

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

IWC/19/14

NINETEENTH MEETING

Session of Monday, 26th June, 1966/7

In the Chair: Mr. W.C. Tame

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, will you please come to order.

The Nineteenth Session of the International Whaling Commission is now open and I would like to welcome all Delegates, Commissioners, Advisers and Observers.

It is first my pleasure to introduce Mr. Norman Buchan who will welcome you on behalf of Her Majesty's Government. Mr. Buchan's full title is Joint Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Scotland, and he is one of the Ministers in Her Majesty's Government with a special responsibility for fisheries, which, in this context, includes whales.

Mr. Norman BUCHAN (Joint Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Scotland):

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen, this is the first opportunity I have had of addressing the Commission and it gives me great pleasure to do so on the occasion of the Nineteenth Meeting. I would like to extend, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, a warm welcome to you all. I sincerely hope that your stay in London will be a pleasant one and that you will have a successful meeting.

We know that about 30 years ago there were about 100,000 blue whales in the oceans; I do not need to remind you that today there remain only about 1 per cent of that number. The evidence offered by your Scientific Committee has shown a grave situation regarding the depletion of the whale stocks for some time. The reduction in the Antarctic whaling fleets and figures of declining catches speak for themselves. It has at last become widely accepted that if the whale is to be preserved for future generations as a valuable source of protein - indeed, if the whaling industry itself is to survive, drastic and effective measures have become an urgent necessity.

You have banned the killing of the blue and hump-back whale in all seas and, in the last two seasons, you have drastically reduced the Antarctic pelagic catch limit. While these have been notable achievements they do no more than hold the position. Still more severe cuts are necessary if there is to be a real improvement in the situation, and the Commission recognised this when it pledged itself to fix the catch limits for sei and fin whales in the 1967/68 season below the sustainable yield. The extent of this cut is perhaps the most important decision which the Commission will take during this meeting. I feel sure that, in spite of the heavy sacrifices which this will entail, the Commission will not weaken in its determination to establish a situation where the downward trend in stocks is not merely halted but is reversed.

In the growing threat of world food shortages and mounting populations, the conservation of all sources of protein is of as vital importance as ever before and what the Commission is achieving is a step - and I must emphasize a valuable one - towards securing this and is worthy of congratulation. Unlike the mineral resources of the world, which must become exhausted within some period of time, the whale stocks, given proper management, could go on contributing to our mutual benefit for all time.

IWC/19/14

It is very unfortunate that the International Observer Scheme agreed in 1963 never came into being, but during this week you will be giving further consideration to this matter; it is an extremely important one. I hope that your discussions meet with success and that you are able to implement a scheme in the near future so that it may be an encouragement for other International bodies to follow. The United Kingdom Government supports the principles of such a scheme as it supported the previous scheme and my Government will certainly continue to support all measures which it considers necessary for the effective control of whaling operations within the Commission's regulations.

Gentlemen, I will not delay the business of the Commission any further. I look forward to the opportunity of meeting you at the reception tomorrow evening, when you will have an opportunity to relax from your efforts here, perhaps for the first time.

May I conclude by wishing you once again a very successful meeting and I hope you will prevail on your Chairman to conduct the meeting so that you have some time this week in which to see something of the sights of London. Thank you. (Applause)

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Buchan.

(Mr. Buchan then left the meeting)

At this stage I have to ask any members of the Press who are present to leave, as the Commission has decided to conduct its deliberations in private.

We now come to item 2 on our provisional agenda, Arrangements for meeting and adoption Agenda. I will first ask the Acting Secretary to call the roll of delegates.

The ACTING SECRETARY: Gentlemen, I will read the names in alphabetical country order.

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

The CHAIRMAN: May I say I do find it rather difficult to see delegates at the far end of each of these tables, and if you want to catch my eye you may have to do something rather vigorous with your arms; however, I will keep a close watch.

Gentlemen, the agenda was circulated more than 60 days in advance of this meeting, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, and we now have to adopt it. May I ask if someone will propose the adoption of the Agenda?

(The adoption of the Agenda, being proposed by Canada and seconded by the U.S.S.R., was agreed.)

The CHAIRMAN: May I now ask if the Secretary wishes to make any announcements about arrangements for the meeting?

The ACTING SECRETARY: I think the meeting arrangements are adequately covered in Paper IWC/19/6, but I have to begin by apologising that some of you have not received these papers, they have been lost on the way, I am afraid, but we are finding spares and will distribute them during the morning.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any questions on the arrangements for the meeting? If not, can we go on to item 3 on the agenda, Appointment of Committees. Rule XVIII of the Rules of Procedure requires us to establish a Scientific Committee, a Technical Committee and a Finance and Administration Committee, and it requires the Chairman to poll the Commissioners to determine if they desire representation on the Scientific and Technical Committees, and the Commissioners are asked to designate their members. It does not necessarily follow that Commissioners should designate their members immediately, but if they do not do so then perhaps they should inform the Acting Secretary as soon as possible. I will now ask the Acting Secretary to poll the Commission to see whether they desire representation on the Scientific Committee.

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

Argentina	Not present
Australia	No
Canada	Yes
Denmark	No
France	No
Iceland	No
Japan	Yes
Mexico	No
Netherlands	No
New Zealand	No
Norway	Yes
Panama	Not Present
South Africa	No
United Kingdom	Yes
U.S.A.	Yes
U.S.S.R.	Yes.

We will now poll for the Technical Committee.

Argentina	Not Present
Australia	Yes
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Yes
France	No
Iceland	No
Japan	Yes
Mexico	Yes
Netherlands	No
New Zealand	Yes
Norway	Yes
Panama	Not Present
South Africa	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes
U.S.A.	Yes.
U.S.S.R.	Yes

/The CHAIRMAN: The other committee....

The CHAIRMAN: The other committee that we have to appoint is the Finance and Administration Committee, and the Rules of Procedure say that this shall consist of five commissioners appointed by the Chairman. In appointing members to this committee I believe it has been the practice for the Chairman to have regard to the different types of interest represented on the Commission, those countries with pelagic expeditions, those countries with land stations, and also the non-whaling countries. In pursuance of this I should like to ask the commissioners for the following countries if they will be kind enough to serve on the Finance Committee: Japan, the Soviet Union, Canada, South Africa and Denmark. Is that acceptable? (Agreed) I think that that completes our business under item 3 of the agenda.

We come now to item 4. As you will see, there will be papers circulated dealing with the accounts for 1966/1967 and the budget and estimate for 1967/1968, but certainly we have not all received these papers yet and I presume that it will be the wish of the Commission that these papers shall be considered further by the Finance and Administration Committee that we have just set up. Unless any commissioner wishes to comment at this stage, I suggest that we defer this item until after the Finance and Administration Committee has reported. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

We come now to item 5 of the agenda, "Review of previous season's catches". Again, I think that some of us at any rate have not yet had the statistics which are usually circulated at the beginning of these meetings. Perhaps I could ask Mr. Vangstein, who usually gives us a report, whether he would like to make any comments on the statistics or to draw our attention to any particular features of the last year.

Mr. E. VANGSTEIN (Norway): Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics has prepared for the Commission a review of whaling operations in the Antarctic during the last season and of the operation in fields outside the Antarctic in the calendar year 1966. We had very little time at our disposal for the Antarctic statistics this time. The whaling companies sent us, indeed, the statistical reports as expeditiously as possible, but a couple of the expeditions continued the hunting of sperm whales until well into May. The last sperm whale was captured on 19 May, the reports came to us about 8 June, and the statistics were to be in London for the opening of the meeting of the Scientific Committee on 20 June. We have, therefore, not had time to carry out the checking which is desirable and necessary.

In the course of the season the expeditions sent us monthly reports of the catch and the number of catcher days' work per square. On the basis of this information the FAO Committee has prepared its report. I see that there are some small discrepancies between FAO statistics and our own, but I do not think that these have any significance.

The Antarctic statistics appear this time in a new tabular form. This has been done at the suggestion of the Scientific Committee which is of the opinion that the new tables furnish sufficient information for the Scientific Committee and for commercial use. The intention is that the new tabular arrangement shall be used in International Whaling Statistics publications. I will quite briefly sum up the chief features of operations in the Antarctic last season.

The global quota was 3500 units. By agreement between the whaling nations this quota was divided into national quotas. Nine pelagic expeditions were active, that is to say, one less than in 1965/1966, because Japan withdrew one expedition from the operations on account of the reduced global and national quota. There was no whaling from the land stations on South Georgia. The total catch was approximately 3500 blue whale units, some 600 units less than in 1965/1966. There were taken 2900 fin whales, about 350 more than in 1965/1966, and 12,400 sei whales, about 5200 less than in 1965/1966.

The catch of fin whales in the two last seasons was lower than the anticipated sustainable yield. The catch of fin whales per catcher per day rose somewhat, but the catch of sei whales fell. The catch per catcher per day of baleen whales converted to blue whale units was approximately as in 1965/1966. As far as I understand, the expeditions had no difficulty in catching their allotted quotas last season, and several expeditions adjusted their activity so as to get maximum yield, especially yield of meat. This may be one of the causes of the reduction in the catch of sei whales per catcher per day.

The statistics relating to the catch outside the Antarctic are not complete. We lack particulars from one company operated from Chile. We did not receive reports from this company in 1965 either. Further, we have not received reports from Brazil. The Department of Fisheries in Brazil states that a report has not been obtained from the company because Brazil has withdrawn from the Whaling Commission. We have, however, taken direct communication with the company and hope to get the required information.

Only one company operated from Peru in 1966, but it was not before 21 June that we received particulars of that catch. Consequently, the Peruvian catch is not included in the tables showing the catch outside the Antarctic in 1966. In the folder you will, however, find a copy of the information received. The same Peruvian company also commenced whaling in 1967, but the operations were suspended in spring this year. No whaling is, therefore, being carried on at present from Peru.

Countries which are members of the Commission caught only 5 blue whales in 1966 and no humpback whales. One Chilean and a Peruvian company caught 235 blue whales and 58 humpback whales. I assume that a small number of blue and humpback whales was also taken by the other Chilean station from which no information is available. I am told that a Peruvian company also caught some blue and humpback whales in 1967, but the catch of said whales was suspended later.

There were the same number of land stations and boats in operation outside the Antarctic as in 1965.

I draw attention further to the detailed surveys of the catch in the individual fields outside the Antarctic.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Vangstein. Does anyone wish to ask any questions or make any comments at this stage?

Dr. S.J. HOLT (FAO): Mr. Chairman, I should like just to add a word to Mr. Vangstein's account as he has been kind enough to mention the co-operation of the BIWS with FAO. We have been very pleased to receive the statistics from Mr. Vangstein's Bureau, and I should only like to add one point to the account of the last year's activity in the Antarctic which he has given.

The calculations that were prepared by FAO on the question of the sustainable yield have been distributed and were considered last week by the Scientific Committee of the Commission. There is one very important aspect of the interpretation of the figures of the last season's catch which I think should be mentioned. That is that, as the number of expeditions operating in the Antarctic has decreased, and as the proportion of the effort contributed by each of the pelagic whaling countries has changed, the figures which the Commission has traditionally taken as a rough index for a statement of the stocks in the Antarctic have begun to lose their significance. That is to say, the catch per catcher day as a measure of abundance must now, in its crude form, be looked upon very warily because two factors are operating increasingly to modify its meaning.

One is that, as we know, the catch per catcher day for the different nationalities varies very much and each country shows a different trend over the years. Secondly, there have been important shifts in the area of operation and, as it were, a segregation of the national expeditions to a large extent in different areas. Without going into any detail about this, it does mean that trends in catch per catcher day, whether of blue whale units, sei whale catches or fin whale catches, cannot be taken simply at their face value as estimates of the changes in the stocks of each species. These factors have been taken into account in our analyses and, of course, in the studies based upon these and upon national studies made by the Scientific Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Holt. I presume that what you have been saying will have been taken into account by the Scientific Committee in its report. Thank you.

Are there any further comments on the statistics or on Mr. Vangstein's statement? I presume that we should ask the Technical Committee as well as the Scientific Committee to have regard to these statistics in making their recommendations later in the meeting.

If there are no further points on item 5, we will pass on to item 6, "The International Observer Scheme". Two decisions were made by the Commission at its last meeting. One was a recommendation calling on the Antarctic pelagic whaling nations to implement the 1963 agreement as soon as possible. I have to say that no information has reached the Commission that any of the countries concerned did, in fact, comply with this recommendation. The second decision was that a working group should be set up to draw up a new international observer scheme to cover both pelagic and land station whaling activities. This group met last week under the chairmanship of Mr. Graham of the United Kingdom, and I should like to ask Mr. Graham if he will be kind enough to let us know what has been the result of his committee's deliberations.

Mr. J. GRAHAM (United Kingdom): I should say that the report of the Working Group still awaits final approval from the members of the group, though I hope that that will be forthcoming in the course of today. I think that perhaps at this stage I need not detain the Commission by going into the details of the report which will presumably, in the normal course, be considered by the Technical Committee.

From a procedural point of view I think that the most important conclusion at this stage, and one which all the members of the group shared, was that for a number of reasons it would not be really practicable to have a single observer scheme covering all whaling operations. The difference of seasonality, the difference of techniques, the complications of large numbers of units, all told against that. The general conclusion was that there should be a series of schemes covering different areas, and that the details of these should be worked out between the countries participating in the areas covered by each scheme, or in the operations covered by each scheme.

We did not think, because we had not worked out the schemes in detail, that this would represent any difficulty in the establishment of these schemes, because the feeling was that the general principle of the scheme which was agreed in 1963 between the countries engaged in pelagic whaling in the Antarctic in regard to the appointment of observers and so on could be followed.

The main places where adaptation would be necessary would be in regard to detailed provisions like the communication facilities observers would need, the rates of subsistence which might vary considerably from one place to another, or as between pelagic expeditions and land stations and all these details. It seemed to us that it would be unrealistic to think that there would be a satisfactory, uniform solution, and that was again one of the reasons for recommending that such details for each scheme should be settled between the countries participating in it.

That is the broad outline, and I think it may be sufficient at this stage to enable the Commission to proceed.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): I would like to make some comments on the Report from the Working Group on the International Observer Scheme. Since Norway is a country which has particularly emphasised the necessity for international observers, I would like to give a more detailed explanation of the Norwegian view.

The facts are the following: 1. This Commission was established at the Washington Convention. Its main task is to ensure proper and effective conservation and development of the whale stocks, and also to consider the interests of the whaling industry. 2. The stocks of whales and especially, most important, the stock of baleen whales in the Antarctic are heavily over-taxed. 3. To protect the Antarctic baleen whales from being completely extinguished, the global quota as far as the pelagic catch is concerned has been drastically reduced by the Commission.

4. In this situation, we have the quota distribution agreements between the active whaling countries, which have also been recognised by the Commission. 5. To ensure strict observance of the provisions of the schedule of which the global quota is only one aspect, an international observer scheme is, in our opinion, of the utmost importance.

This was the basis on which the special Working Group on the International Observer Scheme was set up by the Commission.

Taking into consideration that the International Observers Agreement of 1963 was entered upon after several years of preparation, it seemed unlikely that the Working Group could succeed in preparing a scheme or schemes which would enable the Commission, during this Nineteenth Session, to adopt an observer scheme covering all whaling.

The Report also shows that all the members of the Working Group did not agree on all points under discussion. However, the Norwegian delegation felt that the majority was of the opinion that international observer schemes were justified and required.

In the view of the Norwegian delegation, the discussions we had in the Group have been useful, even if no detailed scheme or schemes have emanated from its activities. A complete scheme or schemes, in our view,

can only be elaborated by a step-by-step method. I would therefore recommend to the Commission to take this Report as a starting point and to entrust the Working Group with the task of continuing the discussions and make a progress report to the next session.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would be for the general convenience of the Commission if we did not have a discussion on this subject until we have actually seen the Report of the Working Group. Mr. Graham told us that it was still awaiting final approval, it will be circulated, I am sure, as soon as that has been obtained. I wonder whether we should not leave this discussion at that point, having heard the Norwegian statement.

Perhaps we could ask the Technical Committee, in the first place, to look at the Report of the Working Group when it is available and to see whether they wish to make any recommendations to the Commission on it. We can then return to this subject at a later plenary session. I feel it will be difficult for the Commission to discuss the subject until they have seen the Report of the Working Group. Could we then leave item 6 at this point and pass on to item 7, the Report of the Scientific Committee? Dr. Chapman, your Committee's Report has not yet been circulated, but do you wish to make any remarks at this stage?

~~D. G. Chapman~~
Dr. J. L. McNEUGH (U.S.A.): As you know, the Scientific Committee met all last week, and worked on the various matters concerning stock assessments. We had a report which we reviewed in some detail on Friday, but we did not have the final report typed until Friday evening.

We met this morning to consider this, but it is still under consideration and has not yet received final approval, so I think I should not say anything further until it has been finally approved.

The CHAIRMAN: This too, I think, is a matter on which the Commission would wish to have the views of the Technical Committee, so perhaps we could ask that Dr. Chapman's report, when it has been circulated, should be considered first by the Technical Committee, and we can then come back again to the matters dealt with in the Report at subsequent plenary sessions.

Can we then turn to item 8 on the Agenda? We had a report from the joint IWC/FAO Working Party on Antarctic whale stock assessments at the last meeting of the Commission, and the Commission took note of the report and recommended that the work should continue during 1966/67, and that an assessment of the sperm whale stock should also be made.

I do not know whether Dr. Holt would like to comment on the work that has been done in the past year by the joint IWC/FAO Working Party.

Dr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): I do not think you would wish me to go into any details of the work, because, as I have said, the results of the work have been considered by the Scientific Committee, as would be appropriate.

I think I would only like to say at this time, more for the record than anything else, that we have been very pleased to continue to co-operate with the Commission, with the very great assistance of the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics, and are prepared to continue, if the Commission so wishes, to co-operate along the same lines as we have for the past two seasons.

The work in relation to the assessment of the Antarctic whale stocks has been carried out on the same basis as in the previous seasons, although no special costs this year were involved, since the assessments

were made by our own staff in Rome without any call upon the Commission to provide special expenses and so on.

However, we were asked if we could assist in the assessment of the sperm whale stocks; this was requested by the Commission at its last session, and we have reported to the Scientific Committee that we were unable to do this owing to the late arrival of data from the countries mainly engaged in sperm whaling. We now have the data, or a considerable amount of the data in our hands in the form requested by the Scientific Committee last year, and are prepared in the coming year to work with the Scientific Committee on an assessment of the status of the sperm whale stocks.

Again, the report of the Scientific Committee has some proposals as to the precise means by which this assessment might be made. I think at this time I have no other comment to make.

The CHAIRMAN: Does anyone wish to comment on this statement by Dr. Holt at this stage? If not, we will go on to item 8(b), arrangements for the continuation of stock assessment work. Dr. Holt has said that FAO would be willing to continue to participate in this work, if that is the wish of the Commission. I presume that this is a matter which would be referred to the Technical Committee, that is the arrangements to be made for the continuation of this work, and that again we should return to the matter at a subsequent session.

Does anyone wish to comment on item 8 of the Agenda? If not, we will go on to item 9, sperm whale stocks, the Report of the Scientific Committee. Dr. Holt has just said that it has not been possible for the joint Working Group to do very much yet on the assessment of sperm whale stocks, may I ask if Dr. Chapman wishes to say anything on this item?

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (U.S.A.): No, I would merely confirm that the Scientific Committee has had no further information with respect to sperm whales and to confirm also that we have made this recommendation the FAO Working Group convene a meeting of scientists from its own staff and from the Scientific Committee with evidence on population assessment and sperm whale biology, to carry out this assessment, and that this meeting perhaps be held before May, 1968. That is the only item we have.

We have no recommendation with respect to sperm whales in general, except in the North Pacific which will be treated under another item of the agenda.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 9(b), which is the action arising, is a matter for the Technical Committee, and the Technical Committee, it seems, will not have very much further information about the state of the sperm whale stocks. However, I presume that we would wish to ask the Technical Committee to consider the question of the sperm whale stocks in the light of what information is available, and see whether they wish to make any recommendations for action. Can we leave this matter to the Technical Committee and return again at a subsequent meeting?

Item 10, the North Pacific whale stocks; I think we have three subjects under this item, there is first of all a working group of scientists from Canada, Japan, the United States and the Soviet Union. Then there is also a meeting of the commissioners of the North Pacific whaling countries, and then the third item under this heading is any action arising. I am not quite sure who will report on these various proceedings, Dr. McHugh, does this fall to you?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The scientists who have worked on the assessment of the North Pacific whale stocks are headed by Mr. Pike of Canada, and perhaps it would be appropriate to call on him first.

Mr. G.C. PIKE (Canada): We have heard in the latest session on the North Pacific whale stocks that the Report has not yet been finalised and accepted by all members of the North Pacific Working Group. This will be referred first of all to the Scientific Committee itself.

The CHAIRMAN: So we must defer our discussion on this item until the scientists concerned have been able to have another meeting. Is that right?

Mr. G.C. PIKE (Canada): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that apply also to the meeting of commissioners, Dr. McHugh?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I could give you a brief interim report on the discussions between the North Pacific commissioners. We took the opportunity to meet early in February this year in Washington, D.C., and I am very sorry to report, as you already know, that we were not able to reach any final agreement, although there was general agreement that we should try to get the catch of fin whales in the North Pacific down below the sustainable yield no later than the 1969 season.

Unfortunately, we were not able to agree on just how this quota, if it were agreed upon, would be divided amongst the interested countries, and this is the problem on which we reached a deadlock.

I would hope that at the appropriate times during the present meetings we might be able to get together again either for bilateral discussions or perhaps for a meeting of the four countries involved. I would hope that we might be able to report some progress before the end of this meeting. That is about all I am able to say right now.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems then that we should leave any further discussion on this item until the scientists and the commissioners concerned have made further attempts to agree on recommendations. This is also a matter which would have to be considered by the Technical Committee, and I think we should ask the Technical Committee to take account of any reports made to them by the Scientific Committee or by Dr. McHugh, and if possible, make recommendations to the Commission for consideration at a later plenary session. I think that is probably as far as we can go on item 10 at this stage.

Item 11 deals with land station catches in the Southern Hemisphere, and the agenda refers commissioners to two paragraphs in the Chairman's Report of the Eighteenth Meeting. The first of these, paragraph 14, relates to attempts to get in touch with the non-member countries of this Commission; the Chairman was in fact asked to try and make contact with the Commission for the South Pacific to which certain non-members of this Commission belong, and I accordingly wrote on behalf of the Commission a rather long and detailed letter. In it I gave our assessment of the stock situation in the Antarctic, and appealed to the Commission to reinforce the recommendations of this Commission by making similar recommendations, particularly for the complete protection of the blue and the hump-backed whales.

I also suggested that we should try and exchange observers and generally exchange information about what we were doing. I received no response to this letter, but when I was in Rome for a meeting of the Committee on Fisheries, I met the Secretary of this Commission who was

observing at this meeting for his Commission. I had a talk with him, unfortunately I did not get what I had hoped to get, that was details of the regulations which this Commission has in operation, but I got expressions of goodwill and the intention to collaborate.

I asked Mr. Garcia Sayan if there was any chance of his attending this meeting as an observer. Unfortunately, he was unable to do so, but a few days ago I had a letter from him enclosing some regulations. These have been circulated this morning, they still do not give sufficient detail of the protective measures that are in operation in these South American countries, but there is a wish expressed to co-operate with this Commission. In particular, there is an invitation to send an observer at the next regular session of the South Pacific Commission which takes place in Lima in October.

That, briefly, is my report on what I have done in an attempt to establish further contact with this Commission. So far, it has not shown very much practical result, but I would hope that the Commission would be able to appoint an observer to attend the conference in Lima next October and perhaps in that way, or in some other way, we can obtain further information about what the other Commission is doing. We may be able to urge them to take stronger protective measures, if indeed those are necessary.

Dr. Holt has been in touch with this body, I do not know whether he can comment or add anything to what I have been saying.

Dr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): I cannot add anything to your remarks, we are in touch with the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific as one of the regional fisheries commissions with which FAO co-operates, but in the past year our contacts with that Commission have not dealt with the subject of whaling at all. So I am afraid I have no further information to offer the Commission in this respect.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any possibility that FAO might form the link? You say that you have not had any contacts with them on whales, is there any possibility that you could do so?

Dr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be quite feasible, I have not really considered this. Do you mean particularly as a link between this Commission and the South Pacific Commission, or that FAO might be more active with respect to the whaling interests of that South Pacific Commission?

I ask this because we have sent observers to the meetings of the Commission and I think at its last meeting it did not look at the subject of whaling at all. It was not on its agenda, and we did not, as observers, ask that this subject should be discussed at that time. We were particularly cautious because the Commission was going through a difficult period with its own re-organisation.

As I reported to this Commission last year, although we had previously sought information from the separate member countries of the permanent Commission for the South Pacific to obtain statistics, we had not gone to the Commission itself. But I see no hindrance to our being more active in this respect, particularly if this Commission were to express an interest that we should do so.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the Commission were concerned last year at the number of whales that were being caught from land stations in the South American countries, particularly blue whales and humpbacked whales which this Commission has completely protected. I am afraid I have not had time to absorb the statistics that came round this morning, but

it appears from one of the loose sheets that in Peru at any rate in 1966 blue whales and humpbacked whales are still being caught.

What I think the Commission wished to have last year was first of all some idea of what regulations the other Commission, the South Pacific Commission, has in operation; secondly, possibly to try and persuade the Commission, if those regulations do not seem to be tight enough, to take parallel action with the action being taken in this Commission to bring the catch down below the sustainable yield.

I think the difficulty has been to establish a channel of communications with the other Commission, and I was really asking whether we could use the good offices of FAO, which is in contact with the other Commission, as a possible channel of communication. But I feel I have spoken rather a lot on this subject, and I would like to know whether other commissioners have any views.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): It would certainly seem to me that it would be quite proper for an FAO observer, if FAO would do this, to have at least presented at the next meeting of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific, the copies of the assessments that FAO are completing with regard to at least Antarctic stocks and perhaps any others that they may have completed by the time of the annual meeting of the Commission.

I think if this were done, it would come very close to expressing to a great extent the feeling of this Commission, and would be doing it from the standpoint of simply placing data before the other Commission. It would seem to me at least as a first step this would be a most desirable course to follow at this time.

/The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Sprules

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Sprules, Does anyone else wish to comment on this item? I think we should, at the moment, note Dr. Sprules' suggestion for the F.A.O. Observer, and perhaps we could return to this subject under one of the later items where we deal with the appointment of observers. I think this is generally done under item 22, Any Other Business. In the meantime, I think we might note the suggestion that F.A.O. should act as our link in this matter unless anyone else has any other suggestion to make.

Dr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I am collecting my thoughts on this matter in stages; I would be happy if you could come back to this matter towards the end of this week for another reason that has occurred to me, and that is that the F.A.O. Committee on Fisheries, which is an inter-Governmental Committee of 30 member countries of F.A.O., recently considered proposals from the countries which are members of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific - Chile, Peru and Ecuador - that a new fishery commission should be established consisting of those countries, under the auspices of F.A.O. The question of establishing this commission is as yet unresolved, but there are, at this moment, discussions going on, in fact, the F.A.O. Council has just been considering the matter which, if it went forward, would involve some division of responsibilities between the existing permanent Commission for the South Pacific and a possible new F.A.O. Fishery Advisory Commission. Towards the end of the week I will be in a better position to see what has happened in this respect, which is, I think, pertinent to this matter, and I will perhaps be able to offer a more concrete suggestion as to F.A.O.'s role in this question. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Holt. I take it then we agree to return to this matter at a later meeting? (Agreed)

The second item under this heading relates to catches from land stations, and this seems to me to be a matter the Commission will wish to refer to the Technical Committee and consider again in the light of the Technical Committee's report. Could I ask if anyone wishes to make any comments at this stage, before the matter is referred to the Technical Committee? No comments? Then we pass to item 12, Economic studies of whaling regulations.

You will recall that at the last meeting of the Commission it was agreed to ask F.A.O. to give some advice on the economic aspects of whaling problems, and I do not know whether I should ask Dr. Holt to report on the progress that has been made by F.A.O. Dr. Holt?

Dr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A note on the economic studies has been distributed to the Commission as document IWC/19/7. I should tell the Commission that, apart from the preamble of this note, the first four paragraphs really record facts which I think are perfectly well known to the members of the Commission.

It soon became apparent that, in fact, the data on which useful economic statements could be made for the purposes of the Commission do not exist, or at least they are not published and were not available to F.A.O. This, I suppose, might have been anticipated and, to a certain extent, was anticipated, but searches of possible sources of information made this clear. Consequently, as the paragraph states, F.A.O. addressed to the operating countries some requests for specific information on the economics, the input and output of the whaling operations. We have no idea whether it will be possible or practicable for the countries to meet this request, but as they were distributed only very recently we have no information yet in our hands, but we would hardly expect to have information in such a short time.

I have little more to add to this, Mr. Chairman; it is a rather negative report on an inter-sessional interval of one year, but a

considerable amount of work did go into the analysis and discussions of the kinds of data which might be useful and which might be available within the countries for the kinds of assessment that the Commission had in mind. We did have in mind that at this meeting the opportunity might be taken to clarify the problem a little in some appropriate committee or ad hoc working group of the Commission, and these suggestions are detailed in paragraph 6 of the note. In particular we were not quite clear how far we should attempt to assess the economic effects of many possible recommendations, and we were not quite sure that we were following the most useful and fruitful route in our requests for more economic data. It may be that we should be assisted in getting the data that is required for these assessments if the Commission itself were to address a request to countries asking that steps be taken to meet the request that has been made by F.A.O. for certain kinds of information.

That really is all I can say about this at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Holt.

Would it be the wish of the Commission to ask the Technical Committee to consider these points set out in paragraph 6 of the F.A.O. note? It seems to me that these are matters on which the Commission would wish to have the advice of the Technical Committee. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Are there any further comments on this item of the agenda? If not, can we now pass on to item 13, Infractions? I think a paper has been circulated. The normal thing is for this to be considered in the first place by the Infractions Sub-Committee of the Technical Committee, and I suggest that we might let this matter take its normal course.

Does anyone wish to comment at this stage? If not, we come to item 14 on the agenda, which we clearly cannot consider until we have had the report of the Technical Committee.

The same applies to item 15, where we must await the report of the Finance and Administration Committee that we have just set up.

We now come to item 16, the Eighteenth Annual Report. A draft has been prepared by the Secretariat and circulated as Paper IWC/19/5. I am not sure how the Commission wishes to take this report. The report is, of course, intended to be purely factual, there are one or two gaps which need to be filled in. Can I take it page by page, or does the Commission wish to have time to consider it and return to it later? I think it is fairly straightforward and if we could dispose of it now it would be an advantage.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, we have not made a thorough study of this draft report to the Commission of the Eighteenth meeting, therefore I wonder if I could propose that we should take up this question at a later stage, at an appropriate time, when we have finished the examination in detail of this report?

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fujita. Mr. Fujita has suggested that as we have only just had this circulated we should defer consideration until we have had time to read it rather more carefully. I am quite prepared to accept this suggestion if that is the general wish, and in that case we will have to return to it at the next plenary session. Is that agreeable? (Agreed)

In that case we will pass on to item 17 on the agenda, Amendments to the Schedule. I think that all proposals for amendments to the schedule have to be referred, in the first place, to the Technical Committee

and I think we should, therefore, ask the Technical Committee to consider all these points, (a) to (j), under item 17.

Could I also ask the Technical Committee, when they make recommendations under this heading, to indicate in their report the precise wording of any amendments to the Schedule that they may propose. This, I think, facilitates the work of the Commission, if they have a precise form of words before them.

Does anyone wish to comment on any of these items under item 17 before they are referred to the Technical Committee?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I would only like to make one comment. I have seen the draft unapproved report of the Scientific Committee and I would simply like to ask the Scientific Committee to be sure that they have dealt with each one of these matters as completely as they can, in order to provide some scientific background for the help of the Technical Committee when it does meet. I do believe that there are some items proposed under our main agenda item 17, Amendments to the Schedule, which have not been looked at by the Scientific Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Sprules.

Dr. Chapman, can you comment on that?

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (U.S.A.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Did you have in mind a specific item with respect to the listed items for amendments to the Schedule, Dr. Sprules?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Yes, item 17 (g).

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (U.S.A.): Yes, I think you are right, we have not considered item 17 (g), and we will have to look at that. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Sprules, for calling attention to it and thank you, Dr. Chapman, for agreeing to look at this point.

Are there any other comments on item 17 of the agenda? We charge the Technical Committee, then, with the duty of making recommendations on these points.

We now come to item 18, Appointment of Secretary. I have one or two things I would like to say under this item. I think this is necessary because the meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee will need to have regard to this item in making their report.

The first thing I want to say is that in accordance with a suggestion made at the last meeting of the Commission I did have a testimonial prepared for Mr. Wimpenny which was very nicely written out and framed and presented to him, and I think he was very pleased with it. I am glad to be able to say too that Mr. Wimpenny, whose health made him resign last year, is now very much better.

During the year Mr. Goldthorpe has carried on the duties of Secretary as Acting Secretary, under my supervision, and I think you will agree that he has done a very good job for the Commission. I feel sure, however, that the Commission will wish to appoint a Secretary who is not just a member of my staff who might be transferred at any time to other work.

At this meeting of the Commission I have asked Mr. Stacey to help the Commission; he is sitting two places away from me. Mr. Stacey has recently retired from an administrative post in my department and he has had considerable experience of working with scientists. He was for a short time at the Agricultural Research Council. He has also had

a good deal of experience in being a secretary of committees and commissions. I think that Mr. Stacey would be willing to take on the post of the secretaryship, if that was your desire. I do not propose to ask the Commission to come to any decision on this point at this moment, but I thought I would like to introduce Mr. Stacey to you. He will, of course, be helping with the secretarial work at this meeting. It will be for the Finance and Administration Committee now to make recommendations to the Commission as to the appointment of the Secretary, the terms of service and so on.

Does anyone wish to comment at this stage? If not, we can pass on to item 19, Date and place of next meeting. Again I must make a short report on this, because I think it is relevant to the work of the Finance and Administration Committee. I should report that I have this morning received a letter from the Ambassador of Japan in London, which I would like to read to the Commission.

"Sir, I have the honour to inform you, under instructions from my Government, that the Government of Japan is prepared, subject to the final approval of the Cabinet, to extend an invitation to the International Whaling Commission to hold its Twentieth Annual Meeting in Tokyo in 1968, if the Commission so desires.

"I have the further honour to request you to bring the intention of the Government of Japan to this effect to the attention of the Commission at the coming meeting, when it considers the place of its Twentieth Meeting, and to inform me of the reactions of the Commission."

I thought it right to bring this to your notice immediately, because it does affect the work of some of our committees. I do not know whether Mr. Fujita or any other commissioner wishes to comment at this stage.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(Interpretation): At last year's meeting of the Commission I indicated that the Government of Japan would be considering inviting the International Whaling Commission to hold its Twentieth Meeting in Tokyo. Since then we have followed that line and, as the Chairman has just indicated, we have dispatched a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Commission from our Ambassador in London to the effect that the Government of Japan is prepared to extend an invitation, if the Commission so desires, to hold its next meeting in Tokyo. Therefore, if it becomes clear that it is the wish of the Commission to hold its next meeting in Tokyo, then the Government of Japan will be in a position to extend a formal invitation to the Commission. I would, therefore, like the Finance and Administration Committee to take up this matter and to carry out their work on the assumption that this coming meeting will be held in Tokyo.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fujita. I am sure the Commission will wish to express their thanks to the Government of Japan for this invitation. I should perhaps remind you that the Rule of Procedure would, in fact, permit the Commission to meet in Tokyo next year, since the last two meetings have been held in London.

Is it your wish, then, that the Commission should accept this invitation? Could I have a motion or suggestion on this matter?

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): I would support the idea that the next meeting of this Commission should be held in Tokyo.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I second that.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further proposals, I think the Commission should accept with gratitude and thanks the offer that has been made by the Government of Japan; this will enable the Finance Committee to make the necessary provisions in the budget that they will be providing for next year.

I presume that the date of the meeting will be the corresponding date to the 26th. That will be the 24th next year because next year is a leap year, is that right?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask that the Finance and Administration Committee decide on the precise date of our meeting next year in Tokyo and inform us later.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that suggestion, Mr. Fujita. We will ask the Finance Committee to consider the date of the next meeting.

We have to leave the other three items on the agenda until later meetings so, unless there are any other points, this concludes the first plenary session of the Commission.

(Arrangements were made for the Scientific Committee to meet at 1330 hours and the Technical Committee at 1430 hours.)

Perhaps I could ask whoever is elected chairman of the Technical Committee to let me, or the acting secretary, know when it will be convenient for the committee to meet, because the meetings of the Technical and Scientific Committees may have to be dovetailed so that they do not overlap.

I hope that during the next two days the Technical Committee, the Finance Committee, the Scientific Committee, and perhaps even the North Pacific commissioners, will find time to meet and to draw up their reports so that we can start plenary sessions again on Thursday morning. If we can start earlier than that, so much the better, but I think that we ought to aim to start plenary sessions again not later than Thursday morning.

(The Meeting adjourned at 1215 hours.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

NINETEENTH MEETING

Session of Thursday, 29th June, 1966/7

In the Chair: Mr. W.C. Tame

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, may we begin the Second Plenary Session of the Commission?

As you all know, the Technical Committee only finished their deliberations about half an hour ago, and the Report of the Technical Committee is not available. We have available, however, the Report of the Finance Committee which has been circulated as IWC/19/15, and unless delegates see any objection, I propose that we should now turn our attention to those items on our Agenda which were referred to the Finance and Administration Committee, and try to dispose of them.

After that, I would like to deal with the formal acceptance of the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee, and then to go on to item 16, the Eighteenth Annual Report.

The Report of the Technical Committee may be available later this evening, or if not, then we shall have to leave over the items on which we require the Technical Committee's advice until the next Plenary Session tomorrow. If that programme is convenient, I suggest we now turn to item 4 on the Agenda, Finance and Administration. I will ask Dr. Sprules who was the Chairman of the Finance Committee if he will introduce the item on behalf of the Committee.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): The Report of the Finance and Administration Committee has been circulated as document IWC/19/15, and I think it has been in the hands of most Commissioners long enough to have been read and digested, so I shall make my remarks as brief as possible.

I believe I am in a fortunate position this year to be able to do that, since I can assure my fellow Commissioners that the financial situation of the Commission seems to be in a reasonably good state, which, as many of us will remember, has not been the case on some occasions.

Your Committee met on two days, and presents this Report for your consideration. Under the Statements of Income and Expenditure for the year ending 31st May, 1967, we found that there is a balance at the end of the year which we have just passed through, and there are also outstanding certain small contributions from some member nations, and a rather major contribution in payments from Panama who, you will remember, has indicated her intention to withdraw from the Commission, but who has not submitted her formal notification to the depository government.

There are smaller contributions outstanding from Argentina, Norway and Mexico, and we felt that perhaps the incoming Secretary would send a notice of this fact to those governments perhaps at the time they are being billed for the amounts owed in the next year.

This covers the Ordinary Budget for the year ending May, 1967, and you will note on the first page of the Report there is a balance of £1457. This, of course, assumes payment of all the owing debts, and thus may not be a very realistic figure. If we subtract from this

the balances owed to the Commission, it brings it down to £304, but that still is at least on the right side of the ledger.

If you will turn to page 2, we have reviewed also the Extra-ordinary Budget for the fiscal year ending May, 1967, and we find here a rather healthy balance of £2577 which has resulted from the fact that the sperm whale assessment work did not get under way in that year, and yet we had gathered funds for it.

I think there is nothing more to say on that, except that at the top of page 2, this surplus money will be discussed once again as I move to the next item which deals with Estimated Income and Expenditure for the year ending 31st May, 1968.

We reviewed the expenditures that are anticipated for this year which we are now in, and it looks as though again there will be some savings. We have moved the balance from the preceding year forward, and we find that we anticipate that at the end of this year, May, 1968, there will be an accumulated balance of approximately £3847. However, I must again bring to your attention that in bringing forward this balance we are including the payments which have not been received, for instance, from Panama which is quite a substantial amount. If we discount this amount, then our balance to carry forward would be £1658.

Coming to the bottom of page 2, we gave consideration to the Extra-ordinary Budget for this same year ending May, 1968 and agreed that we should make arrangements to pay for the sperm whale assessment work which will be conducted, we understand, in this year, from the balance which we are carrying forward from the Extra-ordinary Budget.

As Chairman, I discussed this both with Dr. Holt and with Dr. Chapman, Chairman of our Scientific Committee, and they indicated that their best estimate of costs for this work would be £2100. Our proposal to the Commission is that from the amount carried forward in the Extra-ordinary Budget which is £2577, once again we contribute £500 to the whale marking programme. This would leave a balance of £2077, and this is so very close to the estimate given to me by the FAO representative and Dr. Chapman that we feel this will indeed cover the costs of the special sperm whale meeting.

/On page 3

(Dr. W.M. Sprules continued.....)

On page 3 we come to the consideration of the next meeting of the Commission, and you will notice, at the bottom of the first paragraph under item 4, the statement that we decided to recommend to the Commission that the next meeting should begin on June 24th, 1968, and that we should accept the very kind invitation from the Government of Japan. However, I am not quite sure that we are doing this in the proper order, Mr. Chairman, because, if I recall correctly, at the opening plenary session I think the Commission made a decision to accept the Japanese invitation. The Finance Committee has now looked at the problem of financing such a meeting and we feel it can be done and that we certainly would lend our support to the decision of the Commission.

I should point out at this time, with regard to the meeting in Tokyo, that the Japanese members of the Finance Committee gave us a great deal of detailed information about the contribution they expect to be able to make to the Commission's meeting if it were held in Tokyo. I want to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that the Japanese Government has not formally accepted us as yet, since the Government itself is waiting to hear from us that we would agree to go to Tokyo. I think then the necessary administrative matters would be cleared away in Japan and we would receive a formal invitation to meet in Tokyo beginning on June 24th; that is the beginning date of our plenary sessions.

The Japanese representatives indicated that they would be able to provide meeting space and considerable assistance in clerical, stenographic and stenotyping operation, and many general, miscellaneous materials and supplies that would be needed to run the Commission's meeting.

We would like to suggest to you that the Commission's thanks should be conveyed to the Government of Japan for their very kind offer.

We then came to a consideration of what members of the Commission staff would be required in Tokyo to service the next annual meeting, and we feel rather strongly that both a Secretary and, perhaps, an Assistant Secretary from London should proceed to Tokyo to make arrangements for the meeting and be there to supervise and give the necessary guidance to the Japanese clerical staff that would be provided by the Government of Japan. In considering this, we came to the conclusion that the subsistence allowance which this Commission has normally made available to its staff when it does travel away from London was rather inadequate when we considered the possible expenses in Japan. It is expected that the meeting would be held in a hotel in Tokyo and that the costs of this room would be rather similar to the costs of a room in North America or, indeed, in London these days, and we think that an allowance of £5 a day would be inadequate to cover food and hotel accommodation. Without wanting to specify a new definitive figure as a subsistence allowance for the secretariat staff that goes to Japan, we wish to recommend to you, Sir, that the actual living expenses of the secretariat staff be met by the Commission when the staff goes to Japan next year. What we mean by this is that the hotel bill would be paid by the Commission and that the meals that are eaten would be paid for. We then have in mind that there are certain things that should not be paid for that very often one becomes involved in in Japan, and we have no intention of authorising the secretariat staff to take their meals at the top geisha houses in Japan or, indeed, to have the Commission pay for any of the geisha entertainment which they may appreciate! But we do feel, Mr. Chairman, that in this case the normal living expenses for meals and, perhaps, taxi cabs and dry cleaning and the hotel room should somehow be met by the Commission in this rather different situation. We so recommend to you.

We then came to the last item that we had under consideration, which was the appointment of a Secretary, and if you will turn to page 4 of our

report you will see that the committee recommended the appointment of Mr. Stacey as Secretary to the International Whaling Commission. We think this is a very kind offer on the part of the United Kingdom, that is to have a man of this competence proposed for us and available to accept such a position, and we certainly would recommend his permanent appointment as Secretary.

In connection with this matter, of course, the matter of salary came up, and we realised that while Mr. Wimpenny was Secretary to this Commission he had a salary of £550 . In addition he was granted £200 for travel allowance, since he was located out of London and found it quite necessary to make trips to London, so he was allowed £200 travel allowance. Our proposal is, after considering the increase in living costs and the decrease in purchasing power of the pound in the last few years, that this amount should be incorporated, that the travel allowance amount that Mr. Wimpenny had should be incorporated in the salary that would be offered to Mr. Stacey, should he agree to take the position of Secretary of the Commission. We have included an amount of £750 under salary in the estimates for the year ending in May 1968, and would recommend that you give favourable consideration to this.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I think all of the Committee has been quite impressed, and I am sure other Commissioners too, with the very efficient work Mr. Goldthorpe has done for us during the last year, and we feel that the Commission would wish to offer a show of appreciation to him at some suitable time, and would bring this to your attention.

That completes the report of the Finance and Administration Committee and, I think, covers the matters referred to us under the main Agenda items 4 (a) and (b); it also includes item 15, which is, indeed, our report, and also our recommendation with regard to date and place of next meeting, which is item 19. On behalf of my committee members I therefore wish to present this report and to move the adoption of the report.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Dr. Sprules.

/I am sure that the Commission.....

The CHAIRMAN (continued): I am sure that the Commission will have noted the austere approach that the Finance Committee has made to the question of expenses in Tokyo and will approve this attitude, even if the Secretariat regard it with some regret.

If I might just comment seriously on one of the points that Dr. Sprules made, I think I misled the Commission at the opening Plenary session in asking Commissioners to make a decision about the place of the next meeting. What I think I should have done was to have reported the Japanese invitation to the Commission and asked the Finance Committee for its advice on it. I am sorry that this matter was not handled quite as it should have been, but perhaps no harm has been done in view of the recommendation of the Finance Committee.

I think that it might now be convenient if we were to take the agenda items in turn, having heard the Report of the Finance Committee as a whole, and we will turn first to item 4(a), which is the review of the Commission's financial position. The effect of the Report of the Finance Committee is to approve the budgets that have been circulated for the year 1966/1967, and there are also recommendations that the Secretariat should communicate with Panama and find out what her intentions are, and also that the Secretariat, in sending out the bills for next year, should call the attention of those governments which have not paid their full contributions for the past year to that fact.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): From this paper it appears that the contribution from Norway for the income and expenditure year ending 31 May, 1967, is still outstanding. I apologize for that. It is due to an entirely technical oversight. The payment is now in hand and will reach the Secretariat either today or tomorrow.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (USA): I should like to ask a question about an item on the ordinary budget on page 1. I rather hesitate to ask the question because it might embarrass my colleague from Mexico, and I certainly do not intend to do that, but I thought I understood Dr. Sprules to say that if the amounts owing to the Commission were deducted from the balance of £1457, this left a balance of £103. The words which I read in this paragraph do not mean that to me, and I was wondering whether the words were at fault or whether that was a slip on Dr. Sprules' part.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I think it was a slip on my part; I am sorry. This refers to the outstanding contribution from ~~Panama~~ Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN: On the third sheet of the budget circulated with IWC/19/2 it does appear, on the right-hand side, that there are outstanding contributions of \$350 from Argentina, \$103 from Mexico, and \$350 from Norway which Mr. Knudtson has just told us about. That seems to me to be the position.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (USA): My question really is, why single out one country and mention the obligation in specific figures, and not mention it also for other countries? Would it not be better simply to delete this reference to £103? I have trouble with this sentence. It does not make sense to me.

The CHAIRMAN: I have read it myself as meaning that the full contribution was outstanding from Argentina and Norway, but that Mexico only owed the balance of £103.

Dr. R. MILLAN (Mexico): Mr. Chairman, I thought that my Government had sent the total amount of our annual contribution. I apologize on my own and my country's behalf if something is wrong in this matter. My information was that my Government had sent the total contribution, and I cannot understand how this has arisen. However, if the Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee will give me what information he has, I will immediately advise my Government.

Mr. A. von der BECKE (Argentina): I am sure that the fact that the contribution from my country is still in arrears is due to a technical difficulty that sometimes arises because the central bank has to deal with the budgets of the Ministries. It is sometimes a little while before it is settled, but I am quite sure that in a very short time the International Whaling Commission will receive Argentina's contribution, and I sincerely apologize for all the problems which this may have caused for the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that we have now had explanations of the amounts outstanding and they will, of course, appear in the record of the plenary session.

Dr. McHugh, I am not sure that, in any case, the Commission would be in order in amending the Report of the Finance Committee. Do you think that the matter is now clear as it has been put on record?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (USA): Yes, it is now clear to me, Mr. Chairman. My question has been answered.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions on the statements of income and expenditure for the year ending 31 May, 1967, could I have a proposal that these statements be accepted?

(The proposal, being moved by Dr. Sprules and seconded by Mr. Bollen, was agreed.)

Do you also propose, Dr. Sprules, that the Secretariat should be asked to get in touch with Panama? This refers to the end of the first page of your Committee's Report. Can I ask if you are moving that as a definite proposal?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Yes, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps we in the Committee have picked on the wrong person to write the letter and maybe it should be the Chairman, but we think it is rather necessary that the member nations now know definitely Panama's intent with regard to membership. She has indicated her intention to withdraw and has not been paying the annual assessment, but she has not delivered a formal note to the Depositary Government. We think that the Commission should have this information if it can be obtained from the Panamanian Government. Then we should not be carrying forward balances which are, indeed, perhaps not true, or budgeting our programmes in anticipation of receiving such funds.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that your proposal is that the Secretary, in consultation with the Chairman, should approach the Government of Panama and endeavour to find out their intentions.

(The proposal, being moved and seconded, was agreed.)

I think that that disposes of the income and expenditure accounts for the year ended 31 May, 1967.

Let us now look at the estimates for 1968. I will ask Dr. Sprules to move any necessary motions in connexion with the estimates for 1968.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I will be very pleased to move the adoption of the Report of income and expenditure for the year ending 31 May, 1968, as outlined in the Report of the Finance and Administration Committee and as detailed on IWC/19/2B, the last sheet of the circulated document.

(The proposal, being moved and seconded, was agreed.)

The other matter under item 4 of the agenda is the review of the present level of contribution from contracting Governments. On this there is no specific recommendation, but I think it follows from what Dr. Sprules has said

that there is no proposal for any change in the rate of contribution next year. As regards the extraordinary budget, I think the proposal is that there should be no levy for next year.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I am trying frantically to find it! I am sure I have read it, but I cannot find it at the moment. The decision of the Finance and Administration Committee was that we would not need to change the level of contributions from member nations during this year. It would remain at £350. There would also be no necessity this year to reinstate or to conduct in any way an additional levy to cover any additional specific project costs. So we are recommending no change in the annual assessment and that no levy be applied this year.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that we should take this proposal in two parts. The first part is that there should be no change in the contribution for 1967/1968. Will somebody second that?

(The proposal, being moved and seconded,
was agreed.)

The second half of Dr. Sprules' proposal was that no levy should be made during the coming year for the extraordinary budget. Will somebody second that?

(The proposal, being moved and seconded,
was agreed.)

That disposes of item 4 on the agenda.

We come now to item 18 on the agenda, the appointment of a Secretary. We have a series of recommendations from the Finance Committee. The first is that Mr. Stacey should be appointed as Secretary of the Committee. I think that Dr. Sprules did, in fact, propose this in the course of his remarks.

(The proposal, being moved and seconded,
was agreed.)

Since that is approved, the Commission will appoint Mr. Stacey as its Secretary.

The next point is the question of the salary to be paid to the Secretary. The recommendation is that the salary should be £750 a year inclusive to take account of increased costs in the United Kingdom. Dr. Sprules, I take it that you will again propose this?

(The proposal, being moved and seconded,
was agreed.)

Finally, it has been suggested that the Commission should record its appreciation of the way in which Mr. Goldthorpe has carried out the duties of Acting Secretary to the Commission.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (USA): I have had an opportunity in the last two or three days to work very closely with Mr. Goldthorpe, and I do not want the occasion to pass without recording my compliments to him for the excellent work that he is doing, and for the excellent services that he has given to the Commission in the past year. He certainly backed me up in every possible way in my capacity as Chairman of the Technical Committee, and I should like to record my personal appreciation of his services.

The CHAIRMAN: I can certainly support that from my own personal experience during the past year. As a very inexperienced Chairman I have had enormous help from Mr. Goldthorpe which I very much appreciate. Would the Commission desire to express its appreciation in the usual way? (Applause)

That disposes of item 18 of the agenda.

We now come to item 19 of the agenda, where again we have a series of propositions from the Finance Committee. The first is that the Commission should accept the provisional invitation which has been given by the Japanese Government. Although the Commission may, perhaps, have done this already, perhaps we should put ourselves in order by doing it again. Could I ask for someone to propose this motion?

(The proposal, being moved and seconded,
was agreed.)

This means that the Commission accepts the recommendation of the Finance Committee to accept the invitation from the Japanese Government to hold the next meeting in Tokyo. I am sure that the Commission would want to endorse the remarks of the Finance Committee that the Commission's thanks should be conveyed to the Japanese Government.

If there are no further comments on the place of the next meeting, we will turn to the date of that meeting. The Finance Committee has recommended the 24th June, 1968.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I should just like to point out to the Commission that this is the date for 1968 which follows the pattern that we have been following for several years in our annual meetings. From informal discussions with members of the Japanese delegation I think I was able to find out that this would be a suitable date from the point of view of Japan. Both these considerations influenced our decision to propose 24 June, and I would so move.

The CHAIRMAN: Would someone second the proposal that the meeting should begin on 24 June?

(The proposal, being moved and seconded,
was agreed.)

Finally under this item there is the proposal from the Committee that the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary should travel to Tokyo for the meeting, and that they should be paid their appropriate living expenses. Dr. Sprules, have I correctly summarized your remarks on that and, if so, will you move that?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Yes, Mr. Chairman. I might just mention, for the information of the other commissioners, that we gave serious consideration to this as to whether we would need one person or two people from the Secretariat with experience to travel to Tokyo to run this meeting. Since Mr. Stacey has been serving only in an assisting capacity at this Annual Meeting we felt that it would put a rather heavy burden on his shoulders if we were to ask him in the first year to conduct the secretarial duties of the meeting in a foreign country away from his books and papers. We feel rather strongly that, if it can be arranged, we should ask Mr. Goldthorpe to bring along his experience to assist Mr. Stacey next year in Tokyo. I should like to move, Mr. Chairman, that both Mr. Stacey and Mr. Goldthorpe be permitted if possible to go to Tokyo for the next Annual Meeting, and that they be paid out of pocket living expenses. The new Finance and Administration Committee next year will have to look very closely at the Tokyo expense accounts, but that will be the responsibility of some other delegations!

The CHAIRMAN: Will someone second this proposal?

(The proposal, being moved and seconded,
was agreed.)

That disposes of item 19 on our agenda.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan):(Interpretation) Mr. Chairman, as it seems that the time and place of the next meeting has been decided, I would like to say a few words in this connection. However, I would ask for the direction and advice of the Chairman as to whether I should do so now or at a later stage.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fujita, I hope we will not need to return to item 19, so if it is relevant to item 19, could you do it now?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): As Commissioner for the host government for the Twentieth Meeting of the International Whaling Commission which is to be held in Tokyo, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the Chairman and members of this Commission for having accepted the invitation from my government.

As it has been formally decided in this Commission to hold the next meeting in Tokyo, after I go home I will submit this matter for final approval by the Cabinet, and in due course a letter will be sent to the Chairman of the Commission informing him of this and extending a formal invitation to the Commission.

According to my recollections, it was in 1954 that the International Whaling Commission held its meeting in Tokyo, and nearly 13 years have passed since then. We would have liked to invite the Whaling Commission to hold its meeting in Tokyo much earlier but due to various situations this has been delayed and now we are very pleased that this hope is to be realised.

Tokyo is changing quite rapidly, it changes more every year and this has probably been noticed by many members of this Commission who have visited Japan, and in particular I believe it will be noticed by those members of this Commission who are to visit Tokyo next year for the first time since the 1954 meeting.

We were considering extending our most generous hospitality to the members of this Commission if the quota of the pelagic catch in the Antarctic were fixed at a level for which we would hope, but it now seems that this situation would be difficult to predict, so the degree of hospitality may vary. In the event of the quota being fixed contrary to our hopes, the degree of hospitality may be rather low!

I believe many members of this Commission who have come to London this year have observed the mini-skirts in fashion, but I cannot guarantee to the members of the Commission that they may see mini-skirts in Tokyo worn by fresh young ladies next year !

In Japan, the end of June falls within the rainy season and therefore I cannot guarantee the weather either. However, Japan possesses many places and things which may attract the visitors from overseas, and we are going to extend a very hearty welcome to the members of the Whaling Commission, I hope they will enjoy their stay in Tokyo as well as carrying out the business of the meeting in a successful manner.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fujita, I am sure the Commission has every confidence that we will enjoy ourselves very much in Tokyo. I did wonder at one stage whether your remarks were being made on the right item on the Agenda, it seemed to me that you were making a strong case under the Schedule paragraph 8 (a), the pelagic catch limit in Antarctica. I suppose we shall have to reconcile ourselves to the absence of mini-skirts, but perhaps if the Commission would care to make a suitable provision in the Budget for next year, we could persuade a mini-skirted young lady from London to come with the Commission as a sample!

Could we now turn to item 15, which is the approval of the Finance and Administration Committee Report? We have now taken up all the points in this Report and have adopted all the proposals put forward, therefore it is really only a formality to adopt the Report. Does Dr. Sprules formally wish to move the adoption of the Report of the Finance Committee?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Yes, I did this at the end of my presentation, but I certainly wish to do it formally, I move the adoption of the Report.

The CHAIRMAN: That is seconded by Mr. Fujita, are there any objections? (Adopted)

Could we now take item 16 on the Agenda, the approval of the draft Eighteenth Report of the Commission which was circulated as document IWC/19/5. I hope that all Commissioners will now have had a chance of reading it.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) : (Interpretation) I do not object to adopting this draft Eighteenth Report of the Commission which was circulated on the first day of the meeting. However, I have read through it, and found many blanks with no figures, it is very difficult to find out what this means. I feel it would be hard to approve this draft without knowing what those blanks mean, so if the Chairman will please fill them in with the appropriate words or figures, we can proceed with the examination of this Report.

The CHAIRMAN: The Acting Secretary has the figures, I was proposing to take the Report page by page, and we can then put the figures in as we come to them, if that will satisfy the point made by Japan.

Page 1 is complete, there are no blanks. If there are no comments on it I will ask the Acting Secretary to let you have the figures for page 2 which go into the various blank spaces.

The ACTING SECRETARY: Reading from left to right, at the top of page 2: Japan, 3 blue whales; the figure in brackets shows the catch for last year, 374 fin whales; no humpbacks; 8695 sei whales; 1639 units.

Norway: 1 blue; 857 fin; no humpbacks; 2232 sei; 801 units.
U.S.S.R.: no blue; 1662 fin; no humpbacks; 1441 sei; 1071 units.

Three lines down: the number of sperm whales caught by the Antarctic pelagic expedition south of 40° south latitude totalled 4960, compared with 4538 in 1965/66.

Going down a few more lines, the total oil output for the 1966/67 Antarctic pelagic season including sperm oil was 600,130 barrels. The average fin whale size was 66.3 feet, the average size of sei whales was 47.9 feet, the sperm whale size average was 46.4 feet.

In the final table, reading from left to right, 1966/67, 23 in Area I, 299 in Area II, 1922 in Area III, 659 in Area IV, 272 in Area V, and 332 in Area VI. The 1965/66 figures show no change, this gives a decrease, reading from left to right: 0; 2140; 0; 0; 89; 0. And an increase: 9; 0; 959; 553; 0; 130.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Goldthorpe.

Does anyone wish to comment on page 2 with the figures inserted?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Believing that those figures are correct, our Delegation has no objection to approving this page, but I would like to ask that the Secretariat type out this page with the concrete figures which have been given, and have this distributed at a later stage. In case any mistake should be found, I should like to reserve the right to ask the Commission to correct the figure. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fujita.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I would just like to endorse what Mr. Fujita has requested, because I notice in the table at the bottom of the page that the numbers under area 5 do not seem to come out correctly; the difference between 361 and 272 is considerably less than 189.

The CHAIRMAN: 89 was the figure.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Oh, I am sorry,

The CHAIRMAN: I thought it might be the quickest way of disposing of this item, but if there is going to be any difficulty about the figures it might be best to ask the Secretariat to get them put in and circulate the document again and we will return to this item tomorrow.

I was wanting to dispose of as much as possible this evening because we have a number of difficult items left and we have only one day of plenary sessions before us, but we will return to this item 16 in the course of tomorrow.

I do not know what the Commission now feel, I should be grateful for your advice. I think all the other items that we have to deal with, except the formal ones at the end, are really dependent on the report of the Technical Committee. I suppose we could start to discuss some of these on the basis of a verbal report from Dr. McHugh, but it might be for the general convenience of members that we should wait until we have the report before us. I am in the hands of the Commission on this. Perhaps, Dr. McHugh, I could ask for your advice on this. It will throw a great strain on you if we have to take the Technical Committee's recommendations before the report was circulated.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I rather think you are correct. I must apologise that the Technical Committee did not complete its work more promptly, but we ran into several difficult questions which required a good deal of debate, as you know, and I did not want to be overly autocratic and limit debate unless it was necessary. I would much prefer to wait until the report of the Technical Committee is in my hands and I have had a chance to review it as a whole, because I rather think if I were to attempt to report on parts of it now I might very well make mistakes which would simply waste everyone's time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me it will be necessary to adjourn this plenary session at this point, unless there is any other business we can do.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUNCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation):
Can we not deal now with the report of the Scientific Committee and accept it?

The CHAIRMAN: The reason I did not suggest taking that item was that the report of the Scientific Committee will be considerably referred

to in the report of the Technical Committee, and I thought that it would be difficult for us to approve the report of the Scientific Committee until we had taken a view on its recommendations and findings in going through the report of the Technical Committee.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): In an effort to save a little time, it might be possible, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, to have Dr. Chapman review briefly the Scientific Report. This is usually done at the annual meetings, and it is my understanding that we do not adopt the report of the Scientific Committee, in the sense of approving all its recommendations, but we simply accept it as a document to be used by the Commission. Perhaps this might save a little time for you tomorrow, if we could go through this part of it, at least.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. McHugh, I think that is a very good suggestion. Perhaps I could ask Dr. Chapman to say a few words about the report of the Scientific Committee.

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, the recommendations of the Scientific Committee pertaining to various items on the Schedule have, of course, been referred to before and have been under much consideration by the Technical Committee. I do not think you will wish me to review any of these at this time, so I will just refer to other recommendations.

There was one other recommendation which, in effect, has been adopted, the proposal to have a sperm whale assessment this year; in accepting the budget brought by the Finance and Administration Committee I presume that that has been approved.

There are two other items of the general recommendations that might now be given some consideration, perhaps, by the Commission. I refer firstly to recommendation 13 on IWC/19/3. That recommendation had reference to the protected species and there is concern by both the scientists and the whaling countries concerning when we will be in a position to re-open the catching of these species and make proper assessments. The Scientific Committee had before it some very good sighting data by Japanese expeditions and other ships from Japan, and we would like the Commission to request all whaling companies to assist in reporting sightings of all prohibited species, blue, humpback, right and gray whales, in respect of area, time and effort as the reporting of catch data. Would you like to discuss this recommendation now or would you like me to go on?

The CHAIRMAN: I would like you to go on and we will come back to this point.

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (U.S.A.): The other item that I might just bring forward briefly is that the Committee became aware of a certain confusion that exists in the International Convention. I refer to the recommendation 15 on page 8 :

"..... in the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (p.13) "sei whales" are taken to include Boyde's whales. Since these two species are now accepted as distinct, it is recommended that steps be taken so that the Commission can recognise them as separate for conservation purposes."

I would also just mention, in passing, a couple of points that were brought out in our report and which I think are of some concern for the future, the fact that it has been generally agreed by the Scientific Committee that in Area II the stock of sei whales is at a level below that of the maximum sustainable yield and therefore the Committee feels that consideration should be given at some future time to establishing separate quotas by areas. This is the last item of point 3. I do not think this point has been particularly called to the attention of the Commission before, but we did feel that there is the possibility of improper

utilisation of the resources if stocks in some areas were pushed down much below the sustainable yield level while stocks in other areas were not being exploited adequately, and there may be problems in this regard. So that at some stage, as we become better able to estimate the stock sizes and the maximum sustainable yields in each of the separate areas, some possibility of such a rational scheme of management perhaps should be considered.

There are a number of other items that we also would like to draw to the attention of the Commission under item 3. I will not go into them at the present time, but I feel that the Commission should be aware of some recommendations that were made by the F.A.O. assessment group. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Chapman.

We then have a proposal from the Scientific Committee that the Commission should request all whaling companies to assist in reporting sightings of prohibited species in the same detail with respect to area, time and effort as the reporting of catch data. This is paragraph 13 on page 8 of the Scientific Committee's report. Can I first ask if there are any comments on this proposal?

Dr. Chapman should you, perhaps, move that the Commission act in accordance with the Committee's recommendations, and we can then see if this is generally supported. Could we have a proposition from you, Dr. Chapman, that the Commission should do as you suggest in recommendation 13?

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN (U.S.A.): I would think this should not, perhaps, take the case of a formal motion at this time, Mr. Chairman, but perhaps this might become a request from the Chairman or the Secretary of the Commission that this be requested at this time. I am not sure that this should come as a formal motion, as it might have to come onto the Schedule, which, of course, would not be possible at this time. It is my suggestion that the Chairman or the Secretary of the Commission should make this as a request to all Commissioners at this time, merely on a rather informal basis at the present time, and if it is found possible to make it more formal later that would be fine.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no question of putting it in the Schedule, but in order that the Chairman or the Secretary can take this action I think they need a request from the Commission to do so. Without wishing to make this too formal I thought you would propose that the Commission should make this request and that someone would second it, then everyone would agree and the Chairman or the Secretary would be able to act accordingly.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): Mr. Chairman, if I may speak for Dr. Chapman, he does not feel he should make a motion before this group because he is not a Commissioner, so to cover his embarrassment I will make the motion for him.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. McHugh.

(The proposal, being moved by U.S.A. and seconded by South Africa, was agreed)

We now come to the second point which Dr. Chapman asked us to consider, and that was paragraph 15 on page 8, relating to the definition of sei whales. I think this would, in fact, entail a change in the Schedule and, therefore, it is not a thing we could do at this meeting. Perhaps we should note this point and ask the Secretary to put the matter on the agenda for the next meeting so that it can then be considered and discussed by the Commission. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

The other point to which you drew particular attention, Dr. Chapman, was your recommendation 3 on page 7, but here I understood you were not putting forward a proposal at this stage but merely drawing a point to the attention of the Commission which it may have to deal with in future meetings.

Dr. D.G. CHAPMAN: That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN: Does anyone wish to comment on this recommendation?

Dr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Mr. Chairman, I was hesitant to ask whether I might speak on this matter or whether what I wished to say was pertinent to item 8 (a) of the agenda relating to the special scientific investigation of the whale stocks, which I think relates specifically to the tasks entrusted to the F.A.O. in this respect. However, this is a matter which has been referred to in F.A.O.'s submission to the Commission on the state of the whale stocks, and as it has been worded in the Scientific Committee's report in this particular form, I wonder if you would permit me to say a brief word about it.

The Committee of Three originally proposed to the Commission that there should be separate species quotas in the Antarctic, but the Commission was unable, at the time, to accept that proposal, and last year the F.A.O., in presenting its report to the Commission, suggested that the Commission might consider the possible closure of the Antarctic to the capture of fin whales, taking advantage of the great surplus of sei whales then existing.

/This surplus of sei whales.....

This surplus of sei whales has now, to a large extent, been removed, and although the FAO report this year again referred to the possibility of ensuring the recovery of the fin whale stock by putting a complete closure on the capture of fin whales, we recognise that the time has perhaps now passed when this is practicable because there is not the sei whale surplus to sustain the Antarctic pelagic industry alone.

It was for this reason that we put forward a suggestion which would, we felt, have the effect of encouraging the re-growth of the fin whale stock without necessitating a complete closure of fin whale capture, or the establishment of species quotas which the Commission had previously found unacceptable.

We proposed that a measure which might be within the powers of the Commission under its Convention, and which might be practicable, was a change in the definition of the blue whale unit which, I think, would imply an amendment to Schedule paragraph 8(b).

I am raising this matter in the Plenary Session because the question was referred to the Commission from the Scientific Committee, and I think I am right in saying that it has not been considered by the Technical Committee. I realise that it is not possible to discuss this and other proposals such as the Scientific Committee's suggestion to close Area II, all of which would have the effect of ensuring a proper, desirable balance in the exploitation of the different species in the area, or a proper balance in the Area exploitation.

I realise that the Commission cannot discuss these at this time, but I wonder whether it might be possible to consider whether this matter could be placed on the Agenda of the Commission at its next meeting. I make this suggestion because if it were so to be placed, then the FAO assessment group would, I think, be in a position to come forward next year with more detailed assessments of the possible consequences of, for example, either closing a particular area, or making specific modifications in the definition of the blue whale unit.

We would not, however, make those extra assessments if the Commission were not prepared to discuss this particular question at its next session. Forgive me for raising this matter in some detail, but it will assist us in knowing what kinds of assessments we should prepare for the assistance of the Commission next year.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask you to be quite precise about the item which you would like the Commission to put on the Agenda for the next meeting?

Dr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): My thought is that the provision might be made in the Agenda for a possible modification of Schedule paragraph 8 (b) which is the definition of the blue whale unit. I think with respect to the Area closures, this is covered by Schedule paragraph 5, but I am subject to correction on that one.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask if there are any comments on the suggestion which Dr. Holt has made to put an item or items on the Agenda of the next meeting of the Commission which would permit the discussion first of all of possible Area closures, and secondly, for modifications of the calculation of the blue whale unit.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Could I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if the definition of the blue whale unit is in the Schedule to the Convention or in the Convention?

The CHAIRMAN: It is in the Schedule.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): I would observe that every year a draft Agenda is prepared by the Secretariat and distributed before the meeting starts. If any member country has any comment or any item to add to the Agenda, they send it to the Secretariat and this item is included in the Agenda. As far as I can see, no member of this Commission has proposed this, and I think if this question were to be dealt with and included in next year's Agenda, then when the draft Agenda is circulated any member nation could ask the Commission to include it on the draft Agenda.

I cannot say what my reaction is, if I am asked for my opinion suddenly on this question of putting that item on the Agenda for next year.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): I support the viewpoint of Mr. Fujita.

It seems that the Soviet Delegation will not agree with this item being included on the Agenda, since doing this will make the statistics more complicated.

The thing is that the whalers, the people directly engaged in the whaling operations during this series of years have become accustomed to the proportion of the different species in the one global unit. Beside that, such a change in the proportion of different species in one global unit would not in any way affect the stock condition of fin whales

/This is not a means by which

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (USSR) (interpretation, continued): This is not a means by which we can stimulate a decrease in fin whale catches. It would be easier for us to fix separate quotas by species than to accept the complications proposed by Mr. Holt.

I will not list now all the other inconveniences, but there will be many if such a proposal is adopted. At this time I will only support the proposal of Mr. Fujita on the question of whether or not to include that matter in the agenda of the forthcoming meeting of the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been suggested by Japan, and supported by the Soviet Union, that the Commission should not take a decision on this matter at present, but that it should be left to any country which wished to do so to raise this matter and put it on the provisional agenda.

I think the point that Mr. Holt was making was that, if it were known by the FAO that this item was to be discussed next year the FAO assessment group would go into the matter in more detail than they might otherwise do. I should like to ask Mr. Holt whether, nonetheless, it would be possible to leave the matter on the basis suggested by Japan and the Soviet Union.

Dr. S.J. HOLT (FAO): Yes, of course. I am completely in your hands on this matter. I am very grateful for the chance for an exchange of views so that we understand the position of the Commission on this.

Dr. R. MILLAN (Mexico): I have listened to the opinions expressed by the delegations of Japan and of the USSR, and my Government would like to propose that, at the next meeting, the agenda should include an item under which we could discuss the possibility of receiving some figures and statistics. Mexico would approve a motion to include in the next agenda the FAO figures and studies.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments on this matter? I understand from Dr. Holt that the figures will, of course, be included in the FAO Report as usual. The question of whether this particular matter should be discussed will, if we accept the Japanese and Soviet suggestion, be left to individual countries to decide in terms of whether they wish to propose an item for the provisional agenda. I wonder if we can leave the matter on that basis.

Gentlemen, I feel that we ought to adjourn within the next two or three minutes because we have an engagement at 6.30. Can I just ask whether there are any further comments on the Report of the Scientific Committee? If not, perhaps we could just conclude our business for this evening by formally adopting that Report.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (USA): I should just like to call to your attention, and it may be evident to everybody already, that the Report of the Technical Committee is now in your hands, and if people could study it some time this evening it might make our work go more smoothly tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we, just before adjourning, dispose of the Report of the Scientific Committee? Would someone propose that this Report should be adopted? That is proposed by the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. It is proposed and seconded. Are there any objections?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I feel rather awkward stating this at the last minute, but, with regard to what you have said about the adoption of this Report, I should like to say that it is sufficient for this Committee to accept the Report as it is, that is the Report of the Scientific Committee, as a basis for discussion when we come to discuss many of the items on the agenda under the Report of the Technical Committee. It seems to me that to say we adopt the Report of the Scientific Committee has too strong a meaning. I think it would be sufficient to say that the Commission accepts the Report as a basis for discussion, and the same could be said with respect to the Report of the Technical Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I was advised earlier in the Meeting on what we should do about the Report of the Scientific Committee, and I certainly understood it in the sense that Mr. Fujita has just mentioned, that is that we accept it as a basis for discussion without necessarily agreeing with every statement that is in it. Perhaps "accept" the Report would be a better formula. Can I ask the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union who proposed and seconded this whether that is their understanding?

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (USSR)(interpretation): I propose that we should adopt and approve the Report of the Scientific Committee, and we will return to the individual problems or recommendations of the Report when we consider the recommendations of the Technical Committee.

/The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that if the Commission accepts the report of the Scientific Committee it is doing exactly what Mr. Sukhoruchenko has just said, and that is, it is taking this report as a basis for discussion without necessarily approving everything that is said in it. Can I take it that it is the wish of the Commission to accept the report in this sense? I see no objection. The Commission accepts the report of the Scientific Committee.

Can I say to Dr. Chapman and his colleagues that the Commission is extremely grateful to him and to them for all the work that they have done, both at the meeting and during the year, to analyse the statistics and present the material to us so clearly and cogently, and can I also record an omission on my part earlier in the afternoon when I should have thanked Dr. Sprules and the Finance and Administration Committee for their work in digesting the different figures, the financial figures, and presenting them to us with such a clear report and recommendations. I hope, Dr. Sprules, that this very sincere thanks is in no way impaired by coming a little late. Thank you very much. (Applause)

The plenary session will reconvene at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, and I would echo Dr. McHugh's wish that you will study the report of the Technical Committee in the meantime, because we shall be working hard on that report tomorrow.

(The meeting adjourned at 5.55 p.m.)

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

NINETEENTH MEETING

Session of Friday, 30th June, 1967

In the Chair: Mr. W.C. Tame

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the Third Plenary Session is now open. I propose that we should go through the remaining items of the Agenda in the light of the recommendations of the Technical Committee, and I propose that we should take the items in the order in which they appear on the Agenda as far as possible. This means we start with item 6, the International Observer Scheme.

On this, we have a report from a working group which was introduced by Mr. Graham at the first meeting of the Plenary Session, and we also have some recommendations from the Technical Committee, which has considered the report of the Working Group. This is item 3 in the report of the Technical Committee, paragraphs 12 - 15, and I will first give the floor to Dr. McHugh and ask him to review the comments of the Technical Committee on this item.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The Technical Committee considered the question of the International Observer Scheme, and we had before us the report of the Working Group headed by Mr. Graham. There was some argument in the Technical Committee as to whether we were able to recommend an amendment to the Schedule because this item had not been included under item 17 of our Agenda. One delegation made the point that this made it impossible to recommend an amendment to the Schedule this year.

Other delegations felt that since this question appeared under another item on the Agenda and had therefore been considered in advance by all delegations, it was possible to make a recommendation.

We reached no decision on this point, and so decided to leave the question up to the Commission to decide. As you will see in our report, we determined that if the Commission decides that it is appropriate to amend the Schedule under the provisions of the rules of procedure, and the Convention, then we would recommend two amendments.

The first would be that in paragraph 1 (a), line 3, we would suggest the deletion of the words "The Antarctic" and in paragraph 1(b) line 1, insert after the words "land station", the words "there shall be maintained such observers as the member countries having jurisdiction over land stations may arrange to place at each other's land stations".

There is one other matter to come up under this item, but perhaps you would like to consider this point first. I would point out once again that these suggested changes in the Schedule are contingent on the Commissioners deciding that this is appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments?

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): I must confess that I have prepared a brief statement, and it would suit me very well if I could take both

the recommendations on paragraphs 14 and 15 as a whole, I think that would simplify the task of dealing with paragraph 14. If the Chairman will allow me, I would be glad to make a statement. (The Chairman assented)

From the Chairman's Report of the Eighteenth Meeting of the Commission, in the paragraph relating to the International Observer Scheme, it appears that the Commission recommended to the pelagic whaling countries that they should meet and implement as soon as possible the previous scheme.

I would recommend that at the bottom of page 3, after the word "operation" in the penultimate line, be inserted the following sentence: "The Commission recommended to the pelagic whaling countries that they should meet and implement as soon as possible this Scheme."

Now I would like to draw the attention of the Commission to IWC/19/16, the Report of the Technical Committee. On page 3, under paragraph 15, is recommended the following resolution:

"The Commission takes note of the report of the Working Group on an International Observer Scheme and invites the countries concerned to establish regional schemes along the lines proposed in that report."

In the opening session of this Nineteenth Meeting, I recommended that the Commission take the report of the Working Group as a starting point, and entrust the Working Group with the task of continuing discussions, and make a progress report to the next meeting.

The Norwegian delegation does not find the resolution recommended by the Technical Committee satisfactory. In the first place, the lines for the Observer Scheme proposed in the report from the Working Group are very vague and will, I am afraid, because of their lack of detail, be of little use for the countries concerned in solving the problem of establishing adequate observer schemes.

I therefore move that the Commission in its resolution stresses the desirability of bringing into operation a complete set of observer schemes.

Next I will comment on paragraph 14 of the report of the Technical Committee. It seems to me to be quite evident that whether the Schedule is altered or not, it will have no effect because there are so many details which must be against that I think it is quite impossible. You cannot even hope that the countries concerned will be able to agree on such arrangements. Therefore, since there have been disputes regarding the question of whether or not the Commission may alter these provisions of the Schedule because the direct wording has not been put on the Agenda, I think it is useless to discuss that question or problem. I move that the Commission take no definite stand on the question.

/The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Knudtzon,

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Knudtzon. I am not quite sure I understood your last remark, did you say you did not think it was desirable for the Commission to spend time discussing this matter and, therefore, it should not take a view on this point? I am not sure I understood you.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): A discussion would be a mere academic one and I think the Commission has so much left to do that we should not hamper the deliberations with academic discussions.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Knudtzon. Secondly, I was not quite sure which was the document you wished to amend in the first part of your statement.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): The Draft Eighteenth Report of the Commission, number 5.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall come to that under another item of the agenda, so we can leave over your point.

As regards your suggestion in regard to paragraph 15 of the Technical Committee's Report, we have not yet had this brought before us by Dr. McHugh, but we note that when we come to this paragraph Norway will, perhaps, move an amendment of the draft resolution.

Can I ask if there are any other comments on paragraph 14 of the Technical Committee's Report?

Mr. A. von der BECKE (Argentina): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When the items of the International Observer Scheme and the catch of whales from land stations were discussed in the Technical Committee the Argentine delegation reserved its position and said it would make a statement on this at the plenary session. Could I make that statement now, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN : Yes, please, Mr. von der Becke.

Mr. A. von der BECKE (Argentina): Mr. Chairman, the Argentine delegation, with regard to land station catches in the Southern Hemisphere and the International Observer Scheme, would like to have included into the record that the Malvinas, Georgias del Sur and Sandwich del Sur Islands, whose occupation is kept by the United Kingdom, as a result of an act of force never accepted by the Argentine people and Government, are part of the territory of the Argentine Republic and are comprehended in its domain and sovereignty. This declaration reiterates the firm determination of the Argentine Government to persist in the reclamation of its legitimate rights until the reintegration of those Islands to the national territory is achieved. It is fitting to the occasion to remember Resolution 2065 (XX) adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 16th December, 1965, and confirmed by consensus adopted by the United Nations Assembly on 20th December, 1966, by which the world community has taken notice of the existence of a dispute between the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom about the sovereignty on those islands, and has invited the Governments of both countries to proceed with negotiations aimed at a peaceful solution to the problem.

This is a statement, Mr. Chairman, and I would be grateful if it could be included in the official record of this session.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. von der Becke. Are there any further comments on this item?

Mr. J. GRAHAM (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Argentine delegation should have thought it necessary once again to raise a matter on which their views and those of the United Kingdom must be well known to the Commission. But since they have done so I feel that I

am bound to state, for the record also, that the United Kingdom Government has no doubt of the legitimacy of its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and its dependants, South Georgia and the Sandwich Islands, and I formally reserve Her Majesty's Government's right on this question.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, it seems that now political problems are being discussed here, so maybe my item will not be in direct line with those.

The Soviet delegation would like to ask you, as the Commission's Chairman, to answer the following question. Under item 6 of the agenda for this meeting, the International Observer Scheme, was any provision made or any forecast made for the amendments to be made to the Schedule of the Convention, and was it necessary to include such proposed amendments under item 17 of the agenda?

In order to clarify this I will ask the same question in some other form. Under the provisions of the Rules of Procedure of the Convention are any amendments to the Schedule envisaged, or are they envisaged under any other item of the agenda, in particular under item 17?

I am asking this question in connection with the Soviet delegation voting for the adoption of the agenda and having in mind the understanding that all the amendments to the Schedule which were proposed to be made were listed under item 17 of the agenda, and in case any amendment to the Schedule was to be considered under item 6 of the agenda that those proposed amendments had to be included in the list of amendments under item 17. I hope my question can be well understood by all participants at the meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

/The Chairman: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I do not think that I am qualified to give a ruling on this subject. If a ruling were required it would be necessary to seek the advice of the Commission's legal adviser, which I think will be difficult in the time available. If I had to give a personal opinion it would be this. Rule XIII says:

"No order of business which involves amendment of the Schedule to the Convention shall be the subject of decisive action by the Commission unless the subject matter has been included in the provisional order of business"

and so on. It does seem to me that the subject matter of this proposed amendment of the schedule, namely the International Observer Scheme, was in fact included in the provisional agenda, the subject matter was included even though there was no proposal for amendment of the schedule. However, I can see the point that is being made by Mr. Sukhoruchenko that item 6 on the agenda should have been picked up in item 17 if it had been thought that an amendment of the Schedule would be made. I would not like to take the responsibility of saying that that is not a perfectly valid argument, because after all we have picked up other matters from other items of the agenda and put them into item 17. There is, for instance, item 17(i), "Provision for restriction of the catch of whales in the North Pacific (arising out of item 10)". I can see the Soviet argument that it would have been consistent to have included in paragraph 19 an entry relating to the International Observer Scheme which would have a note, "(arising out of item 6)".

I think, therefore, that the matter is of so much doubt that I would not care to rule on it without taking legal advice. I wonder, therefore, whether the Commission would be prepared to accept the helpful suggestion made by Mr. Knudtson that, as this is not a vital matter, it could be left over without the Commission taking a decision this year, but that it should be included in the agenda for next year if that is the wish of the Commission.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (USA): Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps your decision is the best way to handle this matter. However, since we might run into the same question at some future time, I would hope that you would indeed ask for legal advice and get a ruling on this question.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Can I take it that Norway has proposed and the United States has seconded a proposition that we should leave this matter over at this Meeting and return to it at a subsequent Meeting of the Commission, and that in the meantime the Chairman should be asked to get a legal ruling on the subject from the Commission's legal adviser?

Mr. Knudtson, would you propose something on those lines?

Mr. H.T. KNUDTSON (Norway): Mr. Chairman, I would agree with you and with Dr. McHugh, but if -- which I do not think would be the case -- the Commission should conflict with the Rules of Procedure, I would ask the Secretary to see to it that, if the Observer Scheme is on the agenda for the next Meeting, it will also be included under the item dealing with the amendments of the Schedule. We shall not then need to have any new discussion based on advice from the legal adviser.

Mr. A.G. BOLLEN (Australia): Would it be possible, when you have obtained this legal advice, to advise the commissioners of what is contained in the ruling, so that we shall be well prepared long before we think up agenda items for the next Meeting?

The CHAIRMAN: If that is the wish of the Meeting I will undertake to see that that is done. Are there any other proposals under this item? This is paragraph 14 of the Technical Committee's Report. Dr. McHugh, did you second the proposal that this should be left over? I think you spoke in favour of it.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (USA): Yes, I am willing to second that motion.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (USSR)(interpretation): The Soviet delegation is also willing to second the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN: The proposal is that the Commission should not take a decision on this matter at this Meeting because of the element of legal doubt, that the Chairman be asked to obtain a legal ruling from the legal adviser, and that this ruling be circulated to Commissioners well in advance of the next Meeting. This has been proposed and seconded.

(The motion, having been proposed and seconded, was agreed.)

We come now to paragraph 15. Dr. McHugh?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (USA): We have already heard from Mr. Knudtzon on this paragraph, but perhaps I might touch on it. The Technical Committee is recommending to the Commission that the following draft resolution be considered:

"The Commission takes note of the report of the Working Group on an International Observer Scheme and invites the countries concerned to establish regional schemes along the lines proposed in that report."

I might point out that there should be quotation marks after the word "report". I would move that this resolution be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Does anyone second this motion?

Mr. J. GRAHAM (United Kingdom): I will second the proposal.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (USSR)(interpretation): The Soviet delegation would like to make a comment on the draft resolution. In the view of the Soviet delegation the proposals made by the Working Group and adopted later are not decisive. The matters which have not been resolved are so great that they negate the effectiveness of any decision. I will talk only about one item.

In the decision taken by the Working Group there is no provision for a catch limit or for quotas to be set for land stations. This means that there is no control over the number of whales taken from land stations. There are only some regulatory measures envisaged in relation to the taking of lactating females, calves, or small-sized whales. The majority of countries have national legislation by means of which whalers who catch small-sized whales or calves are fined for doing so. Besides that, every country has very strict control under the whaling regulations. However, with the exception of South Africa, no country has control over the quantitative limitation of the whale catch. The land stations have the right to take whales in unlimited numbers and there is no control over them.

The basis for the 1963 agreement on an International Observer Scheme was quantitative control. The Working Group, while using that agreement as a basis, simultaneously excluded quantitative control. If such a decision were to be taken at this session very little benefit would be derived from it. All the participants in our Meetings are well aware that world public opinion is very concerned about the problem of conserving the whale stocks. If we were to take a decision such as that recommended by the Working Group we might well calm down public opinion by stating that international control would be established, but under cover of such proposed control unlimited catches of whales could in fact continue to be taken. We feel that this is to some degree misleading public opinion and that such control would have negative rather than positive consequences. It does, in fact, lead us away from real and effective control of whaling.

Therefore, taking into account all that we have said, the Soviet delegation will abstain from adopting the recommendations put forward by the Working Group.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(interpretation): Mr. Chairman, our delegation agrees with the adoption of the draft resolution in paragraph 15 as moved by the United States delegation and seconded by the United Kingdom.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (USA): I should just like to correct an impression that may have been left. For a good part of the day I shall be making motions as Chairman of the Technical Committee, but that does not mean that I am making them necessarily as head of the United States delegation. I just want to make that clear, because I may vote differently from the way that I move.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that your position will be understood.

I understood from what the Norwegian delegate said earlier that he might wish to move an amendment to this.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): I should like to move an addition to the recommendation of the Technical Committee as follows:

"In doing so it reiterates its recommendation from its eighteenth meeting to the effect that the pelagic whaling countries should implement as soon as possible the previous scheme."

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Knudtzon, this is an addition, is it?

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): Yes, it is a proposed addition to the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The proposal from Norway, as I understand it, is to accept the first sentence in the draft resolution as set out in paragraph 15, but to add a further sentence which would read:

"In doing so it reiterates its recommendation from its eighteenth meeting to the effect that the pelagic whaling countries should implement as soon as possible the previous scheme."

Does anyone second the Norwegian proposal?

Dr. V.G. LAFITSKY (USSR)(interpretation): I should like to ask Mr. Knudtzon a question for clarification. What does he have in mind when he speaks about implementing the scheme which previously existed? Five countries participated in the 1963 Agreement on an International Observer Scheme, but that Scheme has now expired and there are only three countries still engaged in Antarctic pelagic whaling. In order to implement an International Observer Scheme we must conclude a new agreement, and the question of what kind of scheme there should be was discussed in the Working Group.

We do not understand what the wording of the Norwegian proposal means.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): I would be very glad to answer the Soviet Union's question. During our discussions in the Working Group I learnt that, in the Soviet view, the main object of an International Observer Scheme would be to ensure that the catch limits were not exceeded, and there would be no other direct regulation of the number of whales taken in any sort of whaling other than pelagic whaling in the Antarctic. In fact, the Soviet delegation agrees that it would be a good thing to have international observers there. I see the point of the Soviet delegation's comment. Today we have not got any quota distribution agreement. However, I think

that the Commission wants very much a meeting of the pelagic countries in order to conclude such an agreement, and perhaps we could add a new sentence at the end stating that the Commission urges the pelagic countries concerned to do what they can to get a quota distribution agreement.

Dr. V.G. LAFITSKY (USSR)(interpretation): It seems to us that the answer was not relevant to the question, but I do not want to take any more of the time of the Commission. We are grateful for having had the opportunity to ask the question.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that it would be appropriate to this particular resolution to say anything about quota distribution. This must be left over for some other place. It also seems to me that the Norwegian proposal is slightly inconsistent with the first half, with the sentence as proposed by the Technical Committee, which invites the countries concerned to establish regional schemes along the lines proposed in the Report. The Norwegian proposal seems to ask something different, that the countries should implement as soon as possible the previous scheme. I think that what the Norwegian delegation had in mind was perhaps that, pending agreement on a regional scheme, they should implement the previous scheme, but it is rather difficult for the Commission to invite countries to establish new schemes and, at the same time, reiterate a recommendation that they should implement the old scheme. This is a question that I should like to ask Mr. Knudtzon to clarify.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): I shall be very brief this time. From the Report of the Working Group it appears that the old expired agreement can be taken as a prototype for other schemes. I agree that, as this scheme was originally formulated, there were five participants and today there are only three countries involved. However, I personally cannot understand why this scheme could not be implemented or renewed between the three pelagic whaling countries while waiting for the problems of the Observer Scheme to be resolved.

However, Mr. Chairman, to simplify matters, I withdraw my proposal.

/The CHAIRMAN: The Commission has

The CHAIRMAN: The Commission has before it the draft resolution set out in paragraph 15 of the Technical Committee's report which has been proposed and seconded. If there are no further comments I propose to poll the Commission on this item, and I will ask the Acting Secretary to call the roll.

The ACTING SECRETARY: Thank you.

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

(The motion was carried with 12 in favour and 2 abstentions)

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other points on item 6 of the Agenda? We have already dealt with item 7, we now come to item 8 (b), arrangements for the continuation of stock assessment work. We have a recommendation from the Technical Committee on this matter, item 13, paragraph 7 of their report.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The Chairman of the Scientific Committee and also the FAO observer reported to us on their activities with respect to stock assessment, and their views as to what might take place in the future. We are very grateful to the FAO for the work that they have done, and we recommend that they be asked to continue their work during the coming year.

This, as you know, also involves a decision by the Finance and Administration Committee which has already been heard, so I do not think a motion is necessary, unless the Chairman thinks we need one. We make this recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps we should have it formally recorded that the Commission asks FAO to continue the work during the coming year, and I will take it that what Dr. McHugh has said is moving that proposition. Are there any comments? (The motion was seconded by Argentina and Mexico) Er. Holt, do you wish to make any comment?

Dr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): I would only like to say that we appreciate the trust that the Commission continues to give FAO in this regard. I will transmit the thanks of the Commission which are expressed in your statement to my Director-General and propose that FAO give sympathetic consideration to the request that we continue to undertake this work.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been proposed, seconded on the lines of the Technical Committee's recommendation and Dr. Holt has agreed to transmit this recommendation to his organisation. If there are no objections, this is the decision of the Commission.

We now come to item 9, dealing with the sperm whale stocks, and I would point out that the possibility of a change in the Schedule is provided for in item (h) of paragraph 17 of the Agenda. Dr. McHugh, will you please introduce the Technical Committee's recommendation on this matter?

Dr. J. L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The Scientific Committee had recommended to us that the FAO Assessment Group should convene a workshop meeting for the assessment of sperm whale stocks before May, 1968, and also recommended that a meeting be convened early in 1968 to resolve some of the age determination problems for sperm whales and baleen whales.

No new conservation measures were suggested because we had no new stock assessment, and it was not considered that there was sufficient evidence to make any recommendations.

We would, however, ask the Commission to request the Scientific Committee to look at the evidence and see whether they think that the minimum size limits for sperm whales are satisfactory from a scientific point of view. As Chairman of the Committee, I would so move.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I think this is quite in order, but it might be advisable for the workshop group to give this consideration, if it happens to fit into their programme. But I think the fundamental body primarily responsible to carry out such a review for this Commission would be our own Scientific Committee. Perhaps it would be simply that the FAO workshop which will include some of our specialists, would look at it briefly, but I think they will be mainly concerned with assessment, and they may have some information which they would pass on to our own Scientific Committee.

Primarily, our own Scientific Committee would wish to look at this problem, and advise us at some later date as well. If this is the understanding, I have no objection to the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments?

Dr. S.J. HOLT (FAO): Forgive me, if I have not understood precisely which problem Dr. Sprules was referring to. I take it he means the question of the size limits, not the question of the age determination, but I would like to be quite clear.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Just the size limit problem.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it not clear in the last sentence of paragraph 10 that the Commission would in fact request the Scientific Committee to look at this matter?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): It is completely clear there, I think I became confused between the written word and the spoken word, but probably it is just the time of day!

The CHAIRMAN: The motion has been proposed by Dr. McHugh, and now Dr. Sprules has seconded that the report of the Technical Committee on this matter be adopted, that is that there should be no new conservation measures introduced yet, that the Commission should request the Scientific Committee to look at the evidence and see whether they thought that the minimum size limits for sperm whales were satisfactory from a scientific point of view. (The motion was accepted) As this has been accepted by the Commission, there is no amendment necessary to the Schedule and item 17 (h) falls.

We now come to the North Pacific stocks, item 10 of the Agenda. This is now a matter covered by the Technical Committee's report, perhaps you would speak on it, Dr. McHugh.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I suppose I should speak on this subject in two capacities, one as Chairman of the North Pacific group of Commissioners, and one as Chairman of the Technical Committee, but I would like to run these together and simply report on the matter as a whole. I think largely this Agenda item refers later to Agenda item 17, so all I have to say at the present time is that we took the advice of the Scientific Committee into consideration on this subject, and the Technical Committee was also pleased to hear that the North Pacific Commissioners had made some progress in the deliberations which they have held during this meeting.

This is very encouraging because, as you will remember, in Washington in February this year we were not able to report very much progress.

I have just one other comment at the present time, that is that the third sentence of paragraph 16 is, I think, in the wrong place. It seems to me that it should come between the two recommendations for the amendment of the Schedule, it should come immediately after the recommendation with respect to paragraph 6 (4). I think it is more appropriate for it to be inserted there.

The rest of this item might be left until we come to item 17, unless you would like to hear something further on it.

The CHAIRMAN: Does anyone wish to comment on the report of the Technical Committee on this matter?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): I would just like to say that the revision proposed by the Chairman of the Technical Committee with regard to paragraph 16 is indeed what I suggested at the Technical Committee meeting. The positioning of this sentence should have been where Dr. McHugh suggests.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Dr. McHugh suggested we should leave this proposed amendments to the Schedule over until we came to item 17 on the Agenda, but I wonder whether it would not be more convenient to take them at this point because we are now addressing our minds to the question of the North Pacific stocks. There is nothing in our Rules of Procedure which prevents us from making amendments to the Schedule at this stage if that is so desired. I feel myself it would be more convenient to go straight on.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The first recommendation concerns item 17(c) with respect to humpback whaling in the North Pacific. The Committee agreed to recommend to the Commission the following amendment in paragraph 6, Section 4: delete "during the 1967 season" and substitute the words "for three years beginning with the 1968 season". Would you like to act on this before I go on to the others?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, please. The effect of this proposed amendment would be to make this paragraph of the Schedule 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 for three years beginning with the 1968 season."

This has been proposed by Dr. McHugh on behalf of the Technical Committee. (The motion was seconded by Argentina, Japan and the U.S.S.R.) As this is an amendment to the Schedule, it requires a three-quarters majority, and I think I must poll Commissioners to make sure that that is obtained. Are there any comments? If not, Mr. Acting Secretary, will you please take a poll.

The ACTING SECRETARY:

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

(The motion was carried unanimously)

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. McHugh, will you move the amendments to paragraph 9 of the Schedule?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The next item refers to item 17 (i) of the Agenda, provision for restriction of the catch of whales in the North Pacific. This is the sentence to which I referred, and so did Dr. Sprules, which should be inserted between the last two paragraphs of this item, "No further recommendations were made with respect to the restriction of catches or season in the North Pacific". I do not think any action is required on this because we have no recommendations.

The next item refers to item 17 (g) of our Agenda, and this is a recommendation for another amendment to the Schedule regarding paragraphs 9(a) and 9(b) of the Schedule. We recommend that the Commission delete the words "1st April 1965" and substitute the words "1st April 1968". As Chairman of the Technical Committee, I so move.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. (The motion was seconded by Canada and Japan). If there are no comments, I will ask the Acting Secretary to poll the Commission on this proposal.

The ACTING SECRETARY:

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

(The Motion was carried unanimously)

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other matters arising under item 10 of the Agenda relating to the North Pacific whale stocks?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada) I would like to take a brief moment to indicate the Canadian disappointment in the necessity to have passed the three year closure on humpbacks which we have just passed.

(Dr. W.M. Sprules continued)

I do not mean to imply in any way that the Canadian Delegation or, indeed, the Canadian Government is against this matter and, in fact, we voted for it. I think that from the scientific evidence made available to us about conditions of stocks in the North Pacific, it is absolutely essential and we agree with it.

However, I think at this time it is incumbent on me to point out that we are certainly proceeding to a very difficult area in the North Pacific ocean and all of us know it. This fact has been expressed on previous occasions, in fact the forewarning of the possible effect of increased effort in the North Pacific was forecast to this Commission many years ago. We have now run out of the opportunity to catch blue whales in the North Pacific, which is similar to the rest of the world. We seem now to have run out of the possibility of catching humpback whales in the North Pacific for a considerable period of time.

In the Scientific report you have addended the report of the North Pacific Working Group and there are statistics there showing the annual catches year by year of the species in the North Pacific. I would like to draw the attention of all Commissioners to this section of the report, so that they can understand the problems that are facing the North Pacific Commissioners as we meet year after year, and we also seem to require interim meetings to reach decisions on our very difficult problems. The catches, species by species, seem to increase year after year, with the amount of effort that is now operating in the North Pacific, and although we are tending to consider this matter as a regional problem, and I have the greatest confidence in the North Pacific Commissioners, I am quite sure that some day before too late we will come to very restrictive measures in the North Pacific similar to those that have been required in the Antarctic. I think the situation is very similar, and I just wish, at this point, to indicate our disappointment that large catches are being made of species in modern years and that as these large catches are made almost immediately it becomes necessary to close the whole area for catching that species. This is a great disappointment to a country who believes in this Commission and which has been trying its hardest to contribute to it, sometimes on the basis of scientific knowledge and sometimes on the basis of economic requirements. But I wish to bring to the attention of all Commissioners that it may be necessary, in the future, for all of us, all member nations, to look seriously at the North Pacific problem if the North Pacific Commissioners themselves are unable to take the necessary action to restrict operations in this area before it has been necessary to exclude the catching of all species. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Sprules.

I am sure Commissioners will wish to take note of the very important statement that has just been made on behalf of Canada.

Are there any further comments on item 10 on the agenda dealing with North Pacific whale stocks?

In that case, I think it would be convenient now to break for coffee.

(The meeting adjourned at 11.20 a.m. and
reconvened at 12.10 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, will you please come to order. I apologise for the long break, but certain consultations have been taking place.

We now come to item 11 on the agenda, Land station catches in Southern Hemisphere. This matter was referred to the Technical Committee and I would like to ask Dr. McHugh to give us the views of the Technical Committee on it.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH: I think this refers not only to agenda item 11, but also touches on agenda item 17 (j), and I think I might as well cover both matters because we have no changes in the Schedule to offer, so it is just a matter of form to report to you what we are recommending.

With respect to item 11, we referred to the correspondence that you had had with the South Pacific Permanent Commission and we also received some information that Peru now has stopped taking blue and humpback whales; we understand also that whaling effort in Chile has dropped considerably. This is very encouraging and we would hope that this trend would continue because otherwise we will have great difficulty in seeing the effects of our own regulations in the Southern hemisphere. I think that is all I have to say about that item.

With respect to agenda item 17 (j), the South African delegation confirmed that they were going to continue the voluntary catch limits which they had imposed last year, and this news was received with great pleasure by the committee.

The delegation of the United Kingdom pointed out that there was no whaling from South Georgia in 1966/1967 and none would take place in 1967/1968 by the United Kingdom, but they did reserve their right to resume whaling there in the future.

The delegate from Argentina wanted it to be recorded that he would reserve his position and that he wished to make a statement to the plenary session. Perhaps that refers to the statement which he has already made, but he may wish to make another statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. McHugh. So there is no proposal from the Technical Committee on this item?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): No, there is no motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any Commissioner wish to comment on item 11 of the agenda? Then there is no action arising under this item, the item has been disposed of.

We now come to item 12, Economic studies of whaling regulations. Dr. McHugh, this is your paragraph 11, I think.

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

With respect to item 12 of our agenda, you will remember that F.A.O. had addressed a series of questions to the Commissioners asking them for certain economic information on their whaling operations, and it became clear that these questions would be very difficult to answer, if not impossible to answer. As a result of our discussion it was agreed that F.A.O. would once again write to the Commissioners concerned and would pose a new set of questions which we generally approved, and that this matter would then be referred to the Commission for consideration at its next meeting, hoping that replies to these questions might have been received and perhaps analysed by then. I think I should perhaps enter a motion, Mr. Chairman, to the effect that this item be placed on the agenda for our meeting next year.

IWC/19/14

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. McHugh. The proposal is that this item shall be placed on our agenda again next year. Does anyone wish to comment on this item?

Dr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): I should just like to inform the Commission that an appropriate letter has already been drafted and will be despatched in a few days. Meanwhile we have received some data from one country and have been promised pertinent data from two or three other countries. We therefore would hope to have a report to place before the Commission next year if this item is on its agenda.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Holt.

Are there any further comments?

(The proposal, being moved by Dr. McHugh and seconded by Mr. A.G. Bollen of Australia, was agreed)

We hope that in the meantime F.A.O. will be able to collect the information that they require.

Item 13 on the agenda, Infractions. Again I must look to Dr. McHugh.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The Infractions Sub-Committee met and submitted a report to us; we accepted this report and attached it as an appendix to our own report without any changes or without any question. In essence this report says that infractions have remained at a very small percentage of total whales caught, in fact the changes in the percentage of infractions are very slight and certainly not significant - less than 2 per cent of the whales caught in the last season involved infractions of the regulations in one way or another. There was some problem, however, with infractions in connection with sperm whale catches. I think all the Commissioners are aware of the particular problem here, it is related to the peculiar life history and habits of sperm whales, and we are not able to make any recommendation as to how these problems can be minimised except to call this to your attention and hope that whalers will be careful to keep such infractions as low as possible.

I think I should recommend that the report of the Infractions Sub-Committee should be accepted by the Commission, and I would so move.

The CHAIRMAN: Does anyone wish to comment on the report of the Infractions Sub-Committee? Will someone second Dr. McHugh's motion that the report of the Infractions Sub-Committee be received? (Japan seconds the motion)

Are there any objections? There are no objections so the Commission receives the report of the Infractions Sub-Committee.

That, I think, disposes of item 13.

We must leave item 14 until we have completed our consideration of the points that the Technical Committee has dealt with.

We now come to item 17 (a), Amendments to the Schedule, Schedule paragraph 5 - Position of the Sanctuary. This is the subject of a recommendation from the Technical Committee.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): The Committee endorsed the recommendation of the Scientific Committee that the Sanctuary should be kept open again in 1967/1968, but this is contingent on the understanding that the Commission carries out its intention reached two years ago by agreement that the catch for the coming season in the Antarctic will be less than the combined sustainable yield of the fin and sei whale stocks, as determined on the basis of

more precise scientific evidence. So that we cannot really make this recommendation firm until we understand what the quota is.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you suggesting, Dr. McHugh, that we should defer this item then until after we have dealt with item 17 (f)?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): It seems to me that this will be necessary, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would probably be convenient to do so although the Commission may not accept the advice of the Technical Committee on this paragraph, but I think it might still be convenient to defer the discussion of it until we have had the discussion on item 17(f), otherwise I think we shall be talking about a hypothetical position. So I would like to leave item 17 (a) until later.

Can we now turn to item 17 (b)?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I can deal with this very briefly, Mr. Chairman. We recommend that Schedule paragraph 6 (3) be amended to read as follows: "It is forbidden to kill or to attempt to kill blue whales in the waters south of the equator." I would like to move that this recommendation be adopted, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Can I have any comments? Is anyone willing to second this?

Mr. A.von der BECKE (Argentina): I second this, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments on this proposal which has been moved and seconded?

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): I also second this motion.

The CHAIRMAN: This is an amendment to the Schedule and I therefore think it necessary to poll the Commission. I will ask the Assistant Secretary to call the roll.

The proposal is that Schedule paragraph 6(3) of the Schedule be amended to read:

"It is forbidden to kill or attempt to kill blue whales in the waters south of the equator."

The ACTING SECRETARY: I will call the roll.

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

The motion is carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN: Then the Commission has decided to make this amendment to the Schedule.

Item 17 (c) we have dealt with already.

Item 17 (d), Schedule paragraph 7(a) - Opening date of Antarctic pelagic baleen season.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I think I can deal with item 17(d) and item 17(c) at the same time. The Scientific Committee recommends that there be no change either in the opening date or the closing date of the baleen whaling season in the Antarctic.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. McHugh.

I shall have to take separate votes on these two items, but there is no objection to them being discussed together.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): There is no question of an alteration of the Schedule, so it should not be necessary; it is only when the Schedule is to be altered that we have to have a roll call. But there is no motion for a change in the Schedule here and in my opinion it should not be voted on by roll call.

The CHAIRMAN: There is nothing in the Rules of Procedure that I am aware of that says that a roll call shall be taken only on amendments to the Schedule, in fact the Rules of Procedure leave it to the discretion of the Chairman to decide whether a roll call shall be taken or whether a decision shall be taken by a show of hands. It seems to me to have been the practice in the past to take a roll call when there was any question affecting the drafting of the Schedule, as to what is to be included in the Schedule, and it does seem to me this is desirable so that the position of delegations may be on record.

Can we now take these two paragraphs one by one. The Schedule paragraph 7(a), the opening date of the Antarctic pelagic baleen season. The Chairman of the Technical Committee has recommended that the date should be unaltered and, therefore, there is no proposal for a change in the Schedule, but I think I should ask for this motion to be considered and also make sure that this is the wish of the Commission. Will someone second the proposal?
(Motion seconded by Japan)

Then the proposal is that there should be no change in the opening date of the pelagic baleen season, and I will ask the Acting Secretary to poll the Commission on this proposal.

The ACTING SECRETARY:

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

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, that has been carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN (continued): We come now to item 17(e), "Closing date of Antarctic pelagic baleen season". The Chairman of the Technical Committee has recommended that there be no change. Could I have a seconder for this proposal? That is seconded by Japan. I will now ask the Acting Secretary to take a vote on this matter.

The ACTING SECRETARY:

Argentina	Yes
Australia	Yes
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Yes
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Yes
Mexico	Yes
New Zealand	Yes
Norway	Yes
South Africa	Yes
Soviet Union	Yes
USA	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes

The CHAIRMAN: There is a unanimous vote in favour of accepting the Technical Committee's recommendation. That disposes of item 17(e).

We now come to item 17(f), "Schedule paragraph 8(a) - Pelagic catch limit in the Antarctic".

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (USA): It is obvious to everybody that this is the most important item on our agenda, and you will note that there is quite a long record of our discussions in the Report of the Technical Committee. I will not attempt even to summarize these discussions except to say that the first three paragraphs represent three different views as to how this matter might be settled. To cut a long story short, I will simply make the motion that the blue whale unit quota for the Antarctic in the coming season should be 3100 blue whale units. I want to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that I am making this motion as the Chairman of the Technical Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. McHugh. The Acting Secretary has asked to be allowed to correct a rather important error in the draft of this section.

The ACTING SECRETARY: I am afraid that, owing to the haste in which we produced this Report, we omitted a word from paragraph 21 which is rather an important one. In line 9, the word "not" should be inserted after the word "did", so that the line would read: "If they did not support"

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, you have heard Dr. McHugh report briefly on the Report of the Technical Committee which you have all had in front of you since last night, and Dr. McHugh has formally moved the recommendation of the Technical Committee that paragraph 8(a) should read -- I am quoting from the end of paragraph 21 of the Report:--

"The number of baleen whales taken during the open season in waters south of 40°S latitude by whale catchers attached to factory ships under the jurisdiction of the contracting Government shall not exceed 3100 blue whale units in 1967/1968."

Can I ask if any other delegation wishes to comment or make a proposal?

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): On behalf of the Norwegian delegation I move that the global quota for pelagic whaling in the Antarctic in the forthcoming season be fixed at 3500 blue whale units. That is the same global quota as the one we had in the last season.

In the Technical Committee I emphasized that the main and final object of the Whaling Convention was to make possible an orderly development of the whaling industry. As the Commission itself has recognized, a quota distribution agreement is quite indispensable to ensure a rational way of carrying on the catching operations. If the global quota is set at the same figure as last year the Norwegian delegation feels confident that the extremely difficult problem of dividing the global quota between the pelagic whaling countries concerned could easily be solved simply by prolonging the last quota distribution agreement again.

While I have the floor I should like to remind the Commission that, on several previous occasions, it has been made perfectly clear by the Norwegian commissioner that any global quota must be supplemented by a satisfactory quota distribution agreement, otherwise Norway must reserve its right to take such steps as are authorized to it under the provisions of the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN: We now have two proposals, neither of which has yet been seconded, one for a catch limit of 3100 and one for a catch limit of 3500. Can I ask if there are any other proposals?

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(interpretation): I should like to confirm one thing, and that is whether the recommendation of the Technical Committee presented by Dr. McHugh, the Chairman of the Committee, has been seconded or not. Could you clarify the position, please?

The CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. Fujita, this has not yet been seconded. At the moment we are discussing the Report of the Technical Committee, or rather, to be quite accurate, we are discussing item 17(f) of the agenda in the light of the Report of the Technical Committee. Dr. McHugh has formally moved the recommendation of the Technical Committee, but this has not yet been seconded. Mr. Knudtzon of Norway has proposed 3500 as the catch limit, but this has not yet been seconded either. Of course, before a vote can be taken on either of these figures it will be necessary for the motion to be seconded, but at the present stage we are still discussing the item in general terms.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (USA): I should like to ask for clarification. It seems to me that it might be easier to handle these questions if each motion or amendment were seconded first. I do not really see how we can discuss my motion until it is seconded by somebody; we might get into a very difficult situation here.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, Dr. McHugh, I appreciate the point. Perhaps I should ask, therefore, if anyone is prepared to second the motion formally moved by Dr. McHugh in favour of a catch limit of 3100. Argentina and Mexico both second this proposal. Can I ask similarly whether there is a seconder for the Norwegian proposal of 3500? Mr. Knudtzon, it appears that your motion is not going to be seconded and, therefore, it falls.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): We have to accept the situation, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other proposals, or does anyone wish to comment on this item?

Mr. J. GRAHAM (United Kingdom): I should like to move an amendment to the proposal from the Technical Committee which has been moved by Dr. McHugh. As he said, this is perhaps the most important item on our agenda, and I think that, since we all know that it is going to be very difficult to reach agreement and there are deep differences of view, and since this is a question where -- as, indeed, I said in the Technical Committee -- in the last resort the Commission cannot impose its view if member countries do not accept it, it is important that every effort of persuasion be made in an attempt to meet the views of other members. In the Technical Committee I supported the motion for 3100 units, and I did so then because it was one that I could support as being

consistent with the pledge that the countries in the Commission had made in previous years that they would get the catch limit down below the sustainable yield. We have a range of figures, but it seems to me -- and I think that probably many members share this view -- that, of the range of estimates that the scientists have given us, 3100 units is the best, indeed I would say the most generous estimate in a sense, of the present sustainable yield of stocks. It is a compromise between the majority of the scientists, who favour a lower figure, and the scientists of really only one country who favour a rather larger figure. So I think that one is not erring on the side of being too low if one takes 3100 as the level of the sustainable yield at the present time.

/In view of the past

In view of the past undertakings of the Commission, the United Kingdom could not positively support any new ceiling which did not come below that figure and reasonably below it.

Having said that, one is conscious that one must be careful when one is not a country engaged in whaling, in urging austerity on other countries who are engaged in whaling. One would not wish to make more than one must of points of principle at other people's expense. Although I think 3100 a very reasonable margin to go down to, so that we get below the sustainable yield and indeed, if we do not go down that far, there is no real assurance that we will not have this problem which has been dogging us for years on our tables next year.

Nevertheless, I would be satisfied and would think it reconcilable with the evidence and with past undertakings to accept a higher figure of 3200 units as the sustainable yield. That would leave very little margin, but I would hope that it would be a figure sufficiently near what some of the pelagic countries would wish to see for them to be able to accept it. In urging it for their consideration, I think it is fair to say that there can be few here who attended the previous meetings who would have supposed today that we would be thinking in terms of a figure of 3200 or 3500, or any figure above 3000.

On previous occasions when the Commission bound itself to agree to reductions, to get below the sustainable yield, I think the general opinion was that one might have to come down to figures possibly in the order of 2000, very low figures indeed. One delegation who has been explaining the difficulties of reaching agreement on the basis of any figure less than 3500 is on record as saying last year that they would have been ready to accept a quota of 3000 units.

In these circumstances I think that it is difficult today, although one would not wish to minimise the very real difficulties of the situation that the countries engaged in the industry must be facing, the situation today is a good deal better than they must have expected to face. It was to make adjustments to enable them to meet that more difficult future that the Commission allowed a delay of two years to give them time to do it.

It is very hard, if at the end of that two years, they do not find it possible to accept a figure which would appeal to the majority of the Commission as reasonable.

I hope that if I now propose a figure of 3200, the pelagic countries will realise that it is a figure which has been chosen to be as high as possible, compatible with at any rate the view that my delegation takes, and I think probably the majority take, about the present state of the stocks, the present level of the sustainable yield and past undertakings of the Commission.

If there are countries - and I think this may be the majority of the countries here - who feel that a lower figure would be desirable and justifiable on the facts, I would appeal to them to be ready to accept a higher figure, remembering that it is other countries who will have to live with it.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that you have proposed as an amendment to the Technical Committee's recommendation that the catch limit should be 3200 blue whale units. Does anyone wish to second this proposal?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): As the representative of the United States, I would like to second this motion, and I would like to have the opportunity to explain why I am doing this.

Two years ago, when we decided on a three-year arrangement for the blue whale unit catch limit in the Antarctic, we agreed that the total catch for the 1967/1968 season would be less than the combined sustainable yields of the fin and sei whale stocks as determined on the basis of more precise scientific evidence.

The Scientific Committee of the Commission has given, on that basis, its best estimate which is 3300 blue whale units, and the United States has to accept this as consistent with the agreement we reached. Therefore, we are obliged to vote for a quota which is lower than 3300 blue whale units.

On the other hand, it has been my feeling in the last two or three days, in talking to other delegations, that a quota as low as 3100 blue whale units will raise great difficulties for the Antarctic whaling nations, and will perhaps raise so many problems that it will be very difficult to obtain an adequate vote on this particular number.

So I would like to support the proposal of the delegate from the United Kingdom, because in my opinion it is consistent with the agreement we made two years ago and is consistent with the position of the United States at this meeting. I hope also that other countries will see this in the same light, and will be able to vote for this number.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): I would like to ask one thing: I understand that Dr. McHugh moved the recommendation of the Technical Committee to fix the pelagic catch limit at the level of 3100. It was seconded by Argentina and Mexico, and the United Kingdom made a revised proposal for 3200 which was seconded by Dr. McHugh, as Commissioner for the United States.

That is my understanding, and my question is then: what is the position on the original proposal of 3100? Is it still outstanding, or has it disappeared? Could you kindly clarify the position?

The CHAIRMAN: This is rather a difficult one.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I would not presume to take over the Chairman's responsibilities, but perhaps I could help Mr. Fujita. I think what the delegate for the United Kingdom and I are proposing is an amendment to the original motion, so the original motion which I made, wearing my other hat, as Chairman of the Technical Committee, still stands. But we have offered an amendment to it, and presumably the amendment would be voted on first. If it is defeated, then the original motion would be voted on, or some other amendment would be considered.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): So I understand that the original proposal for 3100 blue whale units for the pelagic catch limit this year, still stands, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN: The position as I understand it is that a proposal was made by Dr. McHugh, speaking formally as the Chairman of the Technical Committee, for the adoption of the Technical Committee's recommendation which was in favour of a catch limit of 3100. This was seconded by Argentina and Mexico.

An amendment was moved by Norway which was not seconded, and which has therefore fallen. A further amendment was proposed by the United Kingdom and seconded by the United States, and I think therefore we have the proposal and an amendment, both of which have been duly moved and seconded. So we have to consider both of these.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan) (Interpretation): Japan would like to propose a further revised motion: we propose that the pelagic catch limit in the Antarctic for 1967/68 be fixed at the level of 3300 blue whale units.

We are firmly convinced that this figure of 3300 satisfies the formula which was agreed that this year's pelagic catch limit in the Antarctic shall be less than the combined sustainable yields of fin and sei whales.

As to the specific figure of 3300, it has been clearly demonstrated by the calculations done by the scientists that the sustainable yields in terms of the blue whale unit in five years' time will increase, on the assumption that the sei and fin whales are to be caught in the same ratio as in the last season.

/I would like to add

(Mr. I. Fujita (Japan) continued.....)

I would like to add a few words to my statement and say that I would like to seek the understanding of the members of this Commission to the fact that those countries engaged in the pelagic whaling in the Antarctic, Norway, the Soviet Union and Japan, are faced with a question of making a national distribution after this meeting, and this question is of an extremely difficult character. In this connection and for the reasons which I have just stated, the higher the total catch limit is set the more desirable it will be. In connection with the previous statement and the reasons given, however, the figure of 3300 blue whale units is the minimum figure that seems acceptable to Japan.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Fujita.

We now have an amendment to the amendment. Mr. Fujita, on behalf of Japan, has proposed that the catch limit should be 3300 blue whale units. Can I ask if there is a seconder for this proposal?

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, the Soviet delegation is seconding the Japanese delegation's motion, and in this connection would like to make a statement.

At the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Commission the Soviet delegation made a motion for the total quota to be fixed at the level of 2500 blue whale units, but that motion was doomed to failure without even being voted on for there was no seconder to it. Even the scientists, on whom we were mainly depending, did not support us at that time. Notwithstanding that the Soviet delegation has come to the Nineteenth Meeting of this Commission again with a proposal of fixing the catch quota limit at the level of 2500 blue whale units, and to escape from the same resistance that we have met with at the previous session we have made a proposal to set the catch limit at the level of 3100 blue whale units. That figure of 3100 blue whale units as a catch limit was following the recommendations and conclusions that the Scientific Committee has come to.

At the Technical Committee meetings the same atmosphere as we have now was created; I put forward a proposal for the catch limit to be at the level of 3100 blue whale units and Japan put forward a proposal for 3300 blue whale units, then Norway proposed the catch limit should be at the level of 3500 blue whale units. The Norwegian proposal failed for it was not supported. In connection with that, I had to withdraw my proposal of 3100 blue whale units, on the understanding that Japan could not accept the figure of 3100. In that case this proposal would seem agreeable to those countries participating in the Antarctic pelagic whaling, but our proposal would not appear to coincide with the wishes of our partners.

Gentlemen, I understand that the proposal made by Argentina and seconded by Mexico of 3100 blue whale units is more rational for the more rapid reconstruction of the whale stocks. However, we cannot help but take into account the wishes of those participating in such whaling operations, particularly Japan. It seems to me that of all those present here Japan is the country most concerned in the conservation of whale stocks, and since Japan is so deeply concerned with the conservation of whale resources and feels she cannot take a figure lower than 3300 blue whale units this shows clearly there is a real reason for it.

We had several discussions with the Japanese and the Norwegian delegations on that item and we understand the very difficult position of the Japanese delegation in not being able to agree to a figure lower than 3300 blue whale units. Therefore, if we fail to support that figure, there will be no quota fixed for the next season. For whom will this be good and for whom bad? It seems to me it will be good for nobody, but it will have an adverse effect most of all on the whales, for in that case there will be

an opportunity for them to be caught without any quota restrictions. That is the reason why, in order to get the quotas set, we are seconding the motion of the Japanese.

All the Commissioners at this meeting have received the conclusions of the scientists and they are confirming that even with the quota fixed at that level the whale stocks will be increasing, but if we take into account that next year we will try to make a further reduction in the total quota then it will not be bad at all. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Sukhoruchenko.

There is now a proposal before the Commission, an amendment, and an amendment to the amendment. Can I ask if any other delegate wishes to speak before a vote is taken on this item?

I think the correct procedure would be first of all to vote on the amendment to the amendment, that is the figure of 3300, which has been put forward by Japan and seconded by the Soviet Union. In order to succeed this needs to obtain a majority of three-quarters of those voting. If this proposal does not succeed then we vote on the proposal put forward by the United Kingdom and supported by the United States, that there should be a catch limit of 3200. If this also fails to obtain the required majority we go back to the original proposal of 3100. If this fails to obtain a three-quarter majority then, of course, there is no amendment made to the Schedule and no catch limit in the Schedule unless a further proposal is put forward.

If there is no further discussion I propose to put the amendment to the amendment suggested by Japan and supported by the Soviet Union that the catch limit should be 3300 blue whale units.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): May I make a proposal for us to have a break now, because all the proposals seem to have been made and it would seem to be a proper thing to provide delegations with an opportunity to discuss and consider the question once more between themselves. I propose we make a break and return to that problem again after lunch. Let the participants exchange their views once more, because the situation is really a crucial one and it would not hurt if participants could think once more over the problem, for I take it for granted that all those participating at the meeting are interested for the catch limit to be fixed.

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

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(interpretation): I think that every member of this Commission has a deep understanding of the position of others and, therefore, it is not possible, even if we try again, to find a figure which is acceptable to all of the members of this Commission. I agree, therefore, with the Soviet proposal if that proposal can be accepted not only by Japan but by other members of this Commission, but I do not think that that is possible.

It seems that we have many other matters to deal with and the Chairman must be in a position to finish the work today. So, as it seems that we have exhausted the detailed discussions, I should like to suggest that we proceed to vote immediately.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fujita. This is a very serious decision that the Commission has to take, it is one that will have wide repercussions, and I would not like to take a vote prematurely while there is any possibility of further moves that might result in agreement. I do not think that it will make any difference to the total length of the session whether we take a vote now and have lunch, or whether we have lunch and then take a vote. It is already a quarter past one and I think that it would be appropriate to take lunch now. I will take the vote immediately after lunch without, as I see it, the necessity for any further discussion unless some delegate has a further contribution to make.

This is my view, Gentlemen. I do not know if anyone else has a strong view to put forward; if so, I am ready to listen to it.

The Meeting is adjourned until a quarter to three.

(The Meeting adjourned at 1.15 p.m.)

IWC/19/14

(The Meeting resumed at 2.45 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN: We will resume the Plenary Session. When we broke before lunch I was about to take a vote on item 17 (f) of the Agenda, and I will just remind Commissioners what the position is. We have a proposal that the catch limit should be 3100 blue whale units, we have had an amendment which was not seconded that it should be 3500, and this amendment is therefore dead. We have had another amendment that the catch limit should be 3200, and we have had a third amendment, or rather an amendment to the amendment that it should be 3300.

Unless any Commissioner has any further remarks to address to the Commission, I propose to take a vote on the last of these proposals, that is that the catch limit should be 3300 blue whale units. I think the formal position is that the Commission will be voting on the proposal to include in the Schedule the sentence in paragraph 21; the result of this vote will affect the Schedule to the extent that if the proposition is carried, the Schedule will be amended in accordance with paragraph 21 of the Technical Committee's report, except that instead of 3100 blue whale units it will be 3300 blue whale units. I am now about to put to the Commission the proposal that it should be 3300 blue whale units.

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Would you clarify your last statement? I presume that this includes deletion of the last sentence of that paragraph. I am referring to the amending of paragraph 8 (a) of the Schedule, and I presume from what has been said during the earlier discussions that the last sentence of this paragraph will be deleted, since we only proposed a change of the number of blue whale units for the 1967/68 season. Am I correct?

The CHAIRMAN: I think the position is that the whole of sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 8 would be deleted, and in its place there would be inserted:

"The number of baleen whales taken during the open season in waters south of 40° south latitude by whale catchers attached to factory ships under the jurisdiction of the contracting governments shall not exceed 3300 blue whale units in 1967/68"

That, as I understand it, is the effect of the Japanese amendment to the proposal put forward by the Technical Committee. Therefore, I think that is the proposition on which the Commission will now have to take a vote. Is that agreed? (Agreed) I will ask the Acting Secretary to poll Commissioners on this point, and I would emphasise once again for clarity that the catch limit we are voting on is 3300 blue whale units.

The ACTING SECRETARY:

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

IWC/19/14

The ACTING SECRETARY: The results of that vote are: against, 7; in favour, 3; abstentions, 5. (The motion was lost)

The CHAIRMAN: We now have to vote on the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom, seconded by the United States of America, which is exactly the same as the previous one, except that the catch limit would be 3200 blue whale units. I will ask the Acting Secretary to poll Commissioners on this proposition.

The ACTING SECRETARY:

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

The result of this vote is that there were 11 in favour, 2 against, 2 abstentions. That means that of the 13 voting yes or no, 11 voted yes, which is the required three-quarters majority and therefore the motion is carried.

/The CHAIRMAN: I am not sure

The CHAIRMAN: I am not sure whether Commissioners followed the calculations that the Secretary has made, but Rule V says that, for action in pursuance of Article V of the Convention, which includes amendments to the Schedule, a three-fourths majority of those casting an affirmative or negative vote is required. The total number of those casting an affirmative or negative vote was 13, of which 11 were in favour and, as that is more than three-fourths of the total positive and negative votes, the motion is carried. The Commission has, therefore, decided to replace the present paragraph 8(a) of the Schedule by a paragraph which reads:

"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 3200 blue whale units in 1967/68."

That is the decision of the Commission.

Gentlemen, are there any other proposals under item 17(f) of the agenda? If not, I think that we should now go back to item 17(a) which we left over until we had dealt with item 17(f). This relates to the position of the Sanctuary, and you will recall that the Technical Committee made a recommendation endorsing the views of the Scientific Committee that the sanctuary should be kept open in 1967/1968, on the understanding that the Commission carries out its intention of bringing the catch to a level that will be less than the combined sustainable yield of the fin and sei stocks as determined on the basis of more precise scientific evidence.

Is it the wish of the Commission, in view of the decision that has just been taken, that the Sanctuary should remain open as proposed? Can I ask for the comments of the Commissioners on this item?

Mr. J. GRAHAM (United Kingdom): I should think that it would be very difficult for the Commission, having taken a vote and fixed a limit in the coming year, now to decide collectively that it had not fixed a limit which satisfied the conditions that it laid down for itself a few years earlier and that, therefore, on mere considerations of consistency, we are bound to conclude that the conditions mentioned here are satisfied and that the Sanctuary should be left open.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you move, Mr. Graham, that the Sanctuary be left open as recommended by the Technical Committee?

Mr. J. GRAHAM (United Kingdom): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Will anyone second that? That is seconded by Argentina. Are there any other proposals? As this relates to an item in the Schedule I propose to poll the Commission once more. I will ask the Acting Secretary to take a vote on the proposal moved by the United Kingdom and seconded by Argentina that the Sanctuary should remain open in 1967/1968.

The ACTING SECRETARY:

Argentina	Yes
Australia	Yes
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Yes
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Yes
Mexico	Yes
Netherlands	Yes
New Zealand	Abstain

Norway	Yes
South Africa	Yes
Soviet Union	Yes
USA	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes

(The proposal was adopted by 14 votes in favour and 1 abstention.)

The CHAIRMAN: That disposes of item 17(a) of the agenda, and I think that we have now dealt with all the sub-items under item 17. We will now take item 14, which is to accept the Report of the Technical Committee. Could I have a motion that the Report of the Technical Committee be accepted?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (USA): I will so move, Mr. Chairman, but before the vote is taken I should like just to make a few comments. I simply want to thank the members of the Committee for their very fine co-operation. We had some difficult sessions and they took a great deal of time to resolve, but I think that everybody entered the work of the Committee in a spirit of goodwill, and I feel that the organization was strengthened by the way in which the various national delegations acted even though their interests were not always in harmony.

I should like also to thank Dr. Chapman, who unfortunately has already left for home, and Dr. Holt, and also the members of their committees for the excellent background material which they provided us with. It was particularly impressive to me that, when questions were directed to them over and above the material that appeared in their report, they were somehow able to get into a quiet corner and come up with some more calculations almost immediately. I still do not quite know how they did it, but it was most helpful to the work of the Technical Committee and, therefore, to the work of this Commission as a whole.

There is one other thing. On page 3 of the Report there is one error which I missed when I dealt with the International Observer Scheme. The first word of the last line of paragraph 13 should be "appeared" instead of "approved".

That is all I want to say, Mr. Chairman, except to reiterate that I move the adoption of the Report of the Technical Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved that the Commission accept the Report of the Technical Committee. Will someone second that? That is seconded by Argentina. If there are no objections, it is agreed that the Commission accept the Report of the Technical Committee. (Agreed)

I should like to say to Dr. McHugh and his colleagues on behalf of the Commission how very much we appreciate the work of the Committee, and particularly of Dr. McHugh. I think that there have been extremely difficult subjects for them to deal with on this occasion and the discussions have not been all that easy. It is a great tribute to Dr. McHugh's chairmanship that we should have had a Report which has been so very helpful to the Commission in its deliberations. I should like on your behalf, Gentlemen, to thank Dr. McHugh in particular and the Technical Committee in general for all the work which they have done which has facilitated the task of the Commission.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(interpretation): Mr. Chairman, you have just expressed on behalf of the whole Commission our sincere gratitude to Dr. McHugh, and I should like to take this opportunity to emphasize our gratitude on behalf of the Japanese delegation in particular. The members of the Technical Committee had a very difficult time, and Dr. McHugh made every effort to enable us to produce a Report. I should like to reiterate our sincere gratitude and appreciation for the efforts and achievements which Dr. McHugh contributed to the meetings of the Technical Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fujita. Are there any other comments? I think that this disposes of item 14 on the agenda.

We come now to item 16 on the agenda and there is a revised version of the Eighteenth Annual Report which includes the figures that were omitted from the first version. I should like to take the Report as a whole and ask if anyone has any comments to make. I believe the Norwegian delegate gave notice this morning that he wished to suggest an amendment.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): Mr. Chairman, as I said this morning, I should like to have added, on page 3 in the last line but one after the word "operation", the following sentence:

"The Commission recommended to the pelagic whaling countries that they should meet and implement as soon as possible this scheme."

If we include that we harmonize the Report from the Commission with that from the Chairman, and it is in fact what happened at the Eighteenth Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: The proposal, as I understand it, is to insert in paragraph 7 of the draft Report, after the first sentence, a new sentence reading:

"The Commission recommended to the pelagic whaling countries that they should meet and implement as soon as possible this scheme."

Are there any comments on this proposal?

Dr. W.M. SPRULES (Canada): Mr. Chairman, as I read the whole paragraph now it seems to provide some duplication of intent. We should have a new second sentence saying:

"The Commission recommended to the pelagic whaling countries that they should meet and implement as soon as possible this scheme"

and the very last part of the next sentence says:

"in addition, pelagic whaling countries were called upon to meet and implement the previous Scheme as soon as possible".

/The CHAIRMAN: I think this is so

The CHAIRMAN: I think this is so, Dr. Sprules. I must confess that I had missed that half sentence at the top of page 4.

Do you not think your point is met in the existing draft, Mr. Knudtzon?

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): I am a bit confused. I would be happy if we could have page 3 as it stands and after the word 'operations' put a full stop, then put in instead of what is stated the sentence proposed by me. In fact, our sentence replaces these last words.

Mr. M.N. SUKHUROCHENKO (U.S.S.R.)(Interpretation): I do not fully understand Mr. Knudtzon, he voted against the quota, so what international control is he speaking about now?

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): My idea is the Commission has fixed a global quota and that is the state as of today.

The CHAIRMAN: May I say, Mr. Sukhoruchenko, that what we are now trying to do is to prepare an accurate report of the work of the Commission at the Eighteenth Meeting, not this meeting but the previous meeting. It is a fact that the Commission decided at that meeting to recommend to the pelagic whaling countries that they should meet and implement the previous scheme. For my part I cannot see that the proposal now made by the Norwegian Commissioner makes any difference to the text as it now stands. The text, as it now stands, says the Commission agreed to set up a working group, and it goes on to say, "in addition, pelagic whaling countries were called upon to meet and implement the previous Scheme as soon as possible." It seems to me that that is an accurate account of what happened at the last meeting of the Commission, and I cannot myself see that the proposed amended wording makes the point any clearer or makes any different point.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): In order not to complicate matters I withdraw my proposal.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Knudtzon, I can assure you that your point is firmly there.

Mr. I. FUJITA (Japan)(Interpretation): As regards the item 7 of this draft report, the Chairman's report of the Eighteenth Meeting, I would like to point out that there is a slight difference in wording of the sentence which we carefully drafted last year in the recommendations of the Whaling Commission. This is in the third line of item 7. Here it is written, "The Commission agreed at the Eighteenth Meeting to set up a Working Group to draw up a new scheme to cover both pelagic and land station whaling operations;". However, if I may refer to last year's resolution it provides that Working Groups be set up to provide details of the scheme or schemes. Therefore I would like to ask that the words, "or schemes" should be inserted after the words "new scheme".

The CHAIRMAN: Your proposal is to insert, after the word "scheme" in the last line on page three, the words, "or schemes". I was trying to check the reference to the exact recommendation last year, but it is not readily to hand. Would the Commission agree to insert those two words, "or schemes"? Are there any objections? There are no objections, so that is agreed that that paragraph be amended as proposed by the Japanese delegation.

Are there any other comments on the Eighteenth Report?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): There is one very minor point and it may have been mentioned in the previous discussion, but if so I did not hear it. In the second line should not the word 'into' be inserted before 'operation'? It should read, "brought into operation".

The CHAIRMAN: It should indeed, yes. Thank you. This is on the last line but one on page 3, there is a word that has been left out in the typing. The sentence should read, "The existing Scheme expired at the end of the 1965/66 season without being brought into operation." Thank you, Dr. McHugh.

Are there any other amendments or proposals in relation to the Eighteenth report of the Commission?

Can I then have a Motion that the draft report be approved?

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I have already made that motion.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, Dr. McHugh. That is seconded by Japan. Are there any objections? Then the Eighteenth Report of the Commission is approved, subject to the two amendments that were agreed to paragraph 7.

This disposes of item 16 of the agenda. We have dealt with items 17, 18 and 19 and we now come to item 20, Reports from Observers. I think I should first take the reports by observers on behalf of this Commission at meetings of other bodies. The only one I have a note of is that Professor Ruud was asked to act as observer for the Commission at the 54th Statutory Meeting of I.C.E.S. We have not, in fact, had a report from Professor Ruud and he is not present here; I do not know whether the Norwegian delegation has anything to say on this behalf.

Mr. H.T. KNUDTZON (Norway): I have again to apologise, and I will ask Professor Ruud to send the report to the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We then come to the observers who are attending this meeting on behalf of other governments or organisations, and I first call on Chile to ask if the observer for Chile wishes to make any statement. The observer from Chile is not here, so I ask the observer from Italy. He has no statement. The observer from Portugal did not arrive. We then have the observer from F.A.O., Dr. Holt.

Dr. S.J. HOLT (F.A.O.): Mr. Chairman, I fear that I may not be popular as the first observer to speak, but I wonder if you would permit me to do as the Commissioner for the United States has done and wear two hats alternately. I have addressed the Commission during this week on occasions, in so far as I have been concerned in the Department of Fisheries of F.A.O., with the tasks of stock assessment which the Commission has entrusted to my organisation, but now I beg leave to address the Commission as observer for my organisation, as distinct from the problem of stock assessment. I do so because it has seemed to my Director General, who personally takes a very great interest in the activities of this Commission, that this meeting of the Commission would be a most crucial one in its history.

F.A.O. has sent observers to this Commission since its first meeting, I think, but an active working association with the Commission began, perhaps, in 1960, when the Commission decided to establish the Committee of Three scientists. The seven years since that time have seen the serious overfishing of the fin whales come about in the Antarctic, the growth and probably the decline of the sei whale fishery; the closure of fishing for blue whales and humpback whales in the Antarctic and elsewhere and a very serious situation in the North Pacific arising in part as a consequence of the decline of stock in the Antarctic and a subsequent movement of whaling effort to other areas.

During those seven years, however, we have also seen, as far as FAO is concerned, a growing working relationship with the Commission which now covers the problems of Antarctic assessments and studies of the sperm whale data, studies of certain aspects of the economics of whaling, and last year we were very pleased to see it extended to our arranging to send observers at the kind invitation of the Japanese Commissioner on board Japanese research vessels in the Antarctic. This was an experience and opportunity which was appreciated in my organisation, and I hope we were able to take some benefit from it.

The Commission this year has asked if FAO will continue to make assessments of the Antarctic stocks and the sperm whale stocks, and I am sure that in view of the decision which the Commission has just taken concerning the Antarctic quota, my organisation will be able to agree to undertake this task again.

As you know, my Director-General had occasion to address the Commissioners of this Commission at a time three years ago when the Commission had found difficulty in obtaining agreement on an Antarctic quota, and was very pleased indeed, as were the governing bodies of FAO and particularly the FAO Council which paid some attention to this problem when the Special Meeting of the Commission resulted in an agreement which seemed to open the way to the recovery of the whale stocks.

It might be wondered why FAO's interest has continued in such depth in what is, after all, only one of the many great international fishery problems. If I may, I should like to say a word about this. Recently, my organisation established an intergovernmental committee on fisheries whose tasks include the provision of arrangements for discussing international aspects of fishery policy, and helping to come to agreements on the study and conservation of fishery resources.

The kinds of problems being met and faced by this Commission now are in many respects common to many fishery bodies also, though they appear in this Commission in a particularly acute form. Therefore, I think it is true to say that the fisheries world is watching very closely what happens in this Commission, since it appears to set precedents for what may be expected to happen in fishery commissions when they begin to approach difficult problems of conservation of over-fished stocks.

The FAO Committee on Fisheries recently took several actions, as the Chairman knows, towards the establishment of several new fishery commissions, and it is the hope that these commissions will be effective in securing a rational exploitation of the stocks in the areas with which they will be concerned.

Clearly then, it is, in a time of difficult decisions of the Whaling Commission, of the greatest interest to member countries participating in the fishery commissions that this Commission should succeed in its objectives.

It was with this in mind also that we encouraged last year the publication by Mr. Gulland who, as most of you know, was a member of the Committee of Four Scientists and is now with FAO, in the journal of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea a study of certain economic aspects of the actions which this Commission has taken. In it, he showed that although it is true that if the Commission had been able to take other more drastic actions in the past, the economic situation of the whaling industry now would be much better, nevertheless the actions which it had found possible to take were such as to have brought benefits certainly far in excess of the cost of the Commission itself.

We are also particularly concerned with the general aspects of this matter in relation to a resolution passed by the United Nations General Assembly last November which called for a study in which FAO and other international organisations are participating, of the international problems of marine science and technology and their particular application to the problems of conservation of fishery resources.

Clearly, in this context of an, as it were, global review of the situation, the successes or failures and difficulties of the regional fishery bodies and the special commissions like the International Whaling Commission are extremely pertinent.

On this subject, although it has been encouraging to notice that there have been reports of progress in the North Pacific area, I have to say that my Director-General regrets the difficulties which have been faced in that area, and are still not resolved, with respect to the slowing down of the over-exploitation of whales in that region.

Also to be regretted, I am sorry to say, is a continuing delay in the Antarctic in taking actions to meet the objectives set out in the preamble to the Convention which ask that the stocks should be allowed to recover as rapidly as possible, remembering that the Convention refers to actions to be taken in the interests not only of the whaling industry but of the consumers of whale products.

In this connection, FAO's policy is concerned with the securing of the maximum supplies of food and particularly of animal protein in the coming years.

After the Special Meeting in 1965, the Commission agreed on a series of steps in reducing the effort in the Antarctic, and at that time it was anticipated that it would be necessary under the terms of that agreement to reduce the Antarctic quota for the coming season as low as 2500 blue whale units. "Although last year it was possible to present upward revisions of those estimates to the order of 3000 or 3500 units, in view of the fact that the agreement as reported from the Special Meeting was that a high initial quota was agreed as a transitional limit to assist the pelagic whaling industries to adjust to the reductions required to begin re-building the whale herds - " I am quoting from the Chairman's Report of the Special Meeting of the Commission "- it is difficult to understand why there should be much further delay in taking the drastic action which is required to allow the stocks in the Antarctic to re-build."

There is, of course, considerable comfort in the decision that the Commission has just taken which brings, if put into operation in the next season, the Antarctic quota down to a level just below what is probably the combined sustainable yield at present of the fin and sei whales. It is not, however, as the Commission knows, sufficiently below to ensure in the absence of other agreements that either the fin whale or the sei whale stocks will not be further over-exploited.

I think it is necessary for us to remember that the possible maximum yield from the Antarctic stocks is in fact more than five times the present yield, and that this could be obtained with less fishing effort, and therefore at less cost than is the present catch. It may be idealistic in the minds of many people to be looking at that kind of target at this time, and it is true that when that high yield could have been obtained there was not the scientific evidence available on which to justify appropriate quotas.

If, however, the Commission had in the past been able to see its way each year to acting promptly on the basis of the best scientific advice available at that time, we would not now have been discussing

3300, or 3200 blue whale units but 4000 or 5000 blue whale units. At no time would it have been necessary for the catch to have been brought down to the present levels. This is, to a considerable extent, the price that must be paid for the inability to act on the best scientific advice available at each particular time, even though it is recognised that that advice cannot be perfect or sure.

It seems that if the present agreement is maintained, and is continued into future years, there will be some recovery of the fin and sei whale stocks, while the blue whales are recovering under the operative total ban. But this rate of recovery is so slow that it will take many, many decades even to arrive at anything approaching the level which can give the maximum sustainable yield. It is therefore with some apprehension, though we would hope unjustified, that we note that the Commission has at this meeting not made any commitment, as it did at the two previous meetings, for its future actions in principle with respect to the stocks.

It is the hope of my organisation, therefore, that next year the Commission will be in a position to undertake a further reduction in the quota to permit the Antarctic stocks to recover at a slightly greater rate, and therefore provide the basis for not a static industry in the Antarctic but a growing one, even if only rather slowly growing.

We also believe that it is quite essential that steps be taken to achieve a proper balance of the exploitation of the various species of whales in the Antarctic, if we are to hope to approach an optimum utilisation of the resources there, as the terms of the Convention provide.

I must apologise for taking so much of the time of the Commission, and I am most grateful for your tolerance now, and for the tolerance of the Commission and of its Technical Committee during the occasions when I have felt that it was my duty to address the Commission during this week.

The CHAIRMAN: The next observer on my list is the Observer for the Survival Service Commission, Mr. Lindbergh.

Mr. C. LINDBERGH (Survival Service Commission): I represent here the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, with its headquarters at Morges, Switzerland. The I.U.C.N. note that the harpooning of blue and humpback whales has, for the first time, been discontinued in all oceans.

The I.U.C.N. compliments the International Whaling Commission on its part in bringing this about, but our satisfaction is mixed with distress in the knowledge that harpooning was discontinued because of the near extermination of both species, rather than because of responsible planning for the use of important ocean resources.

The I.U.C.N. again calls attention to the fact that over-exploitation to obtain short-term profits has reduced a great ocean resource to a small fraction of its optimum yield potential, at a time when growing human populations desperately need additional meat, oils and meals.

The I.U.C.N. continues to urge adoption of kill quotas that will re-build whale stocks to the point of maximum yield within the shortest practicable period of time. Obviously, the quota of 3200 blue whale units for the 1967/1968 season is too high to accomplish this objective.

The IUCN recommend the adoption of quotas for each whale species as a major step in reaching maximum-yield populations. Experience shows that the present B.W.U. system has led to the destruction of one whale stock after another.

The present whale crisis is an outstanding example of the danger of uncontrolled and irresponsible exploitation of natural resources. The IUCN believes that the ability of the International Whaling Commission, and the governments it represents, to programme a return to optimum-yield stocks has significance reaching far beyond the whaling industry. It is an indication of man's ability, in general, to turn this planet's natural resources to his own essential needs, with all the implications this involves.

Gentlemen, on behalf of the IUCN, I would like to thank the International Whaling Commission for the opportunity of making this statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lindbergh.

Mr. Bourne, for the World Wildlife Fund.

Mr. A. G. BOURNE: We, the World Wildlife Fund, would like to support the statement made by Mr. Lindbergh on behalf of the IUCN.

We would, however, like to repeat our disappointment first expressed at the Eighteenth Meeting of the International Whaling Commission in that the Commission has been unable to establish the International Observer Scheme. Although we appreciate the difficulties, we feel that it should not be impossible to find a way out of this. Would it not be possible for the recruitment of observers to be taken from non-whaling countries, possibly even from non-maritime countries, if trained by the IWC? This should at least ensure impartiality.

We would, without seeming impertinent, Sir, go on to point out that whales, in common with all living organisms, have the ability to reproduce themselves. It follows, therefore, that under proper management the whale stocks could support a healthy industry. It might mean a cut in the size of the industry, but a smaller but healthier industry is better than one heading for extinction. As it is, one by one, the world's great whale resources are being reduced to extremely low levels, the present sustainable yields of whales is only a fraction of that it could be under rational management. The blue and humpback whales are no longer of commercial importance, and the fin whale stocks may soon be in an equally poor condition. Only two important whale resources remain, the sei and the sperm whales and, unless stringent measures are taken very soon, there is no doubt that these whales also will decline. This Commission has the power and the opportunity to show that it is seriously interested in conservation by taking steps to prevent overfishing of these two remaining stocks. This will require real international co-operation providing the necessary scientific data, especially for sperm whales.

We would, therefore, urge the Commission to begin the task of rebuilding world whale resources by demonstrating that it can prevent over-cropping of the two species that are apparently still in a healthy condition, according to what we have heard here. As Antarctic whale resources have declined, the north Pacific has become the most important whaling ground in the world. The speed with which a modern whaling fleet can damage the reserves has been demonstrated physically in the north Pacific in the past few years. It is disturbing that the nations concerned apparently cannot find an acceptable solution to management problems in that area. The living resources of the oceans are increasingly important to man and yet we are over-fishing these resources one by one in many parts of the world. It has sometimes been thought necessary for economic reasons to condone overfishing for short periods, but it is irrational and irresponsible

to pursue such a policy for very long. Economic destruction of a source cannot be excused on economic grounds. Yet, that is exactly what has happened to the blue whales; it appears that the same arguments are leading to the destruction of the remaining whale resources.

We have a saying that it is no good shutting the stable door when the horse has gone. In the public eye this Commission is getting the reputation of having some expertise in shutting empty stable doors. Only the Commission can, by its actions, show the world and change this growing adverse public opinion.

Thank you, Gentlemen, for letting us make our statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Bourne.

The next on our list is the Fauna Preservation Society.

Mr. FITTER: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak on behalf of the Fauna Preservation Society.

We would like very strongly to support the wise words of the Observer of the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, and would also like to associate ourselves with what has just been expressed by the IUCN and the World Wildlife Fund.

In particular we would like to urge those responsible for the future of the north Pacific whaling stocks to lose no time in coming to an arrangement whereby quotas can be imposed before it is too late and we lose yet another valuable international marine resource.

The Society would also like to urge the International Whaling Commission at this moment, when it appears to have ended a rather depressing run of years in which conservation measures and management have been of a rather negative and preventative character, and when it appears that a turning has been reached when it is possible to look forward to and undertake positive management, to recognise a fact well-known to all those who are responsible for the management of terrestrial animal stocks. We know that each particular species of animal requires different treatment, one cannot lump animals of any kind together in their treatment, the different species must be respected.

The fact that one talks about whales in general does rather lead to the impression that one can treat all whales alike and, in particular, the fact that the deliberations of this Commission are conducted in terms of blue whale units rather gives the impression that whales are some kind of impersonal abstract thing, that they are units, they are not live animals. As you know, whales are of different species and, like all other animal species are different in various respects, and have different ecological requirements. What I am leading up to is that I do hope that in future it will be possible for management to be positive and to take account of the fact that different species of whales have different requirements, and are not just treated en bloc. This involves separate conservation measures, this involves the disappearance of the blue whale unit which I understand is something like thirty years old, and is therefore a somewhat antique tool for conservation of any animal. It involves the disappearance of this overall measure and the conservation of whales by species and, within species, by different stocks in different parts of the oceans of the world.

I would urge the Commission increasingly in future to give attention to this fact: that you are looking after different stocks of whales in different parts of the ocean and not just to wrap everything up in one global quota. This, it seems to me, is the way of positive management and conservation, the way that the Commission must go if we are to get back to

the state where we were thirty years ago, when there was an abundance of whales in the world as an invaluable international resource.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fitter.

The International Society for the Protection of Animals,
Mr. Platt.

Mr. C. PLATT: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen, the International Society for the Protection of Animals supports the conservation recommendations made by the previous speakers.

The International Observer Scheme is welcomed, and its effective implementation is urged at the earliest opportunity. My organisation reiterates its recommendation, made at the International Whaling Commission's Eighteenth Meeting, that a training scheme for gunners be considered. It is in the best interests of all concerned that these animals are captured and killed as efficiently and with the least degree of pain humanly possible. Animal welfare opinion throughout the world has for many years expressed concern at the manner in which some whales are killed. It is with this in mind that the International Society advocates the gunnery training scheme.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, my organisation wishes me to convey to this Commission its deep appreciation of the invitation to have an observer present at this meeting. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Platt.

The Universities Federation for Animal Welfare. Are they represented this afternoon? No. Then, last but not least, I think is the observer from ICES. Dr. Mackintosh, do you wish to address the Commission?

Dr. N.A. MACKINTOSH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I think that I am only asked to inform the International Council in due course of the principal results of this meeting and, like previous observers for ICES, I think it is not necessary for me to address the Commission. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Then, if there are no further observers whom I have missed, I think that concludes item 20 on the agenda.

Item 21 - Arrangements for Press Release. In recent years the Commission have entrusted the Chairman and the Secretary with the task of drawing up a press release and distributing it through the machinery of the Ministry of Agriculture. Is it the wish of the Commission that this procedure be followed on this occasion? Is that agreed? Agreed.

Item 22 - Any other business. Under this item I think we have to deal with invitations for the Commission to be represented by an observer at meetings of other international bodies. I will ask the Acting Secretary to inform the Commission of the invitations that we have received.

The ACTING SECRETARY: As you will know by the papers circulated at the beginning of this week, the Commission has been invited to send an observer to the meeting of the South Pacific Permanent Commission at Lima in October this year. The Commission has also been invited by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea to send an observer to their Fifty-fifth Statutory Meeting in Hamburg from 9 to 18 October. Finally, we have had a letter from the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission inviting us, in common with all intergovernmental organizations, to send an observer to the Fifth Session of the Commission which will be held in Paris from 19 to 28 October, 1967. These are the three invitations which we have received to date.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Goldthorpe. Let us take first the meeting of the South Pacific Commission. I believe that on previous occasions the commissioner for the Argentine Republic has represented this Commission at meetings of that Commission. I do not know whether it would be the wish of the Commission that he should do so on this occasion, and whether he would be willing to do so if he were asked.

Mr. A. von der BECKE (Argentina): As far as I understand it, the Argentine intervention on this has been that, at the last Meeting, the Chairman asked Mr. Figuerero, who was the commissioner at that time, to get in touch with Chile, Peru and other representatives and find out how this Commission was doing. I do not think it was something which was done officially by the Government. It was more of a personal request made to Mr. Figuerero.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that on this occasion we have been invited to send an observer to the meeting.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (USSR)(interpretation): I should like to propose that we send Mr. Graham as an observer to the South Pacific Whaling Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure that Mr. Graham would welcome this proposal very warmly.

Mr. J. GRAHAM (United Kingdom): If the Chairman, in his other capacity thought that I could be spared, I would gladly go.

The CHAIRMAN: I think, in my other capacity, that I should find it very difficult to spare Mr. Graham. I wonder though whether we should not appoint as observer someone who would not have quite so far to travel across the world. That is the wish of the Commission on this matter?

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (USSR)(interpretation): Mr. Chairman, I put forward an official proposal.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that Mr. Graham has been obliged to decline through having received telephonic instructions from a superior officer. Could I, therefore, ask for an alternative proposal?

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (USSR)(interpretation): It seems that Mr. Graham is not refusing, and in this Commission Meeting he has no superiors.

Mr. J. GRAHAM (United Kingdom): In view of that I should say that, although I am greatly flattered by the invitation, I feel quite sure that the United Kingdom authorities would not, in fact, make me available, so that I must regretfully decline it.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sukhoruchenko, you will have to think of another one.

Mr. A. von der BECKE (Argentina): Since we seem to have reached an impasse, I should like to suggest that there are many embassies of the Governments represented on this Commission in Lima in Peru, and I am sure that any of them would be very pleased to send one of their officers as an observer

to the meeting, and he could then advise the Commission on the results of that meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that suggestion. I would only say that this Commission at the last Meeting expressed a great desire to make closer contact with the Commission for the South Pacific. I think that it would have been a very useful gesture if we could, in fact, have sent someone who was present at this Meeting to the meeting of the South Pacific Commission to represent our viewpoint there and -- and this I think is just as important -- to bring back to this Commission at its next Meeting an account of how these things are handled by the Commission for the South Pacific. I am only sorry that it was not possible to accept Mr. Sukhoruchenko's suggestion, but I wonder if there is not someone else here, or someone who will be going to Tokyo next year, who could attend the South Pacific Commission on our behalf.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (USA): I think that the delegate from Argentina has made a good suggestion, and I wonder if I could suggest a modification of it which might be useful. It could be that, in the course of the next few months, some person's itinerary might change, and it might be possible that there could be a member of this Commission in or near the area at the time who might be able to attend. Could it be left in abeyance in the hope that that might occur? If not, then perhaps you could follow the suggestion made by the delegate from Argentina and have someone from one of the embassies of the member countries go.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that suggestion. It seems to me to be a very valuable one, if I may say so. Could I ask, then, that any commissioner who is likely to be in the neighbourhood of Lima next October, that is October, 1967, should let the Secretary or me know, so that we can make arrangements to be represented if it is possible?

Dr. S.J. HOLT (FAO): Mr. Chairman, in the opening session of this meeting of the Commission you asked me whether it might be possible for FAO to offer its good offices to the Commission in connexion with its relations with the South Pacific Permanent Commission. Although, of course, it would certainly not under any circumstances be possible for an FAO observer to the South Pacific Commission to represent the views of this Commission, I think it would be in order if such were desired for the FAO observer who will be attending that meeting to make available to the Commission his report on the activities of the South Pacific Permanent Commission with respect to whaling, should that body discuss this matter. I think I can say that my organization will be represented at the South Pacific Permanent Commission, although I cannot say by whom it will be represented. We shall also be corresponding with that Commission in connexion with the possible inclusion on its agenda of the subject of whaling investigations and whaling regulations. If, therefore, Mr. Chairman, you wished me to take up this question on my return to Rome I could do so, and I am sure from my discussions with my superiors that it would receive a sympathetic response.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Holt. That does give us another possible link with the Commission.

(The Chairman continued....)

Could we now come to I.C.E.S.? Does the Commission wish to nominate an observer to I.C.E.S.? Dr. Mackintosh is the I.C.E.S. observer here, there is nothing to prevent him being the Whaling Commission observer at I.C.E.S., if that would be the wish of the Commission and if he is prepared to undertake this double task. Can I ask if there are any other proposals?

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Mr. Chairman, is it really expedient for our observer to be represented at the I.C.E.S. meeting, they are not dealing with whales and have practically no common interest with our Commission?

The CHAIRMAN: The Commission has been represented by an observer in the past.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): What is the significance of having an observer at the I.C.E.S. meeting, I do not quite understand the aim of so doing? When we are discussing the deputising of our observer to the South Pacific Whaling Commission it is quite understandable, but it is not clear when it concerns I.C.E.S.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sukhoruchenko suggests that the Commission should not be represented by an observer at I.C.E.S., what is the feeling of the Commission on this point? If no one else speaks, I shall take it to be the wish of the Commission that we be not represented by an observer at I.C.E.S.

Dr. J.L. McHUGH (U.S.A.): I have done enough talking today, but I am afraid I have to speak again. It is my impression that this would not involve any cost to the Commission because presumably Dr. Mackintosh, and perhaps other members of the Commission, will be at the I.C.E.S. meeting. It is my understanding that the reason to have an observer at the meeting of another international body that deals with fishery matters is that some things might be going on there which it would be useful for this Commission to know about at first hand; it is possible we might learn something useful.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Such international organisations number at least 40 and maybe more.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the point is, Mr. Sukhoruchenko, that I.C.E.S. have invited this Commission to send an observer and the question is whether the Commission wishes to accept the invitation. You have suggested it is not necessary; Dr. McHugh, on the other hand, suggests it would be useful to have an observer there to let us know what is going on and, as is pointed out, there would be no cost to the Commission.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): So, Mr. Chairman, it is up to you.

The CHAIRMAN: No, it is not up to me, it is up to the Commission to decide what they want to do.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): I put a proposal that the Commission should authorise you to solve that problem.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sukhoruchenko has suggested that the Chairman should solve this problem, which I think means that the Chairman should decide whether an observer should go and who the observer should be. I think I should warn the Commission that if it leaves the decision to me I shall ask Dr. Mackintosh to be the observer, but I am quite willing to make that my own decision rather than the decision of the Commission, if that is their wish.

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): I agree.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? I see no objection. (Agreed)

The final body is the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission which has asked us to send an observer to the meeting in Paris on 19th to 28th October. Perhaps Mr. Sukhoruchenko would like to spend a week in Paris between 19th and 28th October!

Mr. M.N. SUKHORUCHENKO (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, but unfortunately I will not be in a position to go.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Commission wish to send an observer to this meeting? There are no proposals, so should we then ask the Secretary to inform the I.O.C. that this Commission does not wish to be represented at its meeting?

Mr. A. von der BECKE (Argentina): I was just going to suggest that if no observer is going to be sent would it be possible to ask the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission to send the documents that have arisen from their meeting so that the International Whaling Commission can follow the results of their work?

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. von der Becke, I think we could probably ask for a record of the meeting to be sent to the Commission.

There are no other observers that we have to appoint. Can I ask if there is any other business for the Commission?

(Dr. McHugh drew attention to an error in the spelling of his name in the list of delegates)

Gentlemen, if there is no other business it only remains for me to thank the Commissioners and other representatives here very much for their kindness and forbearance to me as Chairman and for the expeditious way in which they have transacted the extremely difficult business of the last two days.

I now declare the Nineteenth Meeting of the International Whaling Commission closed. Thank you.

Dr. B. van dyk de JAGER (South Africa): On behalf of all the Commissioners present I wish to express a vote of deep thanks and gratitude to our Chairman at this meeting. Thank you very much. (Applause)

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much indeed, and thank you for your help.

(The meeting closed at 4.20 p.m.)