at page 8 of its report.

I wonder whether, Mr. Setter, you would wish to make any comments on that item.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, the Technical Committee considered this item and found it was not possible to reach any conclusions in the absence of any definite proposals regarding economic investigations into the whaling industry, and I think the general feeling of the Technical Committee was that this matter might be looked at by national groups, and that if a substantive proposal came before the Commission it would then be possible to examine it. But in the absence of such a proposal, the Committee found itself unable to reach any decision, so that the Committee recommends that the matter be dropped until such time as a substantive proposal is presented. As Chairman of the Committee, I would move.

(The Proposal was seconded by Dr. W.M. Sprules, Canada)

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I would like to second this motion, but I wonder if you would permit me just to speak to it for a moment. I think we all agreed last year that there would be benefits which might accrue if an economic assessment group could work with our technical experts with regard to the economics of whaling. As I pointed out in the Technical Committee discussions, Canada gave this very serious consideration, but we were unable to come up with any concrete proposal. I would just like to suggest that after the vote has been taken or after the indication has been received with regard to the wishes of all of the member nations concerning this motion which is before us, I wonder if consideration could be given by the Commission to asking F.A.O., because of their particular competence and experience in dealing with the economics of fisheries matters, if they would be willing to look into this matter for us. Perhaps they could at some time come up with a proposal that the Commission might give consideration to.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): What is Mr. Holt's opinion on that matter?

Mr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Mr. Chairman, if the Commission so desires, I think F.A.O. could accept that invitation, bearing in mind the limitations of data available for making any studies. It would fit in very well with some current activities which perhaps I should mention: the recent first session of the newly established F.A.O. Committee on Fisheries in examining items for possible consideration in future has decided to consider or pay some attention at its meeting next year to the economic effects of fishery regulations; and the Secretariat of F.A.O. have an obligation to prepare background papers for that discussion. I think it would be possible to prepare at the same time a working document or a proposal, if that is the intention of this Commission, which could be subsequently submitted to the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So we have two proposals now: the first proposal is to delete the matter from discussion until it is put into some concrete form, and this is the proposal of the Technical Committee. The second proposal put forward by Dr. Sprules is for the Commission to raise this problem with the F.A.O. and ask them whether they can assist us in achieving the solution of this problem. Is my understanding of these proposals correct?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I seconded Mr. Setter's proposal that this Commission accept the recommendation of the Technical Committee on this matter, and I would suggest that there should be a decision made on this. Once that decision has been made, Canada would be prepared to propose as a motion the proposal which you have just outlined so adequately for me.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation): Mr. Setter, would you object if we discussed the proposal put by Dr. Sprules?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): No, not at all, I will second Dr. Sprules' proposal, if you really want to complicate it.

Mr. I.F. DENISENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, may I ask Mr. Holt of F.A.O. a question? It concerns the financial aspects in settling this matter.

Mr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Mr. Chairman, if I understood the question correctly, I think the answer is that F.A.O.'s services would be free in this regard.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you for that clarification for the benefit of Mr. Denisenko. Dr. Sprules' proposal has been seconded by Mr. Setter; who else is supporting the proposal? The delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union support it. Are there any objections to it? If not, the proposal put by Dr. Sprules is carried. (Agreed)

Let us proceed to discuss item 13 of our agenda, Infractions. The Technical Committee appointed the Infractions Sub-Committee, and has taken certain recommendations under item 4. Does Mr. Setter wish to make any comments?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I think there are no recommendations arising out of that. The Sub-Committee drew attention to certain developments which had also been noted by the Scientific Committee, and I think there are no recommendations arising out of the Report of the Infractions Sub-Committee.

/The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, ...

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

Gentlemen, are you all aware of the recommendation of the Technical Committee and the Infractions Sub-Committee? May I take it that you are acquainted with that Report? If so, I should like to ask for a seconder for the motion from the Technical Committee.

(The proposal was seconded by Dr. W.M. Sprules of Canada)

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I am very familiar with the Infractions Sub-Committee's Report.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Who else wishes to support this?

(Also supported by USSR, UK, South Africa and USA)

There are no objections? Then the motion, being agreed unanimously, I should like to propose that we have a tea break.

(The meeting adjourned at 3.06 p.m.
and reconvened at 3.45 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, may I have your attention? I should like to propose that we proceed with the discussion of the sub-items of agenda item 17. the Amendments to the Schedule. As you know, all the proposals dealing with amendments to the Schedule are to be considered by the Technical Committee. Thus, we are dealing now only with amendments proposed by the Technical Committee and the Technical Committee will give the precise wording of each recommendation of amendment to the Schedule.

The first amendment is concerned with Paragraph 5 of the Schedule, the Position of the Sanctuary. The Technical Committee's opinion is given in item 8 of its Report. I should like to ask Mr. Setter to give us the wording of their proposal.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): The Technical Committee considered that there was no need to change the position regarding the Sanctuary, and therefore we have not offered any change of wording. The proposal is that there be no change in the Schedule so far as the Sanctuary is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Setter. Who supports this proposal?

(The proposal was seconded by Japan)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Dr. Mackintosh, would you please take the vote on that amendment to the Schedule.

The ACTING SECRETARY: The proposal is that no action should be taken to close the Sanctuary, that it should be kept open in the season 1966/1967.

Argentina	Not present
Australia	Yes
Brazil	Not present
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Yes
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Yes
Mexico	Not present

Netherlands	No vote
New Zealand	Yes
Norway	Yes
Panama	Not present
South Africa	Yes
USSR	Yes
USA	Yes
UK	Yes

Agreed unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The motion was....

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The motion was carried unanimously by the Commission.

We will proceed now to paragraph 6(4) of the Schedule -- Humpback whaling in North Pacific after 1966 season. This problem was discussed at the meeting of the North Pacific Commissioners under the chairmanship of Dr. McHugh, and with Commissioners Fujita, Sprules and Sukhoruchenko present. The proposal, which was included as a part of the recommendations concerning the North Pacific whaling operations, was referred to the Technical Committee.

Who would like to comment on that proposal?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): The Technical Committee endorsed the recommendation of the North Pacific Group, and it was proposed therefore that paragraph 6(4) of the Schedule be amended to read:

"It is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill humpback whales in the North Pacific ocean and its dependent waters north of the equator during the 1967 season."

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Before I second the motion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question. I suppose that it is not necessary to say, "during the 1966 and 1967 seasons", because the present Schedule applies to the 1966 season?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): As the amendments to this Schedule will not come into force until 90 days after this Meeting, I think this position will be covered, if that is satisfactory to Dr. McHugh.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): My understanding is that Dr. McHugh is seconding the motion of the Technical Committee.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I will then ask Dr. Mackintosh to take a vote on that amendment of the Schedule.

The ACTING SECRETARY: The proposal is to alter item 6, paragraph 4 of the Schedule by changing the word "1966" to 1967".

Australia	Yes
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Yes
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Yes
Mexico	Not present
Netherlands	No vote
New Zealand	Yes
Norway	Yes
South Africa	Yes
USSR	Yes
USA	Yes
UK	Yes

The motion is carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.

Let us proceed to Paragraph 7(a) of the Schedule - Opening of Antarctic pelagic baleen season. A decision on this matter was given by the Technical Committee under item 5 of its Report. Would Mr. Setter like to comment on this?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I would suggest that we take both these items together, the question of the opening date and the closing date, because the Technical Committee has dealt with these two together, and to date their recommendation is that there be no change. Thus, so far as the opening date and the closing date is concerned, there is no amendment to the Schedule.

There is one other item: Deletion of words "and no such whale catcher shall be used for the purpose of killing or attempting to kill blue whales before 14th February in any year." The Technical Committee also considered this matter, and agreed that these words should be deleted. Therefore, the proposal is now to amend the Schedule to delete these words.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): You are a little bit in a hurry, Mr. Setter. You see, according to the Rules of Procedure, we have to adopt and vote on each amendment separately.

The ACTING SECRETARY: The proposal

I am a formalist, so I cannot get away from that rule. I am putting to the vote the proposal concerning the opening of the Antarctic pelagic baleen season.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

In connection with the opening of the baleen season, the Technical Committee has recommended no change.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Setter. Who will second this Motion?

(The Motion was seconded by the Japanese and Soviet Delegations)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Dr. Mackintosh, would you please put to the vote the recommendation of the Technical Committee, seconded by the Soviet and Japanese Delegations.

The ACTING SECRETARY: The Motion is, there should be no change in the opening date of the Antarctic pelagic baleen season, as specified in paragraph 7(a) of the Schedule.

Australia	Yes
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Yes
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Yes
New Zealand	Yes
Norway	Yes
South Africa	Yes
USSR	Yes
USA	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes

The Motion is carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Gentlemen, the Motion is carried unanimously.

The second amendment is the deletion of the words, "and no such whale catcher shall be used for the purpose of killing or attempting to kill blue whales before 14th February in any year." That is in the same paragraph.

The decision of the Technical Committee on that matter is covered by item 6 of the report of the Technical Committee.

Mr. Setter, would you please give your comments on the decision taken by the Committee.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there is now open season for blue whales in the Antarctic, it was decided that these words should be removed and, therefore, I move that the words in paragraph 7(a) of the Schedule, after the word, "inclusive", be deleted.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Setter. Who will second the proposal.

(The Motion was seconded by Mr. I. Fujita of Japan)

Mr. Mackintosh, would you please put to the vote the proposed amendment.

The ACTING SECRETARY: The proposal refers to Paragraph 7(a) of the Schedule, and is to delete the words following "inclusive", which refer to the killing of blue whales before the 14th of February.

Australia	Yes
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Yes
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Yes
New Zealand	Yes
Norway	Yes
South Africa	Yes
USSR	Yes
USA	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes

That is carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So the amendment is agreed upon unanimously.

We now come to the next amendment, paragraph 8(d) of the Schedule, Closing date of Antarctic pelagic baleen season. The Technical Committee's decision is expressed under item 5 of the report. Mr. Setter has already informed the Commission that the decision was taken by the Committee to put no change in the closing date of the baleen season, that is for it to remain as the 7th of April. Am I right, Mr. Setter?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australi): That is right, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Who will second the Motion?

(The Motion was seconded by the Japanese Delegation)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Mackintosh, would you please put the proposition.

The ACTING SECRETARY: The proposition is for the 7th of April as the closing date for the Antarctic season.

Australia	Yes
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Yes
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Yes
New Zealand	Yes
Norway	Yes
South Africa	Yes
USSR	Yes
USA	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes

That is carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Gentlemen, the Motion was carried unanimously.

We are now proceeding to paragraph 8(a) of the Schedule, Blue whale unit catch limit in the Antarctic. I think there will be those wishing to give their comments on that item, and meanwhile I would like to ask Mr. Setter to give his comments on the decision taken by the Technical Committee and covered by item 3 of the Report of the Technical Committee.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, the Technical Committee discussed this item very fully, and there were two proposals submitted, the proposal of the Norwegian delegation that the catch limit for 1966/1967 should be 3,500 blue whale units, and the proposal submitted by the U.S.S.R. delegation that the catch limit for 1966/1967 should be 2,500 blue whale units, with an addition of not more than 300 blue whale units for land stations in the Antarctic. These proposals were put to the vote and the amendment proposed by the U.S.S.R. delegation was defeated, and the original proposal by the Norwegian delegation that the catch limit be 3,500 blue whale units was agreed by the Committee. Therefore the view of the Technical Committee was that the catch limit for 1966/1967 should be 3,500 blue whale units.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Does anybody wish to comment on that item?

Mr. I.F. DENISENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen, as is well known, at the meeting of the Technical Committee the Soviet Delegation put forward the proposal setting out the total whaling quota of 2,800 blue whale units for the Antarctic in the forthcoming season, 1966/1967.

/ We still think that.....

We still think that the Eighteenth Meeting of the Commission should adopt such effective measures as would actually guarantee the preservation of whales not only from depletion but would guarantee the rebuilding of the whale stocks in the shortest possible time. It will ensure permanent and profitable exploitation of whale stocks. So the Soviet Delegation is putting forward a proposal as an amendment moved by the Technical Committee that we should allocate a total quota for blue whales amounting to 2,800 blue whale units.

In connection with this, the Soviet Delegation proposes that the member countries of the Commission at this Eighteenth Meeting recommend their respective governments to reduce approximately by half the number of fleets engaged in Antarctic whaling in the 1966/1967 season in comparison with the last one. So the Soviet Delegation considers that such a level of catch limit in the Antarctic will be the most effective measure for the preservation of whale stocks and for their permanent and continued exploitation.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Does anybody wish to make any further comments on that item?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): In order to clarify matters from the point of view of the rules of procedure, I would like to ask one question of the Chairman: I wonder whether the Russian Delegation has made a proposal, and whether this new proposal has been seconded.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Fujita, I do not understand whether you are asking me this question as Chairman, or Mr. Denisenko.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): I am asking this question of you as Chairman, because in order to proceed with the discussion, we have to clarify whether this has been able to qualify as an item for discussion after it has been seconded or not.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation): I do not fully understand your question; I was not putting as a motion either the proposal itself or the amendment to it. We will take everything in due course, I would now like to give the floor to those who would like to comment on this item.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I understood that the Soviet Delegation has stated their opinion and not put a proposal, so I am not making any comment at this stage.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): My understanding was that the Soviet Delegation was moving it as an amendment to the proposal.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I am a little confused, if the Russian statement is to be established as a proposal, it must be seconded by some other delegation and after this I would like you to confirm whether this proposal or statement is seconded, thus enabling it to qualify as a proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Fujita, I would like to ask you to comment for the time being on the items put forward by the Chairman. There cannot be two Chairmen at one and the same time. Now a free exchange of opinion is taking place so the Soviet Delegation expressed a viewpoint. If you would like to express yours, you are welcome. When it comes to voting, in the first place the amendment will be voted on, then the amendments made previously, and then the motion of the Technical Committee, as is the case of all motions. Now I am just asking for your comments, and if anybody wishes to make any comments they are welcome.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I do not yet fully understand what you have said, but I should like to keep silent for the time being so that I can listen to the statements or comments to be made by other delegations.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Does anyone wish to comment on our proposals, so that we can have an expression of opinions.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): In order that we may be able more fully to understand the unseconded Soviet proposal, could any of the Assessment Group tell us what would, in effect, happen if the 1965/66 fleet strength were reduced by one half, and what this would mean in terms of estimated catch of whales in the Antarctic next year.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): In that case, I should like to ask Mr. Gulland or Mr. Holt to answer that question if possible, and if they do not object to it.

Dr. Sprules, in other words, I understand your question to be: what effect will it have on the whale stocks if the smaller quota were adopted. Am I right?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I am looking for clarification. I am afraid I am a little confused about what is happening; but it seemed to me that the Soviet delegation made a proposal for our consideration. I do not recall that the proposal was seconded, but you have made a decision that we can freely discuss this. My difficulty is that I thought the Soviet proposal was that the blue whale unit catch for the Antarctic area next season be 2,800 blue whale units, and that the fleet size be reduced for all Antarctic nations to one half of the size that operated in the last season. If that is, in effect, the Soviet proposal, in order for me to make a decision as to whether I have comment or not I should like to know from the Assessment Group what a 50% reduction in effort would mean with regard to the actual catch of whales.

First of all, is my impression of the Soviet proposal correct? Does the Soviet proposal contain 2,800 blue whale units plus a 50% reduction in fleet size for all nations?

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I understand this is a question for the Soviet delegation.

Mr. I.F. DENISENKO (USSR)(Interpretation): The Soviet proposal is that there be a catch limit estimated as 2,800 blue whale units, and a reduction of marine by half.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So my understanding is that you are proposing a global quota as being at the level of 2,800 blue whale units, including up to 300 blue whale units for land stations, and up to 2,500 blue whale units for pelagic fleets; and, at the same time, you are proposing to reduce the number of pelagic fleets engaged in whaling operations to make it half as much. Is my understanding right? Thank you. We should like to hear Mr. Gulland's remarks.

Mr. J.A. GULLAND (United Kingdom): So far as the difference between a pelagic quota of 2,500 and the effect of halving the number of expeditions is concerned, it is rather difficult to say precisely what the difference between the two would be. Last year the expeditions operating took just over 4,000 units, though some of these expeditions did finish operations before the end of the season. But, assuming their operating catches are the same rate as last time, last season, presumably at a first approximation we would suppose that half the number of expeditions would take approximately 2,000 units. It is possible however that the more

effective expeditions would operate, so it is quite likely that half the number of expeditions would take somewhere quite close to the 2,500 blue whale units proposed as the alternative suggestion.

What the effect on the stocks would be, I would have to repeat the point put forward by the Scientific Committee: that a lot will depend on whether these blue whale units are taken in terms of fin whales or sei whales or a mixture of both. The stock at the end of next season, at this time next year, will be in a better state if these blue whale units are taken purely as sei whales, than if some fin whales are also taken.

If you wish me to compare the results of this 2,500 unit quota with the 3,500 unit quota, it is difficult to compare with great precision. What we can say quite certainly is that there will be more whales left, and also the sustainable yield from the combined fin and sei whale stocks for the 1967/1968 season will be higher, if only 2,500 are taken next season, than if 3,500 are taken. This, of course, will have a bearing at our next meeting when there is the firm commitment to come down to below the combined sustainable yield.

I think that is all I can say at the moment.

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

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Gulland, for a very detailed and precise explanation.

Dr. Sprules, is that satisfactory?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, yes.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I should like to ask whether anyone else wishes to comment. If not, then we have the motion of the Technical Committee before us. They are recommending that the total quota should be fixed for the forthcoming season at the level of 3500 blue whale units. The Soviet delegation put forward an amendment to that proposal, that the catch limit should be at the level of 2800 blue whale units, including up to 300 for the land stations. It was further put forward in the Soviet amendment that there should be a decrease in the fishing effort to approximately a half. This would be achieved by a reduction in the number of whaling fleets to be sent to Antarctic waters. Both the proposal and the amendment have been clearly stated.

According to the Rules of Procedure, I must now ask for a seconder for the proposal put forward by the Technical Committee.

(The proposal was seconded by Norway)

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): I should like to second the proposal moved by the Technical Committee that the catch limit should be set at 3500 blue whale units. However, before this motion is put to the vote, I think we should have precise wording for the sentences which are to be voted upon. I should, therefore, like to confirm with Mr. Setter, who was chairman of the Technical Committee, and with Mr. Knudtson, the leader of the Norwegian delegation, whether the following sentences which I am going to read express the recommendations of the Technical Committee which Mr. Knudtson has seconded.

The Schedule, article 8(a), should read as follows:

"The number of baleen whales taken during the open season, caught in waters south of 40° south latitude, by whale catchers attached to factory ships under the jurisdiction of the contracting Governments, shall not exceed 3,500 blue whale units in 1966/1967. The total catch for 1967/1968 shall be less than the combined sustainable yield of the fin and sei stocks as determined on the basis of more precise scientific evidence."

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Will Mr. Setter please confirm that?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Those words cover the recommendation of the Technical Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The proposal of the Technical Committee has been seconded by the Norwegian and Japanese delegations.

Mr. I.P. DENISENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): We should like our proposal to be considered as an amendment to the proposal put forward by the Technical Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The Soviet delegation wishes its proposal to be considered as an amendment to the proposal of the Technical Committee. Will someone second the motion of the Soviet delegation? It appears that no one wishes to second that proposal, and we have therefore to vote upon the proposal put forward by the Technical Committee and seconded by the Norwegian and Japanese delegations.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I am afraid that once again I have become confused. If what Mr. Fujita just said is indeed the agreement reached in the Technical Committee with regard to changing the wording of paragraph 8(a), I think I shall have to vote against the motion. The reason for this is that, as the interpretation of Mr. Fujita's statement came through to me, there was an alteration made which I consider to be a very significant one in the agreement reached at last year's annual meeting. When we look at paragraph 8(a) as it reads now, we reached a decision last year that we should be considering yields based on more precise scientific information for 1966/1967 and 1967/1968. If we take Mr. Fujita's amendment to this, I read it then that we must have more precise information, since the word was changed to "shall", and also it then refers only to 1967/1968.

/I am not sure

I am not sure if I have got that through very clearly in my own mind, it came too suddenly. But I think there is something rather significant here, and I would like to have the opportunity to assure myself that this is exactly what we did agree to in the Technical Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Fujita, would you like to make clarification?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan):(Interpretation): I would like to explain concerning the question put forward by Dr. Sprules of Canada. I feel that my proposal has been in entire agreement with what was discussed at the Technical Committee. After the first part of the sentence I have just replaced the number of 4,500 with the number 3,500, and we have replaced the words 1965/1966 with the words 1966/1967. I have made just two alterations to the previous provision.

As to the second paragraph in the previous Schedule, concerning 1966/1967, we have determined the level to be 3,500; then we have omitted the paragraph. We have just omitted this year, and we have made no alteration to the previous provisions. Therefore I do not think there has been any change made in the meaning of the provision. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Dr. Sprules, are you satisfied with the explanation of Mr. Fujita?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, may I try to use an example of my problem, and perhaps Mr. Fujita could help me. We are about to make a decision on a reduction of the blue whale unit catch for 1967/1968, in line with the agreement reached last year.

Let me put it this way: since last year we have obtained more precise scientific evidence with regard to sustainable yields, so the agreement that we reached last year has been well considered. My question is, if we did not obtain any more precise scientific information before the next annual meeting, would we, in fact, be able to agree on a sustainable yield, or is the sustainable yield to be accepted by this Commission dependent on the obtaining of more precise scientific information, which we have obtained this year, and which we may or may not obtain next year?

My difficulty is this, that we made a commitment last year which is recorded in the Schedule, and as soon as we change very many things in that section of the Schedule it no longer clearly outlines the original commitment that we made last year. I am not sure this is significant, Mr. Chairman, it is just, as I have said, I am rather confused, and I am wondering if anyone can help me.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, I hope I can help Dr. Sprules by my comments. I realise for the first time what is bothering Dr. Sprules, and it seems to me that we will have more precise scientific evidence next year, after the end of next year's season, because we will have one more year of data provided by the scientific observations made during the 1966/1967 season. So that it would appear to me that there is ample assurance that we will have a better determination of what the sustainable yield is at that time. I do not find any cause for concern here myself. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. McHugh. Frankly, speaking, I am also worried, as is Dr. Sprules, and I would like to request information from the Scientific Committee, because I understand the recommendations of the Scientific Committee are as follows.

They are considering the sustainable yield as varying from 3,000 blue whale units to 3,500 blue whale units; that would indicate that the 3,500 blue whale units is not the better solution. As far as I understood the scientific opinion on fin whales, some opinions were in favour of prohibiting the taking of fin whales at all. Thus I would like Dr. Chapman and Mr. Holt to clear the situation up for us.

Mr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether I can clarify the situation; I will not refer to the question of a ban on fin whaling because I think this was not a matter of precision in estimation, but merely a suggestion for a practical procedure which the Commission did not find to be practical.

Specifically, with regard to the question of precision, speaking for the F.A.O. Assessment Group, I think we would lie somewhere between Dr. Sprules' fears and Dr. McHugh's lack of fear. If I may explain on the basis of our assessments this year, it is a fact, I think, that the assessments of the fin whale stock, that we have given this year, are more precise than those which we gave last year. This is because the Joint Working Group meeting in Seattle made an analysis of marking data which confirmed essentially the previous assessments. We therefore feel more sure for that reason of our fin whale assessments. Suppose, however, that we had not had the evaluation of marking data, it would then be true that our fin whale assessment for this year would be updated from last year, but would not have been more precise because, as we said in the report presented to this Commission, the data on catch and effort for fin whales added no new information with which to improve the estimates. All we could do was to update the estimates.

With regard to the sei whale, we have, I am sure, got a more precise estimate of the sei whale stock this year than we presented last year; the addition of one more year of intensive whaling on the data has added considerably to our knowledge, and we would have the verbal report from the Japanese scientists which give results falling within our range of estimates. So we have an estimate of the sei whale stock which is certainly more precise than last year. I think it is probably true, perhaps almost certainly true, that the estimate of sei whale stocks which will be presented next year will be more precise than that which has been presented this year, but because of the unpredictability and difficulty of interpretation of the changes of whaling effort as between the fin and sei whales, I think we cannot say for certain that the estimates of both the fin and the sei whale stocks or either the fin or sei whale stocks will necessarily be more precise next year than they have been this year. We cannot guarantee that.

Of course, what we will do is to ensure that they are as precise and updated. I hope that I have made that position clear, but it may be that the Chairman of the Scientific Committee will wish to add to that.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Does Dr. Chapman wish to add anything?

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, I think I would agree more or less with Mr. Holt, and I think in view of what he has said it will certainly be true that the combined yield of the fin and sei stocks will certainly be more precise next year, the estimate will be more precise than it is this year. In view of the additional data that will be forthcoming from the analysis of catch data, the analysis of marking data studies made by the national groups of which we heard in particular of the study Japan is going to undertake, there is no doubt in my mind as far as the estimate of the combined yields of fin and sei stocks is concerned, they will be more precise this time next year.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I am prepared for the question; I am satisfied with the explanations and am ready to vote on the amendment as proposed by Mr. Setter and seconded by the Japanese delegation.

Mr. I.F. DENISENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen, the Soviet delegation, to its great regret, did not receive support from other member countries. I would like to draw your attention to the report of the Scientific Committee concerning the assertion that the Commission should consider studying quotas sufficiently below the level of the sustainable yield. Of course, we cannot ignore the recommendation of our scientists; as we can see from the scientific report on page 7, paragraph 3, it says that the Committee recommends that the Commission should consider taking quotas sufficiently below the level of the sustainable yield so that fin whale stocks can begin to rebuild, rather than to be simply maintained at the present low level.

As you can see, the Soviet amendment to the proposal moved by the Technical Committee is quite in line with the recommendation made by the scientists, and we see no danger in decreasing the quota which was proposed by the Soviet delegation, and it is of less danger than those proposed by the Technical Committee. The Soviet delegation would like once again to appeal to the member countries to second the Soviet proposals.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The Soviet delegation is appealing once more with its request for a seconder to its amendment aimed at a faster rebuilding of the whale stocks. There seems to be no seconder.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): Mr. Chairman, the position of Norway with regard to the quota problem is the following: at the Special Session in May, 1965, Norway proposed a three-year global quota corresponding to the estimates of the scientists which were 4,000, 3,000 and 2,000 blue whale units for the seasons 1965/1966 to 1967/1968.

At the Seventeenth Session Norway supported the proposal of 4,500, particularly in view of the difficulties for the industry in one of the participating countries. This year we would have preferred a quota of 3,000 units. For the same reasons, however, as last year, we proposed in the Technical Committee a similar increase of 500 units to 3,500 units, corresponding to the upper limit of the estimated maximum sustainable yield in the Antarctic. There is reason to believe that the catch in the Antarctic in the coming season will be carried out by only pelagic expeditions. Moreover, it is likely that the pelagic expeditions will concentrate their activities on sei whales in 1966/1967 as they did last season. In that case, the exploitation of the fin whale stock may be below the maximum sustainable yield of that stock also in 1966/1967.

At the Twelfth and subsequent Sessions the Commission has stressed that effective restrictions on the total catch depend on the co-operation between the nations actively engaged in pelagic whaling in the matter of quota distribution. I should like to quote from the resolution, Resolution II:

- "Having regard to
- (a) the importance of taking all necessary measures for conserving the stocks of whales and in particular the need that the total catch of whales in the Antarctic should be limited in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention, and in the light of the best scientific assessment of the need for conservation,
 - (b) the fact that effective action for these ends depends upon co-operation between the five Antarctic pelagic whaling countries both as regards the sharing of the total catch and as regards the introduction of an international system of inspection in accordance with the amendment of Article 5 agreed to in the protocol of November, 19th, 1956"

At the Special meeting in May, 1965 and at the Seventeenth Session in June last year, the Norwegian Commissioner emphasised the necessity of a new quota agreement, and stated, I quote,

"The acceptance by Norway of a three-year global quota was based on the assumption that the quota agreement be established for the seasons 1966, 1967 and 1968."

I refer in this connection to document IWC, SM, 11. I can only repeat this declaration at this session.

Unfortunately, negotiations in Tokyo and in London have not so far led to a new quota agreement, neither for the coming nor for future seasons. If the talks presently going on should fail to produce the desired result, the Norwegian Government intend to take such steps as authorised to it under the provisions of the Convention, Having read this, Mr. Chairman, we are also prepared to vote. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Knudtzon. Although I do not fully understand what connection there is between the distribution of national quotas and the establishment of the total quota.

Can we vote on the Technical Committee's motion?

Mr. I.F. DENISENKO (USSR)(Interpretation): Mr.Chairman, Gentlemen, the Soviet delegation expresses its regret that their proposal to amend that motion moved by the Technical Committee has not been seconded and the situation now appears very complicated. The Soviet delegation will, therefore, vote in favour of the first proposal.

Our understanding is that if this proposal is rejected no quota will be set and the quota of 4500 units will remain. This will be much worse for everybody. We are, therefore, compelled to vote in favour of the proposal moved by the Technical Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): If there are no further comments I will put the Technical Committee's motion, which has been seconded by the Japanese and Norwegian delegations, to the vote. I will ask Dr.Mackintosh to read the wording and to put the motion to the vote.

The ACTING SECRETARY: The proposed alteration to paragraph 8 (a) will make it read as follows:-

"The number of baleen whales taken during the open season caught in waters south of 40° south latitude by whale catchers attached to factory ships under the jurisdiction of the Contracting Governments shall not exceed 3,500 blue whale units in 1966/1967. The total catch for 1967/1968 shall be less than the combined sustainable yields of the fin and sei whale stocks as determined on the basis of more precise scientific evidence."

Argentina	Not present
Australia	Yes
Brazil	Not present
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Yes
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Yes
Mexico	Not present
Netherlands	Not present
New Zealand	Yes
Norway	Yes
Panama	Not present
South Africa	Yes
USSR	Yes
USA	Yes
UK	Yes

The motion is carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation) The proposal of the Technical Committee has been adopted unanimously, and the total catch limit is therefore fixed at the level of 3500 blue whale units.

We will proceed now to other amendments. Sub item (f) is the "Provision for restriction of the catch of sperm whales". The Technical Committee's decision on this subject appears under item 11. I should like to ask Mr. Setter to comment on that proposal.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): The Technical Committee considered the question of sperm whale stocks and examined the recommendations of the Scientific Committee. There is no proposal to recommend any changes to the Schedule in respect of sperm whales, but there are certain proposals for continuing the work of examining the stocks of sperm whales, and these proposals are set out in the report. I think that they need to be submitted to this Meeting for endorsement.

There has been general agreement on the continuation of the assessment work, and it is proposed that the assessment work should also cover sperm whale stocks. The Scientific Committee expressed the need for additional marking of sperm whales, and this was endorsed by the Technical Committee.

The Scientific Committee also considered that studies to ensure standardisation of age readings for sperm whales should be initiated or continued where those studies are taking place, and arrangements were made in the Scientific Committee to co-ordinate this work. This is supported by the Technical Committee.

On the question of the taking of entire schools of sperm whales under special permit for scientific studies, it was recommended that the proposal of the Scientific Committee that this should be encouraged should be supported by the Technical Committee.

The proposal by the Scientific Committee, that the biological data for sperm whales which was being collected on the forms SP/1 to SP/6 should be submitted as soon as possible to the F.A.O. Assessment Group, and that in future such data should be submitted annually, and that such data should be available for exchange between national groups on request, was also supported by the Technical Committee.

I would recommend to this session that these proposals be endorsed.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Can we have a seconder for Mr. Setter's proposal?

(The proposal was seconded by Dr. W.M. Sprules of Canada.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Is there any necessity to take a vote on these proposals? May I take it that we are all agreed that no vote is necessary? These proposals are not enforcing any amendments to the Schedule. (Agreed)

This proposal has been seconded by Dr. Sprules. Is there any objection? Since there is no objection, that proposal has been adopted unanimously.

We will proceed to sub item (g) of item 17 -- "Provision for restriction of the catch of whales in the North Pacific", and, "Provision for restriction of the catching season in the North Pacific". The recommendation of the Technical Committee is under item 10. Mr. Setter?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): We have already covered the position regarding the blue and humpback whales in the North Pacific. There was no proposal for a restriction on the taking of other species of whales and, therefore, there is no proposal to put forward at this time.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So that under the sub item, "Provision for restriction of the catch of whales in the North Pacific", this will mean that it concerns the humpbacks? My understanding is, Mr. Setter, that you are not proposing any amendment in your recommendations, but are just reporting the result of the meeting under the chairmanship of Dr. McHugh.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I think I am a bit lost and I shall have to sort this out. I was under the impression that we had already dealt with the question of blue whales and humpback whales in the North Pacific, and I do not know of any additional proposals.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I think that Mr. Setter is right. The Schedule as it stands takes care of the blue whale prohibition in the North Pacific. We have voted to amend the Schedule as it concerns humpback whales in 1967, and we have no further recommendations for quotas or other restrictions on whaling in the North Pacific at this time.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It seems that under paragraph 6(4) -- "Humpback whaling in North Pacific after 1966 season" -- we have already adopted the recommendation.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): That is correct. I thought I had made it clear, but perhaps I did not. I do not believe any further action is necessary as a result of the recommendations that came from the meetings of the North Pacific Commissioners.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Setter, is there any concrete proposal concerning that sub item?

/Mr C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman ...

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I think it might clarify the situation if I just outlined what action has been taken. Under Schedule Paragraph 4(b) it is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales in the North Pacific ocean and its dependent waters north of the equator for five years, beginning with the 1966 season.

The Technical Committee endorsed the recommendation of the North Pacific Group that this should be maintained and, therefore, it is not proposed that there should be any amendment to that item.

The Technical Committee also endorsed the recommendation of the North Pacific Group that the prohibition on the killing of humpback whales in the North Pacific should be continued during the 1967 season, and we did vote on the amendment to paragraph 6(4), which provides for the prohibition against killing or attempting to kill humpback whales in the North Pacific ocean and its dependent waters, which now reads, north of the equator, during the 1967 season. So those two items have been covered.

There were no other proposals for restricting the catch, nor for restricting seasons in the North Pacific, so there is no other action necessary, as far as amending the schedule is concerned.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Who is supporting the proposal of the Technical Committee, Gentlemen.

(The Motion was seconded by Dr. McHugh, U.S.A. and
Dr. Sprules of Canada)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Does anyone object to the proposal put forward by the Technical Committee? As there are no objections the proposal is adopted.

Gentlemen, the last sub-item is the provision for restriction of the catch of whales from land stations, sub-item (h). What are the recommendations of the Technical Committee on that subject?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I think there are three separate proposals or three separate modes of action that this session will have to take in respect to the catches at land stations.

The Technical Committee considered this and has offered a proposal which recommends that the Chairman - I think I mentioned this before - should write to the Governments of Peru and Chile, either directly or through the United Nations or its appropriate specialised agency, seeking the co-operation of those countries in the protection of the stocks of whales which are being exploited off those coasts. The proposal is that special attention should be drawn to the protection needed for blue and humpback whales. This was the proposal, I think, that was agreed earlier in the Session.

The other proposal was that the Governments responsible for operating the land stations in the southern hemisphere, and who offer a voluntary limitation of the catches, should be supported.

The other question was in relation to the protection of blue whales in the whole of the southern hemisphere. During the discussion on the whale stocks the South African Commissioner indicated his willingness to a proposal that the taking of blue whales should be prohibited in the whole of the southern hemisphere. At the present time blue whales are protected south of 40° south and humpback whales are protected in the whole of the southern hemisphere. The proposal was that the protection of blue whales should be extended to the whole of the southern hemisphere. There has been no specific amendment to the

Schedule of the Convention proposed for this meeting in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. However, the Technical Committee considered this point and thought that as it was unlikely there would be any objections to this proposal that the Commission might wish to take a decision on the matter at its present Session, which would mean waiving the Rules of Procedure in this case. But the Technical Committee thought this matter should go to the Plenary Session for consideration. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Actually there are no amendments to the Schedule to be put for voting.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): If the Commission decided to take action at this meeting it would mean an amendment to the Schedule, but as I pointed out there has been no notice given of such an amendment. My own personal view is that it would be competent for the Commission to make a decision like this at this particular meeting, but that is only a personal opinion.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, my understanding is that the proposed implementation of the ban for the taking of blue whales in the waters of the whole of the southern hemisphere cannot be taken as an amendment to the Schedule, but, of course, the Commission can take a decision which would be enforced. So I would like to ask for your support for the proposal put forward by the Technical Committee on the prohibition of taking of blue whales in the waters between the equator and the 40° south latitude.

/Who supports this proposal?

Who supports this proposal?

(The Proposal was seconded by Mr. B.V.D. De Jager of South Africa)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, I would like this proposal to be voted on. If there are no objections to that, Dr. Mackintosh would you take the vote?

The ACTING SECRETARY: We are now voting on the proposal that there should be a ban on the catching of blue whales between the Equator and 40° South latitude. This is not an amendment to the Schedule, but it is for the Commissioners to agree that it shall be adopted.

Australia	Yes
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Yes
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Abstain
New Zealand	Yes
Norway	Yes
South Africa	Yes
U.S.S.R.	Yes
U.S.A.	Yes
U.K.	Yes

The proposal is adopted, strictly speaking nem con, that is with none against and one abstention.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The proposal is carried with one abstention. Several delegations have asked me to finish our work today a little early; before meeting their demand, I would like to ask Dr. Chapman whether one hour is enough for him to finish the work of the Scientific Committee which is meeting at 9.00 tomorrow morning, or whether he would like the time of the meeting of the Plenary to be changed.

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (U.S.A.): One hour will be more than adequate, Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why the Plenary should not begin as scheduled at 10 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So tomorrow the Plenary Session will be at 10 o'clock. Thank you. Gentlemen, I bid you good night.

(The Meeting adjourned at 5.35 p.m.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

EIGHTEENTH MEETING

Session of Friday, 1st July, 1966

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

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Good morning, Gentlemen; may I call for your attention.

May I draw your attention to item 7 of the agenda, Report of the Scientific Committee. Dr. Chapman has already reported to the Commission about the results of the work of the Scientific Committee; shall we ask Dr. Chapman to take the floor again, or shall we limit our discussions to the information already given to us?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Unfortunately, Dr. Chapman had to leave as he had an early aeroplane reservation, and I suppose either Mr. Holt or Mr. Gulland will be speaking for him. I do not know, I thought he had made arrangements before he left.

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

Gentlemen, shall we then listen once more to the report of the Scientific Committee, or shall we limit ourselves to the information given in the first plenary session? What is your opinion, Gentlemen?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I think the report of the Scientific Committee should be taken as read. I do not know if you need a Motion to endorse the report.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Maybe Mr. Gulland would like to add something?

Mr. J.A. GULLAND (United Kingdom): I have very little to add, Mr. Chairman. First I should pass on the apologies of Dr. Chapman that he was unable to stay for this meeting. We did have this morning a short meeting to conclude our work, which was mainly concerned with, as it were, domestic matters, with the collection and reporting of statistics for the sperm whale data, which is an essential step towards our better understanding of the state of the stocks of this species, and we also re-elected Dr. Chapman as Chairman of the Scientific Committee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Would any of the Commissioners like to make any comments on the report?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, if it requires a formal Motion, I would be glad to second Mr. Setter's Motion that the report be adopted or that the report be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Dr. McHugh has seconded the Motion of Mr. Setter about the adoption of the report of the Scientific Committee. Does anybody object to that proposal? Having no objection the Motion is carried.

So we have adopted and accepted the report of the Scientific Committee at our plenary session, and on behalf of all the Commissioners present and myself I would like to express our gratitude to the Scientific Committee for the large scope of work carried out, which was very useful, and I would like to wish them further success in their work.

As far as Dr. Chapman is concerned, I would like to give him our best wishes in connection with his re-election as Chairman of the Scientific Committee.

Now I would like to draw your attention again to Item 14 of the agenda, the Report of the Technical Committee. Would Mr. Setter like to add something under that item?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I think that all the items considered by the Technical Committee have been brought back to this Plenary Session and considered, and there is only the need for us formally to adopt the Report, so I move that the Report of the Technical Committee be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, what kind of proposal or resolution would you suggest for the Report of the Technical Committee?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, I second the motion made by Mr. Setter that the Report of the Technical Committee be adopted.

(The proposal was seconded by the U.S.A. and Soviet delegations)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any objections to the proposal? If not, then the motion for the acceptance and adoption of the Report of the Technical Committee is carried. (Agreed) On behalf of all the Commissioners and myself I would like to express our gratitude for the work carried out by the Technical Committee and by its Chairman, Mr. Setter, because the findings and results of the discussions carried out in the Technical Committee meetings have made our work here in the Plenary Sessions much easier, and I am very grateful to Mr. Setter.

Now may we proceed with Item 15 of the agenda, the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee. If Mr. De Jager does not object, I would like to give him the floor for his comments.

Mr. B.V.D. De JAGER (South Africa): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Finance and Administration Committee met on three occasions and their Report was circulated as document IWC/18/14, and addendum LWC/18/2.

The Committee reviewed the statement of the income and expenditure for the financial year ended 31st May, 1966, and recommended the acceptance of the statement. The Committee also suggest to the Chairman of the Commission to request Panama under an item on the first page to pay their accumulated arrears. The estimates for 1966/1967 were drafted and it is clear that the Commission is being operated on minimal funds, leaving little or no scope for eventualities. The Committee noted the letter of the National Institute of Oceanography in relation to whale marking, and agreed to recommend the continuation of the contribution of £500. It was stressed that whale marking data played a vital role in the stock assessment work.

The Committee also reviewed the level of contributions from contracting governments and the consideration of an increase. The Committee therefore recommended the Commission to seek ways of increasing the income in order to put their finances on a sounder basis, and to ensure that the work is adequately provided for in the future. This could be done by a flat rate increase in contributions. The Committee understand, however, that some countries without whaling interests at the present time would wish to reserve their position if a general increase is proposed. The Commission might therefore like to consider the alternative of a pro rata increase in the contribution based on the level of their whaling interests, in order to cover the cost of assessments. This would entail restoration of the Extraordinary Budget in the accounts.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. De Jager. Are there any questions for Mr. De Jager?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Under the review of the level of contributions from contracting governments, Mr. Chairman, could I ask what amount of money the Committee considers is required to bring their financial status to a reasonable working level? How many dollars are we trying to find?

Mr. B.V.D. De JAGER (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer that to the Acting Secretary, Dr. Mackintosh.

The ACTING SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I am fully competent to answer this myself, I may have to pass the question on to Mr. Goldthorpe on my left. However, I think the position is approximately this: if we had either an increase of £50 again from each contracting government, or shall I say an average increase of £50 per government, we should be covered in our coming expenses provided we also have the outstanding contributions which are referred to on the first page of the Report, but perhaps I ought to consult Mr. Goldthorpe to see whether I am giving you correct information.

/Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman ...

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, while the secretariat are pondering this matter, I wonder if I could just reinforce the question that has been asked. Circulated with the report of the Finance Committee there is a statement, addendum IWC/18/2, with a table attached to it showing the estimate of income and expenditure for the year ending 31st May, 1967. If you look at the expenditure budgeted for, on the left hand side, you will see that, leaving out the estimated balance, the total is around £8,000. If you look at the incomes side, you see that the income from the sixteen contracting governments at the present rate of subscription is £5,600. This means, Mr. Chairman, that at the present time income is falling short of expenditure by about £2,400.

It seems to me that an increase in subscription of £50 would only increase the income by about £800, leaving a deficit of £1,600. While it is true that this could be met in the coming year by dipping into the balance, it is quite clear that the Commission will very soon become bankrupt at that rate. Unless we can see some prospect of decreasing expenditure in the following year, it seems to me that we may have to contemplate an increase in subscription of more than £50 or, alternatively, a reduction in expenditure.

There is no reason why we should increase the subscription all at one time, it could be done in two stages if necessary, but I do think the Commission needs to look very seriously at this statement of expenditure and income, and look perhaps more than just one year ahead at this moment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, there are two points I should like to make in support of the statement made by Mr. Tame.

First of all, I think there might be some misconception about the collecting of the outstanding contributions from Panama. If those contributions are paid, it will not make any difference to the financial position of the Commission because it will only mean that we will be able to pay our benevolent bankers, because that money has already been accounted for in the balance sheets. I would certainly stress, however, that very careful attention be given to the question of meeting the costs of the year's operations. When the estimate balance sheet is examined you will see that we are just using up all our reserves to meet the stock assessment work, and I recommend for serious consideration the proposal that the stock assessment work be financed by a special arrangement, and I think this is something to which we should give very careful consideration. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you. Until the secretariat have the problem quite clear, perhaps somebody else would like to take the floor.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I should like to support the suggestion made by Mr. Setter, the leader of the Australian delegation, to the effect that the item of stock assessment work should be excluded from this ordinary budget and should be shared by the acting countries concerned as an extraordinary budget. I think this suggestion will contribute to the solution of this question.

From a purely legal point of view, in this International Whaling Commission each participating country has one vote. Therefore, if each country is to exercise an equal part in the voting, it is reasonable that the costs should be shared equally by each country. Therefore, if the cost is shared unequally, frankly the question might arise that the voting should be weighted.

Although the legal interpretation is as I have stated it, in order to solve this question more easily I should like to support the suggestion made by Mr. Setter.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The United States is a member of several international fishery commissions and, if I remember correctly, it is not unusual that financial contributions be pro-rated in some way according to the level of interest that the country has in the fishery concerned. I am thinking particularly of the Inter-Americas Tropical Tuna Commission, where the United States pays a very large proportion of the total contribution, but has only one vote and usually gets out-voted because everybody else gangs up on us. So that I do not think that it is necessarily true that the amount of the contribution should determine the weight of the vote.

I might say that the United States is present at this Meeting with authorization to agree to a small increase in the contribution if it is considered necessary, but it appears to us that a proposal that would include something in the nature of a basic contribution, a contribution of the same amount that would be made by each country, and then an additional contribution which would bear some relationship to the interest of that country in the resource, would be a very logical way of handling this problem.

It seems to me that we should have some specific proposal, perhaps from the Secretariat, or if that is not possible at this Meeting perhaps it might be a good idea for the Chairman to appoint the Finance and Administration Committee for next year's Meeting at this time, so that that Committee might select a chairman and might then begin its work immediately, perhaps by correspondence, so that a complete and thorough review and a specific recommendation can be made at the latest at our annual meeting next year. It is obvious that the Commission cannot continue to operate at a loss; sooner or later we must come to grips with this financial problem. It does not seem to me that it is a very responsible action to have to deal with this question every year and to agree to small increases year by year which really do not take full account of the financial situation in which we find ourselves.

My proposal, therefore, is really a double one. First, we should attempt to develop a specific recommendation, through the advice of the Secretariat today, if we can. Failing that, I would suggest that you consider the advisability of appointing the Finance and Administration Committee now, so that it may begin its work for next year.

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

Dr. Mackintosh has a word to say.

The ACTING SECRETARY: I am sorry that we were not able to give a very clear answer to this question about how much more would be needed, but I can perhaps explain it in this way. It was a little complicated.

If you look at the revised estimates of income and expenditure for the coming year, that is IWC/18/2B(Revised), on the left you see expenditure totalling £8,152, and on the right there is the income. Contributions at their present level are £350, and the balance is £2,552. That means that, without extra contributions, and assuming that all the outstanding contributions are received, we would just cover ourselves, but we should use up all our last balances and be in a very unsatisfactory position.

Taking a realistic view, we cannot assume that all these outstanding contributions will come in, especially the large amount outstanding from Panama. Again, if we have all the outstanding contributions, including the Panamanian sum, and the contributions are put up by £50 all round, then we shall just be covered and put into a realistic financial position with a small balance in hand. If we write off the £1,488 outstanding from Panama, then we need a £150 increase on each contribution to put us on a realistic basis.

I hope that that explains the essential points and the essential requirements.

/The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you ...

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

Does anybody else wish to take the floor, Gentlemen? I understand there is nobody who wishes to speak.

Then I would like to propose that we take a resolution on that problem. The first proposal put forward by the Finance and Administration Committee is for us to approve the Provisional Balance Sheet for the financial year ended 31st May, 1966. What would be your opinion on that proposal? Have I put it clearly, that it is proposed to accept and adopt the report of the previous financial year?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I so move, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): There is a Motion from Dr. Sprules to approve that report, and the Soviet Delegation is seconding the Motion of Dr. Sprules. Does anybody object? (Agreed) We have accepted and approved the report for the last financial year.

We are now proceeding to the Balance Sheet for the forthcoming year, that is document IWC/18/2B. Mr. Setter proposes that we exclude from the expenditure the item for stock assessment work, and the Japanese Delegation seconded that Motion. Was my understanding right, Mr. Setter and Mr. Fujita?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Yes.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Is the proposal moved clear? Are there any amendments to that proposal? There are no amendments. Is anybody objecting to the Motion of Mr. Setter about excluding the stock assessment work item from the column of expenditure in the revised estimate of income and expenditure for the year ending 31st May 1967? I see that nobody objects to that proposal, so for the forthcoming year we will have two budgets, our ordinary budget and an extraordinary budget.

I consider this proposal as adopted, as there were no objections to the Motion, and it was also seconded. Thank you, Gentlemen.

Then we have a proposal by Dr. McHugh. Dr. McHugh, will you kindly repeat your proposal?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): If you will give me just a second to remember what I said, Mr. Chairman.

I think my proposal was this, Mr. Chairman, that first of all I suggested that perhaps the Secretariat could tell us specifically how much money was needed in order to bring us into balance with our costs, and I think Mr. Mackintosh did this.

The second part of my proposal was that if we could not completely resolve this problem at this meeting, then perhaps you might wish to appoint the Finance and Administration Committee for next year at this time, so that they would have a little more time in advance to give this matter some deep thought and prepare additional recommendations for action by the Commission next year. So that I think this is not really in the form of a Motion, but rather in the form of a suggestion, Mr. Chairman.

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

As I understood Dr. Mackintosh, he explained that it would be necessary to increase the contribution by £50 for each country in the case of Panama paying her accumulated arrears, and in the case of Panama not

paying, then the increase would be an amount of £150 for each country. Was my understanding right, Dr. Mackintosh?

The ACTING SECRETARY: I think that is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): And what proposal is to be moved for Motion, £50 or £150?

The ACTING SECRETARY: May I explain a little more; I think I have been dividing my attention a little bit between what is being said and clearing the situation with the Accounts. But I think that if the £2,250 on the expenditure side for stock assessment work is removed for separate consideration, then we should have enough without increasing contributions, but only if we still keep on the credit side the £884 balance from the extraordinary budget. Now if we were to restore the extraordinary budget for stock assessment work, etcetera, then that £884 should be on the credit side of the extraordinary budget. In that case, to cover ordinary expenditure, we should need the extra £50.

I do not know whether I have made myself clear, but our expected income would cover the ordinary expenditure, but not the stock assessment work.

/Dr. L.G. LAFITSKII (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation):....

Dr. L.G. LAFITSKII (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): The Soviet Delegation concludes that the expenditure on stock assessment work was excluded from the proposal moved by the Australian delegation and seconded by the Japanese delegation. In such a case, the Soviet delegation reserves its position.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It is not the right time to reserve it, but we will note it.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify what we are now discussing. I understand that Mr. Setter's proposal to exclude the item of stock assessment work from the Ordinary Budget, thus making it come under the Extraordinary Budget, has been approved. Therefore, what we are going to discuss from now on is firstly the question of the Extraordinary Budget and then the Ordinary Budget.

Therefore, we should consider the matter of the question of sharing the cost of the Ordinary Budget which is an amount of £2,250 less than the amount which is stated here. This new estimated expenditure is to be borne by the amount of the contribution by each country at the previous level; and so I do not think it necessary to discuss this question of the sharing of the Ordinary Budget. Then the question we have to decide is how to divide the Extraordinary Budget which amounts to £2,250 among the active whaling nations concerned. If those two questions are discussed, I do not think it will be necessary to revert to the argument as to whether we should increase our contribution either by £50 or by £150.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, I am always in a difficult position when I am asked as Chairman to advise you. I would like to propose the following: we will take a short break in order that the Finance and Administration Committee may prepare two estimates for us, one for the Ordinary Budget and one for the Extraordinary Budget. We should consider those; then besides that, as far as I know we have no single opinion on the division of the estimates and I would have to put this to the vote; this is how it stands, and we will now have an intermission in order to enable Dr. De Jager and his Committee, together with the Secretariat, to prepare two estimates for us for the Ordinary Budget and the Extraordinary Budget.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I agree with you entirely, but there seems to be one new aspect which has arisen as a result of the decisions taken, and that relates to the request that the assessment group carry on work related to sperm whale stocks of all the oceans. Therefore, I am sure that you are asking the Finance Committee, in considering the Extraordinary Budget, to give consideration to a formula which relates not only to Antarctic pelagic whaling countries, which was the old term of reference for the Extraordinary Budget, but also to those countries who will benefit from stock assessments related to sperm whales.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Sprules, I would like Mr. De Jager to note that proposal.

(The Meeting adjourned at 11.00 a.m.)

(The Meeting reconvened at 11.55 a.m.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, I should like to call you to order.

The Finance and Administration Committee has finished its work, but their estimate is being typed, so I think we will return to discussing that problem later on when the estimates have been typed and distributed.

We can now proceed to discussing item 16 on the agenda. Are there any objections to this proposal? There being no objections, I will draw your attention to item 16, Seventeenth Annual Report. I should like to remind you that the draft of the Seventeenth Annual Report prepared by the Secretary, Mr. Wimpenny, was circulated to you as paper IWC/18/5. I should like to ask Commissioners to give their comments or proposals concerning that report. If you wish, it is possible to make your comments paragraph by paragraph, and after that the report is to be approved formally. Does anybody wish to comment on the report? Am I to understand that there are no comments on that report? If there are no comments, what are your proposals, Gentlemen?

Dr. L.G. LAFITSKII (U.S.S.R.)(Interpretation): The Soviet Delegation proposes the adoption of this report without any amendments.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The Soviet Delegation has moved the acceptance and approval of the Seventeenth Annual Report without any amendments. Who will second the motion? (The motion was seconded by the United Kingdom and Australia) Are there any objections to the acceptance and approval of the report? As there are no objections, I consider that the report is accepted and approved by all sections.

I should like to proceed now to the consideration of item 18 of our agenda, Reports from Other Organisations. It is proposed that we consider the report of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific. The relevant paper to the report has been circulated as document IWC/18/8.

A meeting of the Permanent Commission was held in Lima in January, 1966, and it was attended by a representative of the Argentine Government on behalf of the International Whaling Commission. I should like to express our gratitude to the Argentine Commissioner, Mr. Marco, and we should like to hear his comments on that report.

Mr. A. von der BECKE (Argentina): The Commissioner, Mr. Marco, is not present for the time being, but if the Chairman wishes, Mr. Marco could come this afternoon and give his comments on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): What are the wishes of the Commissioners on this? Will it be necessary to have additional discussion? Or, since the report has been circulated previously, can we limit our discussion to comments on something which we already have? May I take it that you agree to discuss this question now without any additional information? Mr. Fujita supports that proposal, is there any objection to it? (Agreed) I should like, then, to hear your comments or remarks concerning that report.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): There are just one or two comments I should like to make in regard to this report from the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific. It has already been agreed that the Chairman should write to the Governments of Peru and Chile regarding the further protection of whales in the southern areas. I think that, in writing to those countries, reference should be made to the report of this Meeting, and some expression of appreciation made regarding the offer of the exchange of scientific information. Also, it might be appropriate to obtain full details of the measures that are adopted by those countries regarding the protection of whales under the Commission itself.

These are just one or two ideas I have that might be followed up when writing to Chile and Peru.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I should like just to refer to the decision we made yesterday when considering agenda item 10, under land stations. This decision was that the Chairman of this Commission should get in touch with the Governments of Peru and Chile in order to express our opinions with regard to possible assistance in regulating whaling in their area. It would seem to me that perhaps the proper avenue of approach would be to have the Chairman of this Commission contact the secretary of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific, rather than contacting directly the Governments of Peru and Chile. This would seem to me, personally, to be the proper approach. I would simply suggest that, if it is the consensus of opinion of this Meeting, the verbatim record should be amended accordingly, changing the reference to the Governments of Peru and Chile to a reference to the general secretary of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I am sorry, Dr. Sprules, you mentioned item 10 of the agenda, but I think it is item 11.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Specifically, Mr. Chairman, in the verbatim record of yesterday's Meeting I am referring to pages 27 and 50. There is a reference there to item 12 on the agenda, but I have not checked this. I believe it should be agenda item 11. There has been some error in the verbatim record.

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): I should like to support what Dr. Sprules has just said about the desirability of the Chairman of the Commission establishing contact with the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific. It seems to me that an approach from this Commission to the corresponding body is more likely to get a favourable reception than one to the individual countries.

The only slight correction I should like to make to Dr. Sprules' statement is that, as I understood the resolution that we passed yesterday, it did in fact leave this to the discretion of the Chairman of the Commission as to the method he should use in passing on the views of this Commission to these other

countries. The verbatim record, quoting Mr. Setter on page 27, said, "the views of the Technical Committee. . . and the Committee has recommended that the Chairman of the Commission should get in touch with the Governments of Peru and Chile directly, or through the special organisation of the United Nations,".

I had thought myself that this was not quite a complete quotation of the recommendation of the Technical Committee, because that recommendation did have in, after these words, "or by such other means as are appropriate". I thought it was that recommendation which we had, in fact, supported, and that therefore this left sufficient discretion to the Chairman of the Commission to use the most appropriate form of approach.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): I think that this is an important comment and a correct one. Dr. Sprules, do you agree with Mr. Tame?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Yes, I do.

/The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The proposal .

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The proposal was put forward by Dr. Sprules that the Chairman of our Committee should establish contact with the General Secretary of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific concerning the certain recommendations on whaling, and that proposal of Dr. Sprules was supported by Mr. Tame. Was my understanding right, Dr. Sprules and Mr. Tame? (Agreed)

Do any of the Commissioners object to that proposal? As there are none against, the proposal of Dr. Sprules is carried. Thank you, Gentlemen.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, what Mr. Tame was suggesting was, I think, that the verbatim record be amended to include the words that were contained in the report of the Technical Committee, and this does give the Chairman the authority from this Commission to contact through governments, through agencies of United Nations, or in any other way. I think Mr. Tame was proposing that we bring those words back in, with the understanding that this Commission would suggest that you might, as another way, contact the General Secretary of the Permanent Commission.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. Sprules. I fully agree with your understanding, and I would like to ask Dr. Mackintosh to make the necessary amendments to the verbatim report.

ACTING SECRETARY: May I say that on page 27 the words should be amended so as to bring in what the Technical Committee said on this point.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): And again in the discussion which starts on page 50.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you. So we have now finished with that problem, Gentlemen.

At this point I would invite the observers from other countries and organisations to make their comments or statements to the Commission if they wish to do so.

Mr. A.G. BOURNE (World Wildlife Fund): I would like to read a statement on behalf of the World Wildlife Fund and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.

We welcome the Commission's decision to reduce the pelagic quota to 3,500 blue whale units as a move in the right direction. We regret that the catch from the land stations has not been included. We would have preferred the lower discussed figure of 2,800 blue whale units, which would have included the land station catches.

We note with hope the recommendation that an approach should be made by this Commission to the governments of Chile and Peru, with a view to adopting the necessary measures on the regulation of whaling from land stations.

We welcome the decision to ban the killing of blue whales between the equator and 40° south latitude, thus giving complete protection to the blue whale in the southern hemisphere, also the decision to ask Chile and Peru to co-operate in this.

We welcome the decision that the ban on the catching of blue whales and humpback whales in the North Pacific is to continue, though we note with regret that the Commission failed to agree on a quota for the fin whale catch in that area.

We also regret that the Commission has once again failed to implement the International Observer Scheme, and note that the I.O.S. Agreement has terminated without being implemented. We therefore urge the Commission to put the International Observer Scheme, covering all whaling operations, into

operation as soon as possible.

Finally, we consider that some progress has been made, especially for the threatened blue and humpback whales, and that the decisions seem to be proceeding in the right direction.

Thank you.

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

Major W.N. SCOTT (Fauna Preservation Society): On behalf of the Fauna Preservation Society, I would like to be associated with the statement made by Mr. Bourne.

The Fauna Preservation Society is deeply conscious of the need not to exterminate our wild animals, both for aesthetic reasons and also for the valuable source of food which they supply. An ever-increasing human population and an ever-decreasing acreage on which to grow food necessitates thought on this matter. Human demand for animal protein is likely to increase and this cannot be completely satisfied by the adoption of a vegetarian diet nor with a reversion to cannibalism; apart from being unsocial, one's friends resent it!

Harvesting based on scientific advice, not only with regard to the numbers harvested but also with regard to the methods used, is preferable. With more research it might be possible to improve techniques of killing and increase the yield, both in meat and other products. Appropriate courses and training schemes on an international level, if established, might enable higher standards of gunnery to be worked out, and this would be the starting point.

I have to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the privilege of attending this meeting.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Major Scott.

Does anybody else wish to take the floor?

Mr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners.

I am indeed very grateful for the many opportunities that I have been given during these meetings, as in past meetings, to express the views of the Food and Agriculture Organisation on specific points which you have been discussing and to be able to co-operate with the Commission, especially in the provision of scientific advice to the Commission through its Scientific Committee.

I would ask again for your usual tolerance, Mr. Chairman, in making a few closing remarks. I am sure that my Director General and the F.A.O. Council, when it meets early next month, will learn with very great pleasure that the Commission has been able to reach agreement on an Antarctic baleen whale quota which, with luck, might even ensure that this year, in advance of next year, the present sustainable yield will not be exceeded or not much exceeded. It is a little disturbing that there is, in this respect, some reliance on luck; the luck of which species will be taken, the luck of what the land stations might take, and it was in an attempt to limit the reliance on luck that F.A.O. put forward a proposal to cease fin whaling in the coming season in the Antarctic.

I appreciate the reasons which have been given for the Commission's inability to accept this proposal, essentially on the grounds that it would not be economic to catch only sei whales next season. This may be so, and indeed I am not questioning that, but I do have to recall that some years ago the same reasons were given for not closing the capture of blue whales that it would be uneconomic only to go to the Antarctic to catch sei and fin whales.

From F.A.O.'s point of view, we believe that the essential need is to rebuild the stocks of whales, and we must favour proposals which would hasten this rebuilding. We understand very well the difficulties which the Commission and whaling nations have in accepting at this stage possibly even losses in the near future in order to obtain longer-term gains from whaling, but we do also have to remember that we are in this difficult position because of our own actions in the past, and they have been made worse by delaying action, for whatever reasons which seemed at the time good ones.

It is salutary to remember, as I have been reminded this week by some members of the Scientific Committee, that if the scientific advice had been acted upon, if it had been possible to act upon it when it was first given, the discussions this week would have centred round proposals for a quota of perhaps 7,000 or 8,000 blue whale units, not 2,500 or 3,500.

In the coming years, the F.A.O. Conference has said that it believes that no major source of food and especially of animal protein can be neglected, and the eyes of very many nations, developed and developing nations, are on the sea, on the oceans and what they promise. We know, however, now that the fulfilment of that promise depends on our ability to agree to utilise these resources rationally.

With respect to the whale stocks, after a long and sad history of over-exploitation in the Antarctic, last year this Commission took an extremely important and fundamental decision at least with respect to the baleen whales there. Last year was not, we believe, a turning point, but we all hope and think we have the right to expect that next year will be. It may be that then although it is late, it will not be too late to save at the eleventh hour and eventually to restore a once great industry. We know that there are many practical problems still to be solved, some of them crucial, and these problems are being met also in fisheries bodies which are concerned with the management of fish stocks. We have in mind especially three problems: the first of these is ensuring membership of the relevant international body by all participating and interested countries. This Commission has met that problem this week. The second problem which is concerning many organisations is the establishment of a climate of assurance in each country that all participating countries are in practice enforcing agreed regulations.

The third problem is the definition of a basis on which agreement can be reached regarding the national shares of total sustainable yields, again not only is it this Commission which is faced with this extremely difficult and fundamental problem. The F.A.O. Conference has said that it is believed that a more frank examination of some of the economic aspects of regulation might facilitate agreement on such matters.

These general questions will certainly occupy the F.A.O. Committee on Fisheries, the activities of which I referred to briefly yesterday. Meanwhile, the Conference of F.A.O. has been informed, and has approved the co-operation which has now been established, I think very firmly, between your Commission and my organisation. We shall do our very best successfully

to extend this co-operation in the coming year as the Commission has requested us in several instances, and especially to assist the Commission to reach a successful conclusion next year by submitting a clear and as far as possible precise statement of the facts concerning the state of the stocks.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Holt. Does anybody else wish to take the floor? If there are no other comments, I would like to express our gratitude to the observers from other organisations represented here who have made speeches at our Plenary Session.

Gentlemen, you have been provided with the revised estimate which has just been circulated, and my understanding is that you need some time in which to become thoroughly acquainted with it. This is why I am now declaring the Plenary Session closed until 2 p.m. in order that we may come together at that time to discuss the revised estimate and approve it. I hope you have a good lunch and a thorough investigation of the estimate.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I could propose that we should resume the Plenary Session at 2.30 instead of at 2 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Is it very important for your delegation? (Mr. Fujita nodded assent) Then let us resume at 2.30.

(The Meeting adjourned at 12.30 p.m.)

(The Meeting reconvened at 2.30 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, I should like to call the session to order, and we will continue our work.

At the plenary session which took place in the morning Mr. Scott, an observer from the International Society for the Protection of Animals, was absent, but he is here now. Would he like to take the floor?

Mr. T.H. SCOTT (International Society for the Protection of Animals): Yes, I would, please.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the International Society for the Protection of Animals, may I first of all thank the Commission for allowing a purely animal welfare organisation to be present once again this year at the meetings of the Commission.

Naturally, animal welfare interests throughout the world are following very keenly the progress of the working of the Commission, because our terms of reference must, of necessity, include conservation. Having said that, I should like to make reference to a letter that we in the International Society have presented to the Acting Secretary, Dr. Mackintosh, relative to what we believe might be a means of alleviating some of the distress and some of the cruelty aspects of whaling. I believe possibly brief mention of this was made this morning by Major Scott. My organisation would very much like the Commission to consider whether it might be possible for a training scheme to be implemented under the auspices of the International Whaling Commission in order that gunners on whalers in particular should not embark upon expeditions entirely without experience. Indeed, we would go further than this and say that it is our hope that they would embark upon expeditions being relatively skilled. We do not suggest for one moment that in many instances this is not already the case, particularly with personnel who have been on whaling fleets for many years, but we do quite seriously suggest that this would not only help curtail the overall amount of suffering in the industry by having accurate and experienced operators all the time, but it would also have economic advantages to the industry.

It is with these thoughts in mind that we express the further hope that possibly the financing of such a training scheme might emanate from the industry itself. This might be a pious and somewhat optimistic hope, but I think at this stage one could say there are animal welfare interests which would also be interested in going along with any properly approved and accepted scheme by the Commission.

I thank you, Sir, for your interest. That concludes the statement on this subject.

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

We have heard item 18 of the agenda, and I am now able to return to item 15, the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee. You have received a revised copy of the estimate of income and expenditure which is separated by ordinary budget and extraordinary budget, and I hope you had time to study it. Nevertheless, I should like to ask Mr. De Jager, as well as Dr. Mackintosh, whether he would like to make any comments on that estimate.

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (Acting Secretary): Just before we go any further, Mr. Chairman, I ought to point out that in this new revision of the estimates, at the lower left hand corner and on the first line on the right, 1965/66 should be 1966/67. I am sorry we had this slip again. I think it is contributable to using an old stencil and correcting it to produce the new version. at/

Mr. B.V.D. DE JAGER (South Africa): I refer to this document, IWC/18/2B (revised), which has been circulated. The Committee met again, and it is suggested that the estimated expenditure for stock assessment work and the contribution to whale marking amounting to £2,750 be reinstated on an extraordinary budget, as the existing extraordinary budget shows a balance of £884.

This would mean that it is necessary to find an amount of approximately £2,000 to meet the estimated total expenditure on the extraordinary budget.

Two alternative suggestions were made to the Committee, but the Committee was divided on this issue, so they are offered as suggestions to the Commission. The first one is a flat rate for all active whaling countries, which would amount to approximately £200 each, and the second alternative is a flat rate levy on whales of any species, including the assessment work taken by all active whaling countries. At one shilling per whale that would amount to roughly £3,000. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

/The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): At the previous ...

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Dr. De Jager. Are there any questions?

At the previous Meeting the Soviet delegation declared that it would abstain if there were a proposal to divide the quota into two parts. Have you changed your attitude to that, Dr. Lafitskii?

Dr. L.G. LAFITSKII (U.S.S.R.)(Interpretation): I should like to draw attention to the fact that the Soviet delegation made its position clear. Since we have only just received this revised document we have not been able to consult our financial experts so as to be able to make a decision on this matter now. However, the Soviet delegation has no objection to sub-dividing the budget so that there were, in effect, two budgets, one ordinary, and one extraordinary budget concerned with investigation and other problems of scientific research.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Since the Soviet delegation has withdrawn its objection to dividing the budget into two parts, there is no need for me to put it forward.

I propose to take separate decisions, the first on the ordinary budget, and the second on the extraordinary budget. What are your proposals concerning the ordinary budget?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Since it is my understanding that no increase is being asked for in the ordinary budget, I am prepared to move its acceptance.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): There is a motion from Dr. Sprules that we accept the ordinary budget. Who will second that proposal?

(The proposal was seconded by the Japanese,
the Australian and the American delegations.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are there any objections to this proposal? Since there are no objections, the estimate of income and expenditure for the forthcoming fiscal year is approved for the ordinary budget.

Now let us proceed to the estimate for the extraordinary budget. What proposals are there with regard to this?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I find myself in the same position as the U.S.S.R. delegation, in that I am unable to commit my Government to any additional expenditure in respect of the Commission. I should need to seek approval for any additional expenditure. If, therefore, I support any proposal to raise the funds it will be necessary to raise to meet the cost of the stock assessment work, I shall have to vote subject to the approval of my Government. I think that probably quite a number of us are in the same position. I think that what we should try to do is to see which of the alternative methods of financing this work which have been suggested by the Finance Committee is preferred by the members of the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So, Gentlemen, what are your proposals concerning the alternative methods which Dr. De Jager has put before us?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The United States delegation is not exactly certain as to what these alternatives are. I wonder if we could have them repeated.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Dr. De Jager, would you be so kind as to repeat the proposals?

Dr. B.V.D. De JAGER (South Africa): The first suggestion was a flat rate for all active whaling countries, of whom there are 11, which would amount to £200 each, or a sum of £2,200.

The alternative is a flat rate levy on whales of any species included in the assessment work taken by all active whaling countries. It would be a shilling per whale taken and, based on last year's average, would amount to £3000.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Can I have your proposals, Gentlemen?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I have one more question of clarification, Mr. Chairman. The alternative suggestion is based on the total catch of whales by the whaling countries in 1965, but I am still wondering if all of these catches are under assessment by the Assessment Committee. I thought that there were two groups of whales being considered by the Assessment Committee, and these included the baleen whales of the Antarctic, and at this Meeting we are asking them to consider the sperm whale stocks of all the oceans.

/This still, as far as Canada

This still, as far as Canada personally is concerned, leaves the baleen whale stocks of the North Pacific still not being looked at by the Commission's Assessment Committee, and I am wondering whether the proposal made by Dr. De Jager took this into consideration or whether it is felt that all whales will come under the Assessment Committee's purview.

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

Dr. De Jager, would you be so kind as to clarify the opinion of the Committee?

Dr. B.V.D. De JAGER (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, it was the understanding of the Committee that all whales falling within that would be included.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan): Mr. Chairman, Dr. De Jager, the Chairman of the Finance Committee, has presented us with two alternative proposals concerning the sharing of the cost of the Extraordinary Budget. The first alternative is that this cost should be borne equally by the active whaling nations. The second alternative proposal is this should be borne according to the level of the catches as shown in last year's records. Japan has a large number of catches in the past year's records and, frankly speaking, Japan's position would be much more favourable if we agreed with the first proposal. However, in order to solve the question easily, I would like to propose a third alternative plan. Our idea is as follows: to divide the £2,000 into two parts, and divide the first part of £1,000 by equal sharing of the active whaling nations. Concerning the other £1,000, the other half, this part should be borne according to the second alternative, that is dependent upon the actual catches of active whaling nations over the last year. I think this proposal will solve the question arising from the different positions, thus making a compromise. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Dr. De Jager, my understanding is that Mr. Fujita has not taken your alternative quite correctly - the second alternative - because our understanding was that you were proposing to take one shilling for each whale caught in the forthcoming season.

Concerning the records of the catches of last year, you just took the record of the last year of the catches for estimating the approximate sum which will be received.

Dr. B.V.D. De JAGER (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, we mentioned this last year's season because the statistics would be available to calculate the payments on; so I think we meant the season of 1965 and 1965/1966 for the Antarctic.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. Fujita, do you insist on your proposal?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, the outline of the Japanese proposal is that this £2,000 should be divided into two parts, and the first part of that £1,000 should be equally borne by the countries concerned and the latter half should be borne in proportion to the number of whales caught by the active whaling nations. That is the outline of the Japanese proposal. Concerning the latter part, we agree with the method which Dr. De Jager has just now described.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): As a matter of principle, the Norwegian opinion is that there should be a flat rate contribution by all countries concerned. If we cannot agree on that, we are most in favour of the Japanese compromise proposal; but in any case we have to reserve our position.

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I have to make the same reservation as other delegates, that is I am not in a position to commit my government to the proposal that is now before us.

As regards the splitting of the contribution to the Extraordinary Budget, my view is very much the same as that of Dr. McHugh, as expressed this morning. It seems to us that the contributions of the countries concerned to this special fund should bear some relation to the economic stake that these countries have in the whaling business, and we would have very much preferred the second alternative put forward by the Chairman of the Finance Committee, namely a levy of so much on each whale caught. If this is not acceptable to the Commission as a whole, Mr. Chairman, I think I would personally go along with the Japanese compromise; but as I said before, this is a matter on which I would have to refer back to my government.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

/The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): In other words,

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): In other words, if I have understood Mr. Tame, you are supporting the proposal of one shilling per head, but you are reserving your position in relation to the decision to be taken by your government.

Mr. W.C. TAME (United Kingdom): Yes, that is so.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Who will second the proposal from Mr. Fujita? I understand that the proposal is not seconded, so only one of the alternative proposals, that is the proposal of one shilling duty per whale, which was seconded by the United Kingdom delegation, is to be voted on.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): I would like to second the Japanese compromise proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Better late than never.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, I think I must explain the U.S. position. I think the United States would be willing to agree to any reasonable proposal which resolved this problem, but unfortunately my instructions limit me at the present time, and I would not be able to support the Japanese position, even though in many respects I find it a reasonable one. Therefore, I would have to reserve my position with respect to the Japanese proposal at the present time. I could vote on the other proposal however.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So Mr. Fujita, was your proposal a single proposal or an amendment to the previous proposal of the Finance and Administrative Committee?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, my proposal was an amendment to the original proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So first we have to vote on the proposal put forward by Mr. Fujita and seconded by the Norwegian delegation. As far as I understood the proposal, it was as follows: that the total contribution of £2,000 is to be divided into two equal parts, and the first half, that is the sum of £1,000 is to be divided in equal parts between the countries concerned. The second half, £1,000, is to be divided between the countries concerned in proportion to the level of their catches. Is my understanding right?

Mr. P.C. COTTON (New Zealand): Could we seek clarification that "countries concerned" includes only the countries actively engaged in whaling operations?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): What I meant by "countries concerned" was that it should be countries actively engaged in whaling, whaling nations.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So it is to be divided between countries actively conducting whaling operations, both pelagic and from land stations. Is it clear now? If so, perhaps Dr. Mackintosh could take a roll call on the amendment proposed by Mr. Fujita.

The ACTING SECRETARY: May I ask one question for clarification? The second half of the £2,000 is in proportion to catches in which year?

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The forthcoming season.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Will you please ask Dr. De Jager to clarify this?

Dr. B.V.D. De JAGER (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, it was suggested in the Committee that it should be based on the summer of 1965, and the 1965/1966 Antarctic season because the statistics are available, they are not available for the coming season, so there is nothing to base them on.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Do you agree with this, Mr. Fujita?
(Mr. Fujita nodded assent)

The ACTING SECRETARY: Then I will take the vote:

Argentina	Not present
Australia	No
Canada	Abstain
Denmark	Abstain
France	No
Iceland	Abstain
Japan	Yes
Netherlands	No
New Zealand	Abstain
Norway	No
South Africa	Yes
U.S.S.R.	Abstain
U.S.A.	Abstain
U.K.	Abstain

We have two in favour, four against and seven abstentions. The motion is lost.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So the motion is lost. I just have a question for Mr. Knudtzon: how is it possible for you to have seconded Mr. Fujita's proposal when you voted against it?

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): Mr. Chairman, I seconded the proposal to have it put to the vote, to find out the opinions, but as I have no assent to the principle of this question and I have no instructions, I must make all sorts of reservations.

/The CHAIRMAN: (interpretation): I should ...

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, I should like to put to the vote the original proposal by Mr. De Jager and seconded by the United Kingdom. Its substance is that one shilling will be taken as a duty on each whale caught, and the sum is to be estimated on the basis of the 1965/66 catch. Is this correct, Mr. De Jager?

Mr. B.V.D. DE JAGER (South Africa): Yes, it is.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I should just like to ask Mr. De Jager whether this is for every whale caught by each whaling nation, regardless of whether or not the stocks of whales are under assessment by the Assessment Group.

Mr. B.V.D. DE JAGER (South Africa): Yes.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat confused myself now. I thought that the Committee, in considering this, referred only to the whales that were subject now to stock assessment or for which we had asked for stock assessments to be carried out. In order to clarify the position, my impression is that it is to be a shilling per whale for all blue, fin, sei, humpback and sperm whales. If that is the understanding of the Committee and the general understanding, I think we should list that in the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Nevertheless, I will have now to put to the vote the proposal put forward by Mr. De Jager. There was no amendment made to it, and the amendment proposed by Mr. Fujita was lost. Dr. Mackintosh, will you please make a roll call for Mr. De Jager's proposal?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (Acting Secretary): This is for a shilling per whale based on the catches of 1965/66.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, before I decide on this question, I want to be quite clear that we are now proposing that we include all whales taken by member countries, because when we discussed this we were looking at the figures for the whales that I mentioned just now, and the £3,000 income was based on a catch of about 6,000 whales. This did not include the smaller types of whale like baleen and minke whales and those whales on which there is no stock assessment work being done. I would be able to support a proposal that we should place a levy of a shilling on all blue, fin, sei, humpback and sperm whales, but I do not know how I would vote if it were to include all whales.

Mr. B.V.D. DE JAGER (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, I think I was a bit confused myself, and I see that I have written here from the Committee, "A flat rate levy on whales of any species included in the assessment work." Those are the ones mentioned by Mr. Setter just now. To clarify it completely, I think that is what we discussed, and that was the wording. I should like Mr. Setter to correct me if I am wrong here.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you. Dr. Mackintosh, will you please make a roll call now? 2

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (Acting Secretary): It is the same motion in which it has been stated for clarification that it applies to blue, fin, sei, humpback and sperm whales.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Is this for whales which are under assessment by the Assessment Committee?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH (Acting Secretary): Whales which are under assessment by the Assessment Group.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I am still somewhat confused, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, we are trying to find funds in an extraordinary budget in order to provide the necessary facilities for the Assessment Group to continue their work on certain stocks of whales which they

have been investigating, and to add to this the sperm whale stocks of the world's oceans. I will use an example. Canada takes fin whales from the North Atlantic Ocean. We are doing our own stock assessments, and no one is paying for that. The Assessment Committee is not, as I understand it, going to carry out an assessment of the fin whale stocks in the North Atlantic Ocean, and thus I am rather confused, as I have been all week, about why we are looking for contributions to an extraordinary budget to carry out a specific project that is not related to the catch of certain baleen whales in certain oceans. If, however, the motion that is before us now is asking for a vote on a shilling per whale for the whales taken by each nation from stocks which are under assessment by the Assessment Group, then I should think the proposal is very clear and understandable to all delegations

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Mr. De Jager, would you please clarify the intention?

Mr. B.V.D. DE JAGER (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, I will read it again, "a flat rate levy on whales of any species included in the assessment work taken by all active whaling countries."

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Are you all satisfied with the clarification by Mr. De Jager?

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, if this proposal is not to include the whales taken by the northern hemisphere, I think the Committee will need to have a look at the rate of assessment on these stocks because it will change the figure quite considerably. We base this figure on all blue, fin, sei, humpback and sperm whales, and the figure worked out at a shilling per whale, but we will have to have a look at it again if it is going to be limited to the stocks on which the assessment work is actually being carried out.

/Mr. B.V.D. DE JAGER (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, I really ...

Dr. B.V.D. De JAGER (South Africa): Mr. Chairman, I really am much more confused myself now than ever before. I think Mr. Setter will recall that we discussed this --

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): It is quite understandable that you should be confused. This is a complicated matter and we are all confused.

Dr. B.V.D. De JAGER (South Africa): If it would help matters, I should like to propose that there should be a flat rate levy on whales taken by all active whaling countries, including the species which were mentioned by Mr. Setter, and not others. I hope that is clear now.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Have you any further questions, Mr. Setter, or can we proceed with the voting? 3

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): If my understanding is correct, we are now going to vote on whether the Commission supports the principle of a levy of one shilling per whale on all blue, fin, sei, humpback and sperm whales taken by member countries. If we are voting on that, I can go ahead and vote.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): In that case, I understand that it may be made still clearer by consultation with Dr. De Jager.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): I think that Dr. De Jager agrees with me on that point now. He is nodding his head.

Dr. B.V.D. De JAGER (South Africa): I agree with Mr. Setter on that point.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): So you have reached an agreement.

If there are no more questions, can we now proceed to the voting? 4

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): Mr. Chairman, I have to join the group of somewhat confused members here. I thought that Dr. De Jager's last proposal was for a flat rate contribution, but perhaps I am mistaken. If it is the case that any member country, for instance Norway, shall pay this contribution for all whales taken by that country, I should like to point out that we have land stations along the Norwegian coast where we catch fin whales and sei whales, and they are not included in the assessment work. I think that the cost of the contributions to this assessment work should be known. How can the people dealing with this say that so much of the Norwegian catch is excluded and should not pay the one shilling per whale?

So far as I have understood it, the problem is the same for Canada.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): If there is no objection, I propose that we should take a break for a few minutes in order to clarify this question.

(The Meeting adjourned at 3.25 p.m.
and reconvened at 3.45 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, I call for your attention.

I would like to ask Dr. De Jager to inform the Commission whether all the problems were clarified and about the progress of the consultations.

Dr. B.W.D. De JAGER (South Africa): I hope that all the problems are clarified, but I do not think one can ever be sure about that.

We have drafted something which reads as follows:-

"The raising of a levy of one shilling per whale on all blue, fin sei and humpback whales taken in the southern hemisphere, and all sperm whales throughout the world."

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): That is an indication that tea is helpful!

Is the wording clear to everybody? There are no objections to put it forward for voting? Thank you. Dr. Mackintosh, would you please call the roll on this vote?

The ACTING SECRETARY: We are voting now on the proposal to levy one shilling per whale, based on 1965 and 1965/1966, on blue, fin, sei and humpback whales in the southern hemisphere, and sperm whales throughout the world.

Argentina	Not present
Australia	Yes (Subject to the reservation regarding payment by my government)
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Yes
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	No
Netherlands	Yes
New Zealand	Yes
Norway	No
South Africa	Yes (Subject to the reservation regarding payment by my government)
U.S.S.R.	Abstain
U.S.A.	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes

The votes are 10 in favour, 2 against, one abstention. The Motion is carried.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): The tea was very helpful!

Gentlemen, my work as Chairman of the Commission is coming to an end, and we have come to item 19 of the agenda, the election of a Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the ensuing three years. Due to the termination of the term of office for the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman we have two vacancies now, and I would like the Commissioners to give their proposals for a nominee for Chairman.

Mr. I.F. DENISENKO (U.S.S.R.): (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, the Soviet Delegation suggests that we nominate as Chairman of the International Whaling Commission, Mr. Tane, the Commissioner for the United Kingdom Delegation.

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): There was a Motion for Mr. Tame to be elected as Chairman, who will second the proposal?

(Mr. Knudtson of Norway seconded the proposal)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Thank you, Gentlemen. Are there any other proposals? No other proposals. If you have no objections I would like to ask Dr. Mackintosh to take a roll call on the Motion put forward and seconded.

The ACTING SECRETARY: The Motion is to elect Mr. Tame as Chairman.

Argentina	Not present
Australia	Yes
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Yes
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Yes
Netherlands	Yes
New Zealand	Yes
Norway	Yes
South Africa	Yes
U.S.S.R.	Yes
U.S.A.	Yes
United Kingdom	Abstain

The Motion is carried, except for one abstention. (Applause)

The CHAIRMAN (Interpretation): Gentlemen, let me, on behalf of all those present here, congratulate Mr. Tame on being elected as Chairman.

As far as I know there is no fixed rule as to which Chairman, the old one or the new one, has to finish the work of the meeting. It seems that in the majority of cases the old Chairman closes the meeting; but in any case my understanding is that the decision is to be taken by the old Chairman, with the agreement of the new Chairman. But from my point of view there must be honour in any business, and if it is to be in order then there cannot be two Chairmen at one and the same meeting. In that case, I would like the newly elected Chairman to take his Chair. Please allow me to express my warm and sincere gratitude to all the Commissioners for the assistance rendered to me in the important work as Chairman of the Commission. Without your support, Gentlemen, it would be impossible for me to achieve the successes which our meeting is really achieving.

With special warmth I would like to express my gratitude to the Secretariat, for the assistance rendered to me during my work, and I would also like once more to congratulate Mr. Tame on being elected as the Chairman, and wish him as great a success as I have had in the Chair. I ask him now to take his Chair. (Applause) Thank you, Gentlemen.

(Mr. M.N. Sukhoruchenko then vacated the Chair, which was assumed by Mr. W.C. Tane)

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that I could make these few remarks before Mr. Sukhoruchenko vacated the Chair because they are really addressed to him. During the three-year term of office which he has held, I think the Commission has gone through some of its most difficult times, and I have never failed to be impressed by his expert conduct of the meetings, by his skill in handling difficult matters with a most unbiased point of view, and more than anything else I have been impressed by his unfailing sense of humour which has helped him over many difficult hurdles. I want to extend to him from the U.S. delegation our thanks and our highest respect, and wish him well in the future.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. McHugh's proposal is evidently carried with acclamation.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the comments made by Dr. McHugh, I think it is the opinion of all of us that Mr. Sukhoruchenko has carried out a very difficult task in a most efficient manner and he has left a great impression on us all for the manner in which he has led this Commission through, as Dr. McHugh said, a difficult period. I would like to associate the Australian delegation with the U.S. delegation's comments and to wish Mr. Sukhoruchenko all the very best as a Commissioner.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Gentlemen, I would like to express my gratitude for the warm words and good wishes, and once more I would like to express my gratitude to all the Commissioners for their assistance in my work as Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Sukhoruchenko. If I could just say a very brief word on my own account, I would like to thank Mr. Sukhoruchenko for his congratulations and the Commission for electing me as Chairman. I realise that this is a very great honour, especially at this particular period in the history of the Commission, because as Mr. Holt was reminding us this morning, some wise decisions have been taken in the last year or two. If these are followed up by more wise decisions in the next few years, we may have done what the Commission has failed to do over a great many years: that is save the whale stocks, and incidentally, save the whaling industry.

For my part, I had thought that the Commission might like to have, in this testing period, someone with more knowledge of the problems and more experience of the work of the Commission, but I shall, of course, do my very best to exercise the post of Chairmanship with impartiality, and in accordance with the wishes of the Commission. At least I have the advantage of having served under Mr. Sukhoruchenko who, I think all of us would agree, is a great master of the art of chairmanship. I shall do my best, it will be very difficult to follow his good example. If, in the meantime, I show these deficiencies which I have mentioned, I am sure I can count on the indulgence of all of you. Thank you very much.

I think we are halfway through Item 19 on the agenda, we have now elected a new Chairman, and we have to elect a Vice-Chairman for the next three years. May I ask if there are any nominations?

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): I move that the distinguished Commissioner for Japan, Mr. Fujita, be elected Vice-Chairman, both because of his personal and extraordinary capability, and because of the fact that Japan up to now has neither had a Chairman nor a Vice-Chairman of the Commission.

(The Proposal was seconded by Mr. M.N. Sukhoruchenko of
the U.S.S.R.)

The CHAIRMAN: The motion that Mr. Fujita be elected Vice-Chairman has been proposed by Norway and seconded by the U.S.S.R. Are there any other proposals? I am afraid this is where my inexperience let me down, I believe it is not necessary to have a vote on this. It seems to me that there has been a proposal which was seconded and there is no other proposal, the Commission has clearly expressed its desire that Mr. Fujita should be the Vice-Chairman. (Applause) I declare that this motion has been carried and I would like to congratulate Mr. Fujita on his election.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen, I would like to express my sincere gratitude for being elected as Vice-Chairman of the Commission by courtesy of the members of the Commission.

So far I have been approached by a number of Commissioners unofficially with the suggestion that I should be Vice-Chairman of the Commission. However, I have been turning this suggestion down because I thought I was not qualified as a Vice-Chairman. One reason for this is the language difficulty; another reason is the question of my state of health, due to my age recently I have found that many parts of my body are not functioning properly, and I find it very difficult, I am not confident as to whether I can carry out the important role of Vice-Chairman effectively. However, through the great skill of the other Commissioners, I have finally been persuaded to be elected as Vice-Chairman of the Commission, after having resisted this.

In particular, the distinguished delegate from Norway made a proposal which was seconded by the Soviet delegation, and this is one of the rarest cases in the history of the International Whaling Commission, so in the light of this fact, I have found it extremely difficult to refuse this.

/In view of the goodwill

In view of the goodwill and understanding of the Commissioners of this Meeting, I shall make every effort to carry out my duties, and I should like to ask my colleagues to assist me in every possible way in carrying out this important task.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I should like to take this opportunity to say one more thing. When I go back home I intend to consult my doctor, because I am not confident about the state of my health. If his advice is that my health does not allow me to carry out the important role of Vice-Chairman of this Committee, I will ask you to nominate my successor as Vice-Chairman.

I should like again to express my sincere gratitude for your kind understanding and courtesy. (Applause)

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fujita. I am sure we are all glad that the unusual combination of members of this Commission and the pressure of Commissioners generally have prevailed upon you to take this office. We all hope that you will have a good report from your doctors when you go back to Japan. I can only say for myself that I found the post of Vice-Chairman a very healthy one. I am sure that it will do you a power of good.

If we have now disposed of item 19 on the agenda, can we pass to item 20, the date and place of the next Meeting? We have a recommendation from the Finance and Administration Committee that the Nineteenth Meeting be held in London in the week beginning 26 June, 1967. I do not know whether the chairman of that Committee wishes to add anything to this, or to explain it.

Dr. B.V.D. De JAGER (South Africa): The Committee decided to recommend London again in view of the fact that there was no invitation to meet anywhere else, and the estimates for the new year were based on a meeting in London.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a seconder for the proposal that the Meeting should be in London next year?

(The proposal was seconded by the Australian and the Netherlands delegations.)

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(Interpretation): I should like to take this opportunity to inform the Commissioners of the following. It has been customary for the annual meeting to be held outside London every three years, and it may well be expected that the Japanese Government will invite the member countries to hold the next annual meeting in Tokyo. Japan, however, is not able to invite the Commission to meet in Tokyo next year, but we are considering inviting the Commission to hold its meeting in Tokyo the year after next.

I just wanted to take this opportunity to inform members of the Commission of our intention.

The CHAIRMAN: We take note that the Japanese Government is considering whether to issue an invitation to the Commission to meet in Tokyo in 1968.

Are there any other proposals for 1967? Of course, if the meeting were not held in London in 1967, it would not be possible to meet in Tokyo in 1968. Under our Rules of Procedure we have to meet twice in London before meeting outside.

Can I take it that the Commissioners agree to the recommendation of the Finance and Administration Committee that the Nineteenth Meeting be held in London in the week beginning 26 June, 1967? Is that agreed? (Agreed)

We now come to item 21, the arrangements for the Press release. I am told that in recent years the Commission has been content to leave it to the Chairman and the Secretary to prepare and issue a Press release. Is it your wish that the same procedure should be followed on this occasion? Perhaps I could have a proposal on this matter.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): It would give me great pleasure to propose that we follow this same procedure once again, and it also gives me an opportunity to express personally the desire that the Committee will be very careful with regard to the listing of the delegations that were present at the Meeting. It was rather peculiar last year when the Press release came to Canada, it ended up on the desk of my superiors and they noted that Canada had not been present at the meetings. I had already submitted an expense account, and it became a little confusing as to whether or not I had actually been to the meetings and, if not, where I had been and how I had spent the money.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Sprules. I am sure we must do our best to avoid that sort of embarrassment.

(The proposal was seconded by the
Australian delegation.)

/The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other proposals?

When I say that it should be left to the Secretary and the Chairman, I am not quite sure which Chairman this refers to. I feel that the occupant of the post for the majority, and certainly all the difficult part, of the meeting should be associated with the Press release, but perhaps I could have a word with Mr. Sukhoruchenko about that.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): We fully rely on the newly elected Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I think this is almost a private quarrel between me and Mr. Sukhoruchenko, so perhaps we could leave it on that basis.

Are there any other points on item 21? If not, could we go on to item 22, Any other business.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): As you will remember, at the first plenary session I asked that the question of the pelagic global quota in the Antarctic should be given the first priority in the Technical Committee, and I explained the reason; namely that it would facilitate the quota distribution negotiations going on between the active pelagic whaling nations. These negotiations have not reached any solution and, as I understood it, at the last meeting of the representatives from these countries, their Chairman, Mr. Wall, was to give a short report in the last plenary session. As Mr. Wall is not present, I have taken the liberty to say what I have said, and to tell the Commissioners that these quota distribution deliberations are supposed to continue.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Knudtson. Mr. Wall asked me to apologise to the pelagic countries as it was quite impossible for him to be present this afternoon. I was myself prepared to make a statement on his behalf, but in view of the statement which you have now made, Mr. Knudtson, I think that is perhaps unnecessary.

There is a matter under Any Other Business which I ought perhaps to raise myself, or ask the United Kingdom Delegation to raise; I am not quite sure in what capacity I am speaking now. But, as was announced at the opening of the plenary sessions, I had a letter from Mr. Wimpenny, in my capacity as Vice-Chairman, saying that it would be impossible for him, for medical reasons, to carry on with the Secretaryship of this Commission. I think he wrote to Mr. Sukhoruchenko in similar terms, but I believe the letter had not reached him before he left Moscow. I only heard of this a very short time before the meeting of the Commission, and I was able to prevail on Dr. Mackintosh at very short notice to deputise for Mr. Wimpenny on this occasion. I am sure we are all extremely grateful to him for what he has done and for stepping into the breach at such short notice. But Dr. Mackintosh tells me that this is only a purely ad hoc, temporary arrangement, and assuming that Mr. Wimpenny's resignation is confirmed, it will, of course, be necessary for the Commission to appoint another Secretary.

I think I can say, on behalf of the United Kingdom, that my department, the Fisheries Department, will continue to provide secretarial services for the time being, if that is the wish of the Commission; I also have to add that we shall be obliged to make a charge for doing so. Perhaps the Commission would wish me to see if it is possible for the United Kingdom to make some suggestions for the appointment of a new Secretary at their next meeting.

There is one other thing I would like to say, just to complete this matter, and that is I felt that perhaps the Commission would want to send a message to Mr. Wimpenny thanking him for all his work and expressing the hope that he will soon recover from his indisposition.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest something of the same sort, but of a somewhat more formal nature. I wonder if it would be possible to prepare some kind of an appropriate testimonial to Mr. Wimpenny for his services over the years, which might be suitably framed and presented to him, in order that he would have some permanent memento of his service to the Commission. Perhaps this could be done either by the Chairman or by the Acting Secretary of the Commission.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, Japan is in entire agreement with what Dr. McHugh has just proposed.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it, at any rate, that it is agreed that some suitable testimonial should be prepared on behalf of the Commission and sent to Mr. Wimpenny. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Then is the Commission content to leave the question of Secretaryship on the basis that I suggested, until the next meeting? That is that the Fisheries Department of the Ministry of Agriculture will carry on secretarial services for the time being, and we hope to be able to make a suggestion to the Commission at their next meeting. Is that acceptable? (Agreed)

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, in the same vein, I have noticed this year that Miss Kirby, who I seem to have felt was the permanent contact in your offices with the Whaling Commission's work for so long, has not been with us this year. Could I ask if she has retired?

The CHAIRMAN: No, Dr. Sprules, she has not retired, but, in accordance with the normal practice in the United Kingdom, she has been transferred to other work within the Department. I would entirely endorse what Dr. Sprules has said about the very fine work that she has done for the Commission over a great many years, and I am sure the Commission will be glad to know that within the last few days she has been promoted to a higher post in the Ministry of Agriculture.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I would rather think that the Commission would like to have the Acting Secretary or the Chairman - probably the Chairman - on our behalf send a letter of appreciation and, perhaps, congratulation to Miss Kirby.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Sprules. Is that agreed? (Agreed)
Then I will undertake that a suitable letter shall be sent. Thank you.

/The ACTING SECRETARY: There is a letter

The ACTING SECRETARY: There is a letter from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea; it is quite short and perhaps I should read it out; it is inviting us to send an observer, and is addressed to the President of the International Whaling Commission, on behalf of the Bureau of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea:

"I have the honour to inform you that the Fifty-Fourth Statutory Meeting of I.C.E.S. will take place in Copenhagen, Charlottenlund, from 3rd - 12th October, and to invite you to take part in that Meeting in an observer capacity.

"The Statutory Meeting will be preceded by a Symposium on the Ecology of Pelagic Fish Species in Arctic Waters. I would be grateful to receive the information and a note of the name and address of the observer or observers from your organisation at your earliest convenience."

It is signed by the Secretary General.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe the Commission has sent observers in the past, but normally it has been someone attending the I.C.E.S. in another capacity as well. What is the wish of the Commission as regards this year's Meeting?

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.)(Interpretation): I have a proposal to authorise the Danish Commissioner to be present at the I.C.E.S. Meeting as our observer.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. May I ask if there is a seconder to that proposal?

(The proposal was seconded by Mr. I. Fujita of Japan)

The CHAIRMAN: Is the Danish Commissioner willing to accept this task? It is in Copenhagen in October of this year.

Mr. J.C. BOGSTAD (Denmark): Mr. Chairman, I am not sure about this.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sukhoruchenko, the Danish Commissioner is rather doubtful whether he can act as an observer. I do not know whether you would wish to make any other proposal in the circumstances. May I ask if there is any Commissioner present who will be at the I.C.E.S. Meeting? What is your desire on this matter? Should we inform the I.C.E.S. that we are unable to send an observer on this occasion, or may I have a proposal for someone other than the Danish Commissioner?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, in order to help you, I was just wondering if any members of the Scientific Committee might be there. This is probably more likely, and if any member of the Scientific Committee is going to be there, perhaps we could ask the Chairman to circulate the members to find out. If so, one of the scientists could be nominated. I think I.C.E.S. is primarily a scientific meeting anyway.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe Professor Ruud, who is not present, is a member of I.C.E.S. Would the Commission then be prepared to leave this to the Chairman to try and find some member of the Commission or the Scientific Committee who will be in Copenhagen in any case and who will act as observer for the Commission? (Agreed)

Mr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might inform the Commission that the second session of the F.A.O. Committee on Fisheries will be meeting in Rome in the first half of next year, that is, before this Commission meets again. The most likely date is the week beginning 24th April, and an invitation to this Commission to send an observer to the second session of the Committee on Fisheries will be forthcoming. The Committee, amongst other things, will be considering a report or an interim report of a sub-committee which it has established in co-operation with international organisations concerned with fisheries. This is only for the information of the Commission, but an invitation will be forthcoming.

Mr. C.G. SETTER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we will not be meeting before that invitation is received or before the Meeting is held, could I suggest that you, as Chairman of this Commission, act as observer at that Meeting?

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Setter. Are there any other proposals? I hope to be going to this Meeting myself, and I would be willing to act as observer if that is the wish of the Commission. (Agreed) Are there any other matters to be raised under this item? If not, I think it only remains for me to thank you all very much for your attendance and your help, and to declare the session closed.

(The Eighteenth Meeting closed at 4.35 p.m.)