

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 23RD MEETING OF THE
INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION, 1971

Please note:

Contained here is document IWC/23/13, the verbatim record of the third Plenary Session at the 1971 meeting – this is the only part of the verbatim record from that year which is lodged in the Commission's archives, no further verbatim records are held for the 1971 meeting.

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION TWENTY - THIRD MEETINGSession of Friday, 25th June, 1971In the Chair: Mr. I. FujitaThe Chairman (Interpretation):

Gentlemen, I should like to start the **third** plenary session. Are you all ready for the meeting?

Mr. N.T. Nosov (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation):

Before discussing questions on the Agenda at the present meeting, the Soviet delegation would like to make a statement. The Soviet delegation expresses their vehement protest that the United States Government does not provide creative conditions for the work of Soviet delegations. The Soviet delegations insist that the Government of the United States of America adopts necessary measures to provide for normal work of the Soviet delegation at the present International Meeting in accordance with the common law. The Soviet delegation requests you, Mr. Chairman, to include this protest in the protocol of the present meeting. Thank you.

Dr. J.L. McHugh (U.S.A.):

Mr. Chairman, it's not clear to the United States delegation just exactly what the Soviet Commissioner's protesting about. I can think of several possible things such as the heat and perhaps lack of a meeting room, or something like that, or some other things that I know he's had problems with. I wonder if he could make it a little clearer to us, then perhaps I can reply to this statement.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Thank you Dr. McHugh.

Mr. N.T. Nosov (U.S.S.R.)(Interpretation):

All the members present here are aware that the Soviet delegation this morning came one hour late to the morning meeting. This was caused by unjust actions of the U.S. citizens towards the Soviet delegation. When the Soviet delegation was leaving the Embassy - the Soviet Embassy - it was not given free access to take the car, and the citizens did not appear shocked by this. Well, the details can be learned by Dr. McHugh from the U.S. Police.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Dr. McHugh - please.

Dr. J.L. McHugh (U.S.A.):

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank the Soviet Commissioner for his explanation. I thought this was perhaps the problem he was alluding to. I can offer no explanation other than that it had nothing to do with the affairs of the International Whaling Commission, and I will be able to talk to him privately about this later on, and I understand the problem completely. Thank you.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

As the Chairman of the meeting, I think this matter is outside the terms of this Commission, therefore I would like to proceed accordingly. As I understand it, the remaining Agenda Items to be discussed are: 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 17.

Mr. N.T. Nosov (U.S.S.R.)(Interpretation):

The Soviet delegation is aware that the question taken up is outside the topic of the meeting - the present meeting - but we would like to state that such a situation prevents the Soviet delegation from normal work at this session, and we persistently demand that this statement be included in the protocol of this present session.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

As the Chairman of the meeting, I agree it is possible that the statement of the Soviet delegation can be recorded in the Minutes. I would now like to start discussing the remaining items. First is Agenda Item 7 - Sperm Whale Stocks. This is related to Agenda Item 17(j) as an amendment to the Schedule, and I would like to discuss the matters simultaneously. ~~It is also related to Agenda Item~~ 8 - North Pacific Whale Stocks. First I would like to discuss 7 and 8, then later on refer to 17(j). May I ask Mr. Rindal, the Chairman of the Technical Committee to make a report.

Mr. I. Rindal (Chairman Technical Committee):

The question which you just raised has been discussed in the Technical Committee. We endorsed the recommendation of the Scientific Committee in its report on page 7 that further analysis of the stock **is needed.** **We supported the** recommendation already put forward in the Scientific Committee's Report that a meeting of scientists should be called for an assessment of the stock at the earliest possible date, and preferably in the first part of 1972. That goes for Agenda Item 8(a). As regards the conservation measure I think it would be natural at this point to call upon the representative of South Africa to explain how he looks at Items 7(a) and 7(b).

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Are there any comments or remarks from the South African delegate?

Mr. D.P. Olivier (South Africa):

Thank you Mr. Chairman. We made a proposal to the Technical Committee this morning, and there was some discussion on it . Unfortunately we didn't get round to proposing our amendment **to the Schedule.** I think it would be appropriate to suggest now the amendment we would like to introduce: "The number of sperm whales taken in the area south of the equator and between 20° East longitude and 70° East longitude in the 1971/72 pelagic, and 1972 coastal seasons, and subsequent seasons so combined shall not exceed the catch in the 1969/70 pelagic and 1970 land station seasons combined".

The Chairman (Interpretation):

The Secretaries are asking you to read more slowly. (The South African delegate repeated the amendment as above).

The Chairman (Interpretation):

(In a question addressed to the South African delegate) Are you now proposing an amendment to the Schedule as in Agenda Item 17(j)?

Mr. D.P. Olivier (South Africa):

Yes.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Thank you very much. The South African delegate has proposed an amendment to the Schedule regarding 17(j). Is the proposal seconded? Since it is not seconded it seems this motion is not **supported. United Kingdom please?**

Mr. B.W. Meynell (U.K.):

would like to

I would second the motion, but/ask a question Mr. Chairman. First I would like to say that considering the history of over-exploitation of baleen whale stocks in the Southern Hemisphere, it seems prudent to follow the Scientific Committee's suggestion that sperm whale catches should not be permitted to increase in the area, pending the assessments available from the special meeting which I understand is to be held on the subject early in 1972. The 20° and 70° East region referred to in the proposal by the South African colleague is a particular case where such a policy is appropriate. My questions Sir, are as follows: First: am I right in understanding that the words that he proposed to be added to the Schedule would provide an aggregate limit for both pelagic and for land based operations? Would they be together, or would they be separate? That is my first question. My second question is: What figures - numbers - could be given to make clear to us what it is that is the substance of this proposal in terms of the number of catches involved? Thank you, Sir.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Thank you. Would the South African delegate please answer **these questions.**

Mr. D.P. Olivier (South Africa):

Mr. Chairman, the total catch for this area and period, was 2747 sperm whales. According to figures here, the pelagic catch was 923 and the coastal was 1824.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Does the U.K. delegate understand?

Mr. B.W. Meynell (U.K.):

Yes Sir, I understand. I think that perhaps there is an ambiguity in the form

of words which our South African colleague proposed, that does need to be tidied up in the wording to make it clear that these separate limits are proposed for pelagic and for coastal catches. On that particular point Sir, if there were differences of view, I am sure we should be open ourselves to reasoned argument about them, but if there are no differences of opinion about the exact number and no differences of opinion about aggregation or separation of the pelagic and coastal limit, I would most warmly support, and most warmly commend to other Commissioners the proposal made by our South African colleague.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

I do not understand very well. Is the U.K. delegate proposing to second the South African delegate proposals?

Mr. B.W. Meynell (U.K.):

Yes, formally I would wish to second that proposal. I think there is a little bit of a possibility that language may be adjusted to make it clear. Yes, I maintain my seconding of the proposal.

Dr. J.T. McHugh (U.S.A.):

Mr. Chairman, operating on the same assumption as the U.K. delegate, the proposal indeed means two separate quotas, one for land stations and one for pelagic fleets, the United States will support this proposal.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

South Africa?

Mr. D.P. Olivier (South Africa):

Mr. Chairman, in order to meet our seconders, I would like to perhaps change the wording of the amendment to read as from - perhaps I should read the whole amendment to the whole proposal. "The number of sperm whales taken in the area south of the equator and between 20° East longitude and 70° East longitude in the 1971/72 pelagic season shall not exceed 923 whales and in the 1972 coastal season, 1824 whales. These same limits to be set for subsequent seasons".

Chairman (Interpretation):

Japan please.

Mr. Fujimura (Japan) (Interpretation):

The population at present of sperm whales in the Southern Hemisphere is estimated to be about 180,000 to 200,000. As we stated at the previous meeting, stock population found between 20° and 70° East is not an independent and separate one, and rather considered to be to belong to a much larger population dispersing widely in the Antarctic region. As we just discussed, our scientists are going to meet before the next Commission meeting to discuss particularly the stock of this species, and I do not think it is wise for us to anticipate the judgement of this Scientific Committee before we decide whether we should set the quota or should not. And I'm afraid the South African proposal is not accompanied by sufficient technical details how to implement the catch quota as far as pelagic whaling is concerned.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

I should like to get the position clear. Amendments to the Schedule first need to be described precisely, and after any second motion we then make a roll call. First; is the South African proposal seconded by the United Kingdom or not?

Second; is the Japanese statement just a statement concerning the opposition, or a new proposal? If the Japanese delegate is opposed, in the roll call, just say "against". If you want to make a revised proposal would you **do it** accordingly. Mr. Rindal please.

Mr. I. Rindal (Norway):

I think that the proposal of the South African delegate would in no way hinder the work of the Scientific Committee. I would propose therefore that ~~the~~ proposal be accepted with the provision that the words "and subsequent seasons" be deleted. That would provide a conservation scheme for the coming year, and give the Scientific Committee full opportunity of discussing and eventually coming to conclusions. I would be prepared to support the suggestion by the South African delegate, seconded by the delegation from the United Kingdom, provided that this restriction on the catch was introduced for one year only, **subject** to future review of the meeting of the Scientific Committee.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Dr. McHugh please.

Dr. J.L. McHugh (U.S.A.):

We support the Norwegian amendment Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Would the Norwegian delegate state the revised amendment since it must be made precisely.

Mr. I. Rindal (Norway):

My proposal is to support the amendment **proposed** by the South African delegate with the words "subsequent season" deleted. The idea being that this restriction on the catch of sperm whales in the area described by him **would be effective for the next year, and the catch in the said area should be reviewed by the Scientific Committee at the forthcoming session.**

The Chairman (Interpretation):

South Africa?

Mr. D.P. Olivier (South Africa):

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Norwegian Commissioner for his support and we accept his wording.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

The South African delegate endorsed the Norwegian delegate's revised proposal. The Norwegian revised proposal is therefore now considered to be the original proposal.

(The adoption of the recommendation was moved by the Norwegian delegation and seconded by the U.S.A. delegation).

The Chairman (Interpretation):

If there is no further revised amendment I shall ask the Secretary to make a roll call.

Dr. J.L. McHugh (U.S.A.):

Mr. Chairman, at the moment there is not a paragraph in the Schedule which deals with the sperm whale. We have to introduce one this afternoon to deal with the

North Pacific proposal and it seems to me that the right place for this present proposal would follow the one which we have to introduce to deal with the North Pacific. Can I suggest then we leave this until we're in a position to submit the North Pacific amendment and incorporate it to make a comprehensive amendment dealing with sperm whales.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Regarding the North Pacific, I prefer to discuss the sperm whale when we deal with the control of other species there. Therefore the discussion of sperm whale stocks outside of the North Pacific should be taken under Item 17(j). If we deal with these problems separately I think it avoids **confusion**. If there are no objections I'd like to make a roll call on this matter as in 17(j). Regarding amendments to the Schedule, I would like to remind members that amendments cannot be **approved** unless at least three quarters vote in favour of the amendment. So if there are no objections I shall ask the Secretary to make the roll call. **Dr. Sprules, Canada?**

Dr. W.M. Sprules (Canada):

Mr. Chairman, just before the roll call, will the Secretary read the proposed words to us please.

The Secretary:

I am in a little bit of difficulty here because I am not sure that I have the proposed amendment of the Schedule in its full terms, so I wonder if the South African delegate could very kindly fill in the gaps for me as I go along. As I have it here, it reads: "The number of sperm whales taken in the area south of the equator and between 20° East longitude and 70° East longitude in the 1971/72 pelagic season, and 1972 coastal season, it shall not exceed - from

here I have a gap I am sorry to say. (Secretary gets help and continues). Well if I may start again I will now read the proposal of the South African delegation as amended by the Norwegian delegation. This is how it now reads: "The number of sperm whales taken in the area south of the equator and between 20° East longitude and 70° East longitude in the 1971/72 pelagic season shall not exceed 923 whales and in the 1972 coastal season shall not exceed 1824 whales. These figures in subsequent seasons to be further adjusted on the basis of the latest scientific assessment". This amendment would come in paragraph 8. At the moment we go up to paragraph 8(h) we are proposing to put a paragraph in 8(i) covering the North Pacific and this will be paragraph 8(j). I would now like the member countries to vote on this proposed amendment.

Argentina	Absent
Australia	Abstain
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Absent
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	No
Mexico	Yes
Norway	Yes
Panama	Yes
South Africa	Yes
U.S.S.R.	No
U.K.	Yes
U.S.A.	Yes

According to my record I have 9 votes in favour, 2 against and 1 abstension.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

As the Secretary told you, this motion is carried. My personal comment is that this provision does not provide anything regarding distribution of the polar expeditions. I am therefore doubtful whether it can be effectively implemented.

How is general agreement to be reached regarding the quota, and how is it to be distributed? However, I don't think I should discuss this matter further.

Turning to Agenda Item 8, may I ask Dr. McHugh who is the Chairman of the North Pacific countries to make a report.

Dr. J.L. McHugh (Chairman North Pacific countries):

I must thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman the new version of our report is still not typed out, I'm sorry, but I do have a copy of the earlier version and the amendments to the Schedule as we propose are as follows: Paragraph 8(f): I'll read it slowly so that the Secretary can take it down. Subject to subparagraph (h)

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Is this a report?

The Secretary:

Mr. Chairman, if Dr. McHugh is reading the proposed amendments to the Schedule I wonder if we could put it **in the terms which** we have to circulate amendments rather than in the terms of the report of the North Pacific Commissioners. **That** would make it simpler for the Secretariat in effecting the amendments.

Dr. J.L. McHugh (U.S.A.):

I have proposed amendments to the Schedule here giving in effect the proposal of the Technical Committee this morning and this would be the better form if I may say so in getting it through the Commission this afternoon. I will defer to the

Secretary and let him read the language Mr. Chairman.

The Secretary:

The proposed amendments are these: In sub-paragraph 8(f) the proposal is to delete 1308 and add 1046 and to delete 1971 and add 1972. In sub-paragraph 8(g) delete 4710 and add 3768. Delete 1971 and substitute 1972. Delete "the succeeding few years" and add "1973". Delete "within a few years" and then it is necessary to add sub-paragraph 8(i) which would read "The number of sperm whales taken in the North Pacific Ocean and dependent waters shall not exceed 10841 whales in 1972".

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Is what Mr. Stacey read the same as you were intending to propose Dr. McHugh?

Dr. J.L. McHugh (U.S.A.):

Yes, I so move Mr. Chairman.

(The adoption of the recommendation was moved by the U.S.A. delegation and seconded by the delegations of Japan and Norway).

The Chairman (Interpretation):

I would like Mr. Stacey to make a roll call.

The Secretary:

Argentina	Absent
Australia	Yes
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Absent
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes

Japan	Yes
Mexico	Yes
Norway	Yes
Panama	Yes
South Africa	Yes
U.S.S.R	Yes
U.K.	Yes
U.S.A.	Yes

The Chairman (Interpretation):

The motion is carried unanimously. Thank you very much. Item 8 is now disposed and simultaneously Agenda Item 7.

Mr. I. Rindal (Chairman Technical Committee)

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I think that under paragraph 8 we have a very important sub-paragraph (h) which has not been discussed. I am talking about the amendment to Schedule paragraph 8. We have taken schedule paragraph 8(f) and (g) but it seems to me that you have forgotten one of the very important conditions for the acceptance of **Schedule 8**(f) and (g) which is contained in separate paragraph (h) of the same paragraph of the Schedule. I suppose it would be appropriate to take this in now at the present time, because as far as I have understood, these three sub-paragraphs (f), (g) and (h) are contingent upon each other.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

We are just at cross purposes here. The item 17(i) **relates** to paragraph 8(h), is that so Mr. Fujimura? Now I'd like to discuss Item 17(i) regarding amendment to the Schedule. May I ask Mr. Rindal to make a report regarding **the** Committee's discussion.

Mr. I. Rindal (Chairman Technical Committee):

Mr. Chairman, as regards 17(i) of our Agenda which refers to paragraph 8(h) of the Schedule, it was unanimously decided by the Technical Committee that this paragraph should be recommended to the Commission as being changed in the following manner: That before the sentence as we find it in 8(h) we should insert the words "For the year 1972". With that proviso the sub-paragraph (h) was unanimously recommended by the Technical Committee to the plenary for adoption.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Dr. McHugh please.

Dr. J.L. McHugh (U.S.A.):

Mr. Chairman, my notes do not agree with what Mr. Rindal just said, I have different language. The language that I think we agreed to, was "Until the end of 1972".

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Dr. Sprules.

Dr. W.M. Sprules (Canada):

I simply wish to raise the same point Mr. Chairman. I agree with the distinguished delegate of the United States.

The Secretary:

Can I offer an apology here to Mr. Rindal. Unfortunately we have been held up in the Printing Department for the copies of the Technical Committee's report so he is rather handicapped by not having before him the document which is necessary in order for him to put this before the Commission.

Mr. I. Rindal (Chairman Technical Committee):

I'm very grateful for your apology Mr. Secretary and I'm sorry that my memory was not as absolute as it should have been. I quite agree with the distinguished delegate from the United States that it is: "Until the end of the year 1972".

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Before we make a roll call I would first ask the Secretary to read the proposed sub-paragraph 8(h).

The Secretary:

The proposal is to add the following words at the beginning of sub-paragraph 8(h). "Until the end of 1972". It will then go on to read: "the catch specified"
Can I now take a vote? A roll call.

Argentina	Absent
Australia	Yes
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Absent
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Yes
Mexico	Yes
Norway	Yes
Panama	Yes
South Africa	Yes
U.S.S.R.	No
U.K.	Yes
U.S.A.	Yes

The Chairman (Interpretation):

11 for and 1 against. The motion is carried. Now Agenda Items 8, 17(i) and (j) are disposed of. Next is Agenda Item 9 - the Minke Whale Stock. May I ask Mr. Rindal the Chairman of the Technical Committee to make a report on the discussions.

Mr. I. Rindal (Chairman Technical Committee):

Thank you Mr. Chairman. The discussion in the Technical Committee of the Minke stocks was quite extensive. There was general agreement that the stock in Antarctic was something about 150,000 to 200,000 and that in 1973 the maximum sustainable yield would be around 5,000. The U.S. delegation proposed a quota of 5,000 Minke for the next Antarctic season. The delegation from the United States believe this would prevent over-exploitation starting from a rapid increase. The Japanese delegation was opposed to setting^a quota without positive scientific evidence, and drew the attention of the Committee to the existence of a large surplus available for catching in that area. It was therefore agreed that the Committee should recommend to the Commission, that careful watch should be kept on the level of the catch in the future.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

According to the report by Mr. Rindal, it seems there is no amendment to the Schedule required. If there is no proposal to make amendment to the Schedule, the practice is not to take a roll call. Dr. McHugh please.

Dr. J.L. McHugh (U.S.A.):

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would just like to make a brief statement about the Minke whale stock in the Southern Hemisphere, the Antarctic, and to bring your attention to a matter of principle. That is, that here would be an opportunity of this Commission to recognise the series of events that have taken place in the

past with respect to land stocks in the Antarctic, and indeed all around the world, and to have taken some action to place a provisional quota on a stock of whales which is just beginning to be exploited. We agree that the estimate of the maximum sustainable yield of Antarctic Minke whales is a very tentative estimate, and it is not very well supported by scientific evidence. ~~But~~ at the same time, it appeared to us that this offered two opportunities to this Commission. One, to indicate its intention to begin setting quotas in the Antarctic by species rather than by blue whale units: and two, a demonstration by this Commission that it recognises that it is prudent to set provisional quotas to avoid the same problems that we have encountered in the past. Recognising that when the catch is small, the quota does not interfere with development of a fishery on this resource, but at the same time provides at least some ceiling on the total catch. I would point out that in each year as that fishery develops, scientists would have better data, more data on which to base their stock estimates, and we might very well, under these circumstances, come up with a rational scientific management programme for this very important whale resource. This is not possible at this meeting Mr. Chairman. We are, however, still concerned about the matter and we will continue to bring this subject up in the future. Thank you.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Any other comment? We agree then, there is no amendment to the Schedule. Next is Agenda Item 10 - Appointment of inspectors on the catchers functioning also as factory ships. Could I ask Mr. Rindal to comment.

Mr. I. Rindal (Chairman Technical Committee):

Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the Schedule was introduced by the Norwegian delegation for the purpose of ensuring that both the national inspector and the observer appointed by the Commission could be accommodated on these small vessels.

The crew of the vessel of this size is very small, the accommodation of the ship is not much to brag about, and as a result, we suggested that we should have the following amendment to the Schedule: In paragraph 1(a) that after the word "inspection" in line 2, the following should be inserted: "provided that at least one such inspector shall be maintained on each catcher functioning as a factory ship". I can assure you Mr. Chairman and the meeting, it is not our intention to reduce the possibility of observation and inspection, it is a practical purpose for which we have asked for this change to the Schedule. The question was debated in the Technical Committee, and the Technical Committee agreed to recommend to the Commission that these words should be included as an amendment of the Schedule as it is established before us. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

The Norwegian delegate made a proposal regarding amendment to the Schedule under Agenda Item 17(a). Also this matter is related to ^{the} amendment to the Schedule regarding the International Observer Scheme. I would like to make sure that each amendment is adopted, and should like the Secretary to combine the wording.

The Secretary:

The proposal is to amend the Schedule paragraph 1(a) by inserting after the word "inspection" in line 2, the following: "provided that at least one such inspector shall be maintained on each catcher functioning as a factory ship". Will member countries please vote on this amendment.

Argentina	Absent
Australia	Yes
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Absent
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Yes
Mexico	Yes
Norway	Yes
Panama	Yes
South Africa	Yes
U.S.S.R.	Yes
U.K.	Yes
U.S.A.	Yes

The Chairman (Interpretation):

The motion is carried unanimously. So Agenda Items 10 and 17(a) are completed. We can now go on to Agenda Item 11 - International Observer Scheme. May I ask Dr. McHugh as the Chairman of the Working Group for this matter to make a report.

Dr. J.L. McHugh (Chairman I.O.S. Working Group):

Thank you Mr. Chairman. After my last experience at trying to handle something like this, perhaps I should ask the Secretary to do it, but let me try. We propose the following amendments to the Schedule: Paragraph 1(a) should be amended by ending the first sentence with "inspection", in other words, in the second line, place a period after "inspection" and delete the words "and also such observers" and so on until the end of the sentence. Do you want to deal with these one by

one, or shall I give them all to you?

The Chairman (Interpretation):

We are not querying this, please speak more loudly.

Dr. J.E. McHugh (Chairman I.O.S. Working Group):

I am sorry Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I should give a word or two of explanation first, because it may not be clear why we propose this. We are attempting to get some language into the Schedule which will clearly authorise the establishment of an International Observer Scheme which will have to be worked out in detail at a later meeting this year, and to make the language neat and tidy we are proposing to delete reference to observers in paragraphs 1(a) and 1(b), and to add a new paragraph, 1(c) which will take care of the observer question. **To do this** we propose that paragraph 1(a) be amended by placing a period after the word "inspection" in the second line of that paragraph, so that that sentence shall read as follows: "There shall be maintained on each factory ship at least two inspectors of whaling for the purpose of maintaining 24 hour inspection", and delete the rest of that sentence which refers to observers, and then carry on "these inspectors" and so on to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. B.W. Meynell (U.K.):

May I interrupt the distinguished delegate of the United States on a point of order Mr. Chairman? We have just amended paragraph 1(a) as I understand it in this Commission. We've just amended it by adding the words which end with the passage "factory ships" those words to be added after the word "inspection". Am I right, as I believe I am, in assuming that the proposals that are now being made are made by the United States delegate in his capacity as Chairman of the **Working**

Group on the International Observer Scheme, and that the words he is proposing, has just proposed, should not be added after the word "ship", thereby retaining the words that we have just in the past 15 minutes added to paragraph 1(a)? I believe this would have the effect intended, but I just wanted to be quite clear about it.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Mr. Rindal?

Mr. I. Rindal (Norway):

May I say that the British delegate took the words out of my mouth. We have now amended paragraph 1(a) of the Schedule inserting after the word "inspection" the words "provided that at least one such inspector shall be maintained on each catcher functioning as a factory ship". The amendment as far as I can see which is now proposed, would need to strike out the rest after that. As the amendment proposed by the Norwegian delegation was not accepted by the plenary at the time the wording was made we could not assume that the Commission would accept it. Since the Commission has accepted our amendment, the first line of 1(a) would be as specified by the British delegate.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Dr. McHugh?

Dr. J.L. McHugh (Chairman I.O.S. Working Group):

I appreciate the correction made by the distinguished delegate from the United Kingdom and supported by the delegate from Norway, and thank them for their help.

They are absolutely right of course. I made an error and I appreciate this

help. As Mr. Rindal explained, the language that I have here was drafted before we had made this decision and simply my stupidity shows up again. So it is correct that the new language should remain. A period at the end of that new language, and then we delete the words - and I **shall read the words that we are** now deleting: "and also such observers as the member countries engaged in palectic whaling may arrange to place on each others factory ships". So we retain the amendment that has already been made, we delete the words that I have read, and that is our proposal for a further amendment to paragraph 1(a) Mr. Chairman. Second amendment, paragraph 1(b). For the same purpose we would propose deleting the second sentence in that paragraph so that the second sentence begins "there shall be maintained such observers". Delete that whole sentence. Then in place of those deletions Mr. Chairman, we propose the following language to be added as sub-paragraph 1(c). "There shall be received such observers as the member countries may arrange to place on factory ships and land stations or groups of land stations of other member countries. The observers shall be appointed by the Commission and paid by the government nominating them". Thank you Mr. Chairman. Those are **the proposed amendments to the Schedule,** and I would move that they be adopted, but I would like to add one more thing. I ~~shall~~ simply read the last paragraph of our Committee Report. "It was agreed that the question of the cost to the Commission of administration of the Observer Scheme should be referred to the Committee on Finance and Administration" and I assume that they have considered this matter and will be ready to report to you at an appropriate time. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Thank you Dr. McHugh. It seems that the delegates may not have understood what I said about the matter of procedure. With regard to inspectors, Agenda Items 10 and 11 are related to each other.

So far as the amendment to the Schedule is concerned, first we are required to approve the amendments to the Schedule for each of these matters separately. Since Agenda Item 10 is already approved, I will ask the Secretary to read the proposed amendments under Agenda Item 11 and 17(b), and make a roll call.

The Secretary:

The proposed amendments are as follows: Delete the words from paragraph 1(a) "and also such observers as the member countries engaged in pelagic whaling may arrange to place on each other's factory ships" and delete the words from paragraph 1(b) "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", and to insert a new paragraph - 1(c) "There shall be received such observers as the member countries may arrange to place on factory ships and land stations, or groups of land stations of other member countries. The observers shall be appointed by the Commission and paid by the government nominating them". Will you please indicate your voting.

Mr. B.W. Meynell (U.K.):

Just a question before I cast my vote. How long will it be before the Finance and Administration Committee can tell us of the financial implications of what we are now voting upon? I wonder if I may intervene at this very late stage of the roll call without offence, Sir, just to ask the question before registering a vote.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

I understand the U.K. delegate's point and after the voting on this amendment to the Schedule will refer the question to Dr. Sprules, the Chairman of the Administration Committee. Are you agreeable to this course of action?

Mr. B.W. Meynell (U.K.):

Yes.

The Secretary:

I will now call the roll.

Argentina	Absent
Australia	Yes
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Absent
France	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Yes
Mexico	Yes
Norway	Yes
Panama	Yes
South Africa	Yes
U.S.S.R.	Yes
U.K.	Yes
U.S.A.	Yes

The amendments are accepted unanimously.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

This motion is carried unanimously.

Mr. N.T. Nosov (U.S.S.R.) (Interpretation):

In connection with the Commission adopting this amendment the Soviet delegation would like to state the following: Implementation of the International Observer Scheme should be carried out on the basis of an international agreement between the countries that are interested in it, so that by no means the new amendment might lead to diminishing the main basic principle of the Convention in this respect that the national inspection is the chief order to implement control. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

I understand the International Observer Scheme has taken one more step, and as the Soviet delegate said we need some kind of agreement regarding this matter among the countries concerned. Regarding implementation; I urge those countries to make an agreement. According to the Japanese proverb, if we do not implement this amendment, it is called the rice cake in the picture. Now may I ask Dr. Sprules as the Chairman of the Administration and Finance Committee to make a report regarding expenditure for the International Observer Scheme.

Dr. W.M. Sprules (Chairman, Finance and Administration Committee):

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman as the members gathered will recall, there has been approved an amendment to Schedule 1(a) indicating that the cost of inspectors placed - I'm sorry - the cost of observers appointed by the Commission and designated to the factory ships, land stations, or groups of land stations, will be met by the appointing Governments. But I wish to point out that in any Observer Scheme administered by the Commission, there will be reports and other matters coming back to the Secretary, and it is our feeling in the Finance and Administration Committee that the Secretariat will need some bolstering, some

additional help in order to deal with the new set of reports or business.

Mr. Chairman, the Finance and Administration Committee has given consideration to the proposal to establish an International Observer Scheme. We have no indication really, of what the additional expenses would be to the Secretariat, also Mr. Chairman, from the personal viewpoint of the Canadian delegation, I must point out that we have already taken action at an earlier plenary session to establish the national assessment, or national contributions for the coming fiscal year. Mr. Chairman with all these matters before us, the Finance and Administration Committee recommends that for the coming whaling season, the Governments of the member nations participating in the International Observer Scheme be requested to provide any additional funds required by the Secretariat to administer the scheme pro rata on the basis of the respective national catches of whales. So our recommendation is that for this first immediate operating season the total cost of the new administration to the Secretariat should be met by the participating nations on a pro rata basis of their national whale catches. Now Mr. Chairman, the Finance and Administration Committee went one step further, We realised that at the next year's Annual Meeting it will be necessary to give further consideration to just how we could properly, conveniently and justly administer this scheme and provide the necessary funds to the Secretary. So as a second recommendation we would propose to the Commission that this matter be reconsidered at next year's Annual Meeting and that consideration might be given to having an estimate after the first year's experience - an estimate of the cost of administration - and then perhaps assessing each member nation party to this Commission a very small token cost or contribution. In this way, every member of this Commission would have an opportunity to make a very small contribution to the cost of administering the very most important matter before us, an International

Observer Scheme. Mr. Chairman, so that the members of this Commission might go home to their Governments with some appreciation or understanding of what we consider to be a small or token contribution, I would say that we are thinking that a year from now each member may be assessed an additional amount equivalent to something like £20, this would be paid by every member nation. Then the additional costs which we rather expect will amount to £2,000 or more, should be met once again by the Governments of the participating nations, or active whaling nations on a pro rata system based on the national catches of whales. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Thank you Dr. Sprules. You have now heard the report by Dr. Sprules and realise what the Committee considered. If you accept this recommendation from the Committee, Agenda Items 11 and 17(b) are disposed of. We now go on to Agenda Item 12. This is a programme regarding the removal of the restriction on the use in other waters of the factory ships used in the waters south of 40° South latitude included in paragraph 11 of the Schedule. May I ask Mr. Rindal to make a report regarding the discussion **in Technical Committee.**

Mr. I. Rindal (Chairman, Technical Committee):

Mr. Chairman, this item was suggested by the Norwegian delegation, and sent to the Secretariat before the meeting in good time. However, under the circumstances the Norwegian delegation have withdrawn their suggestion and I would therefore move that this part of the Agenda be taken out.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Thank you Dr. Rindal. Dr. McHugh please.

Dr. J.L. McHugh (Chairman I.O.S. Working Group):

I am sorry Mr. Chairman to intervene at this stage, I have made a mistake. I should have said one other thing about the International Observer Scheme. If you will allow me to go back for a moment to Item 11 of the Agenda, I am sorry to do this. One thing that is very important to us, is that we have amended the Schedule, but we still do not have an International Observer Scheme. I think it is very important to call to your attention the fact that in the Committee we agreed unanimously as I remember, that as soon as possible, we would meet to work out the details of such a scheme at some convenient time and place, some delegates seem to favour Hawaii for some strange reason, and at that meeting we would come up with a detailed scheme which would provide all the arrangements including estimates of cost. We would plan to schedule this meeting at a time that would allow us then to implement the Scheme at the beginning of the 1972 season. Now let me make it clear what I mean by this. It is the same terminology that is used by the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics, which means that the 1971/72 season in the Antarctic and calendar year 1972 in the rest of the world ocean. I think it is most important to draw this to your attention, because this signifies our intentions to indeed come up with a Scheme, and all of this language in the Schedule does is simply make it possible for the Commission to do that. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Thank you Dr. McHugh. I have the same opinion as Dr. McHugh and I previously stated the urgency required in implementing this International Observer Scheme. Since the Norwegian delegate withdrew Agenda Item 12 and 17(k), these are completed. Agenda Item 13 - Infractions - has been dealt with, and the next is Agenda Item 17(c). This item deals with the position of the Sanctuary and may I ask Mr. Rindal to make a report.

Mr. I. Rindal (Chairman, Technical Committee):

Mr. Chairman, sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 17 - the position of **the Sanctuary** was discussed by the Technical Committee which accepted the recommendation of the Scientific Committee that the Sanctuary should remain open for the season 1971/72. It **is** recommended to the Commission that this recommendation by the Scientific Committee **and supported by the Technical Committee be adopted.**

The Chairman (Interpretation):

^{of}
The Committee accepted the recommendation/the Scientific Committee that the **Sanctuary** should remain open in the 1971/72 season. Since there is no amendment to the Schedule required, all in favour? The motion is carried. The next Item is Agenda Item 17(d) - Determination of the opening and closing dates of the Antarctic pelagic **baleen** season. Again may I ask Mr. Rindal to make a report about this matter.

Mr. I. Rindal (Chairman, Technical Committee):

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Again the report of the Scientific Committee was debated in the Technical Committee which found it possible to accept a recommendation that the opening and closing dates of the Antarctic season should be the same as previously. It was agreed that such a procedure should be recommended to the Commission for acceptance.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

As this matter has also remained unchanged is there any opposition to the proposal that we should accept this recommendation? There is no amendment to the Schedule required. All in favour - carried. The motion is carried. The next item is 17(e) Pelagic catch limits in the Antarctic for the 1971/72 season. This is a most important and most difficult item. If we could solve this problem it seems we've almost finished our Agenda to be discussed today. May I ask Mr. Rindal to make a

report on this matter.

Mr. I. Rindal (Chairman, Technical Committee):

Mr. Chairman, as you said, this is one of the central problems of our work. I am happy to say that during the meeting of the Technical Committee we have been able to propose to the Commission a series of improvements as to what was the case in the past. I think that this meeting of the plenary session can register a series of positive results which I, who have been lucky enough to be on this Commission since 1956, have never come across. We have solved, I hope, a number of tricky questions which in the past have been baffling us, which we have been postponing from one meeting to the next, and which in many cases, never have come to any kind of solution. I think we should be very encouraged by what has been achieved during this session of the International Whaling Commission. We should congratulate each other for having made very important, very substantial work towards the conservation of whales, towards the removal of what suspicion might exist as to whether we are as diligent in the observation of what we are doing as we should be. On the other hand, a firm commitment on the pelagic whaling countries in the Antarctic that for the next season we will leave this dated and almost fossilised concept of blue whale units and go over and count by species. All in all Mr. Chairman, I might say that we have actually achieved something which, when we came to this Commission meeting we, at least the Norwegian delegation, did not believe possible. It is therefore my firm hope, and I hope also, the ideas of the rest of the members that this last item of our Agenda, even if it is the most difficult one, should come to a happy conclusion, which would make all these things possible. I have a feeling that this one is a very important one, not only for the particular question of the baleen quota in the Antarctic, but also for the spirit of co-operation which

we hope will continue in the years to come. During the meeting of the Technical Committee, the Norwegian Commissioner **had** long and intense discussions between those countries which were most directly concerned by this particular question. I regret that **representatives** of other countries **not** were present, but that seems to be the same when we come to the North Pacific, so I suppose we are in order. After those discussions, and after having gone through the matter quite seriously, the Norwegian Commissioner at the meeting of the Technical Committee proposed the catch limit for 1971/72 of 2,300 **blue** whale units. This proposal was supported by the Japanese delegation and when the vote was taken it was agreed upon by the majority of the representatives voting in the Technical Committee. The proposal then for this Commission plenary session is a Norwegian proposal, seconded by Japan and accepted by the majority of the members of the Technical Committee voting that the total global **quota** for the next baleen whaling season in the Antarctic 1971/72 should be 2,300 units. May I add, even if that **does not** make any difference, that the actual catch will definitely be below the number, 2,300. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Since this involves an amendment to the Schedule, I should like the Secretary to propose the amendment in the precise language.

The Secretary:

It is proposed that in sub-paragraph 8(a) of the Schedule, the number 2,700 which appears in the third line, be deleted and substituted by the figure 2,300. Further, that 1970/71 be deleted and substituted by 1971/72.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

The motion is carried. Are there any other further remarks or comments?

Dr. J.L. McHugh (U.S.A.):

No the motion was not carried Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Why?

Dr. J.L. McHugh (U.S.A.):

It was made. Before you bring this matter to a vote Mr. Chairman the United States wants to make a statement. But I don't want to interfere now, I simply want to let you know that we wish to make a statement at an appropriate time before we come to a vote on this question. I'm prepared to listen to the discussion.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

I see; thank you very much. Does this mean you wish to make revised proposals? Or do I understand there is no revised proposal from your side?

Dr. J.L. McHugh (U.S.A.):

Yes Mr. Chairman. At an appropriate stage I wish to make an amendment to this motion.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Amendment?

Dr. J.L. McHugh (U.S.A.):

Yes.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

In accordance with procedure Dr. McHugh, I should like you to make your revised proposal, please.

Dr. J.L. McHugh (U.S.A.):

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Before I introduce my amendment Mr. Chairman, I would like to give a few words of explanation. First of all I would like to point out that the United States was one of the nations that voted against the Norwegian motion, which has been seconded by Japan. You will all remember that in the Technical Committee we had proposed a much lower quota, one which would clearly enable us to begin to rebuild the stocks in the Antarctic. Also we started the discussion by pointing out that really any quota in the Antarctic is not a very good quota unless it includes elimination of the blue whale unit. We were very encouraged by the decision that the blue whale unit will be eliminated next year. Our original position told us that we would like to have it this year, but these things are not always possible, but we were very encouraged by this assurance from the other member nations. But on the other hand, we are not happy about the proposal by the Norwegian delegation because, according to our interpretation of the Scientific Committee's Report, as it refers to the condition of the stocks of whales in the Antarctic, the quota is too high, and will not begin to build up the stocks. We recognise that some countries do not agree with this, but this is our position and our interpretation of the scientific evidence. We proposed a quota which was roughly 600 blue whale units lower than this. However, we recognise the implications of a lack of agreement on the quota in the Antarctic, the fact that if we do not agree there's a real danger that there will be no quota at all, or at the best, it will be a quota agreed on privately by the Antarctic whaling nations, and we have no means of knowing now, what that quota might be. It

certainly would be as high as 2,300 and probably higher, and so we're prepared to make a compromise to prevent this happening. We have looked very carefully at the scientific evidence and we have made certain assumptions and our proposal is based on that interpretation, and upon those assumptions. The assumption is that the catch of sei whales in the 1971/72 season will be about 6,000 sei whales, that is about the number that have been taken in the last two seasons, each in the last two seasons. And on the basis of that assumption Mr. Chairman, we calculate that to hold the fin whale stock just at equilibrium, neither decrease it any more, or increase it any more, it would be necessary to have a quota of 2,140 blue whale units to stabilise. Linking this proposal with the assurance that we will have quotas by species next year, and by our faith in the ability of this Commission to come up with reasonable scientific quotas by species in the Antarctic next year, we are willing to compromise to this extent. We do not like doing this, but it's an attempt on our part to avoid the consequences of not reaching an agreement. Therefore our motion, Mr. Chairman, is that this amendment by the delegation of Norway and seconded by Japan, be amended to read 2,140 Blue whale units in 1971/72. Thank you.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Thank you very much Dr. McHugh. The original proposal - the Norwegian proposal, and seconded by Japan is 2,300. However, now the U.S. delegate has amended it to 2,140 blue whale units, may I ask someone to second the U.S. proposed amendment?

Mr. B.W. Meynell (U.K.):

Mr. Chairmen, I would second the amendment to the motion proposed from the Technical Committee. I would second the amendment to that motion proposed by the distinguished Commissioner from the United States.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Thank you very much. The revised proposal of the United States delegate is seconded by the UK delegate. In accordance with the procedure, I would like to consider first the revised proposals. I therefore ask Mr Stacey to take a roll call.

The Secretary:

The proposal in the amendment is to delete from paragraph 8(a) 2,700 and substitute for it 2,140. Will the members please indicate how they wish to vote on this amendment.

Argentina	Absent
Australia	Abstain
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Absent
France	Abstain
Iceland	Abstain
Japan	No
Mexico	Abstain
Norway	Yes
Panama	Abstain
South Africa	Yes
USSR	No
UK	Yes
USA	Yes

Seven countries voted; five voted in favour, two voted against. That means that the amendment was carried, or rather perhaps I should put it this way, that it means that the amendment had a three-quarters majority.

Mr K Fujimura (Japan) (Interpretation):

It would appear it is not a three-quarters majority.

The Secretary:

Yes Mr Chairman, I am sorry, but from my notes here I can see now what I said originally was a mistake, there was not a three-quarters majority for the amendment.

Mr E Jimenez (Mexico):

I would like to change my vote and to support the amendment.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Mr Rindal

Mr I Rindal (Norway):

Mr Chairman if there is a chance of changing the vote as the Mexican delegate did, I would also like to change it, to no.

(Unannounced delegate):

Can the Chairman of the meeting ask the Secretary to specify what figure we are voting now?

The Secretary:

We are voting for 2140.

Argentina	Absent
Australia	Abstain
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Absent
France	Abstain
Iceland	Abstain
Japan	No
Mexico	Yes
Norway	No
Panama	Yes
South Africa	Yes
USSR	No
UK	Yes
USA	Yes

The Mexican vote is now yes - we have six in favour and three against, Norway having also changed, and three abstained. According to the revised figures we had nine member countries voting, 6 voted in favour, 3 voted against and there was not therefore the necessary three quarters majority required to carry the amendment.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

proposed by the USA
The amendment/is not carried and I would ask the Secretary to take a roll call on the proposal suggested by the Norwegian delegation.

The Secretary:

The proposal is now to amend paragraph 8(a) by deleting 2,700 and inserting 2,300.
Would you please indicate how you wish to vote.

Mr. B.W. Meynell (U.K.):

I am sorry, you say you want to have a vote immediately on this proposal. I would have wished to, I would wish, with your permission Sir, to say something before we have a vote on the Technical Committee's proposal. May I do so Sir, because the vote has already begun before I had time to speak.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Do you want to make any remarks before we take a roll call for the original proposal?

Mr B W Meynell (U.K.):

Mr. Chairman I would like to speak about the proposal on which we are going to vote. The proposal I mean is the proposal by the Technical Committee reported to us, and not the amendment which has been lost. Therefore I am speaking to the original proposal, the proposal for a limit of 2,300 blue whale units.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

I am not sure, please repeat it again.

Mr. B.W. Meynell (U.K.):

I fear that I did not hear you opening to discussion the substantive motion that is before us now. I heard you only ask the Secretary to have a vote on that motion. I came in to ask, to be able to speak about this motion before the vote is taken Sir.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Please make a comment.

Mr B W Maynell (U.K.):

Mr. Chairman, the United Kingdom would wish to explain a little bit, its thinking very briefly. This year's Commission has focussed very closely on the particular question we are discussing today. It has been an object, if I may say so, of very intensive private discussions, quite apart from the discussions that have taken place in plenary of this Commission. I think it is right therefore, very briefly to mark some of the points that seem to be relevant to the vote that we are about to take before we come to the vote. Mr. Chairman, the objectives that we have to consider in recording our votes this afternoon are really two; the objective of preserving a species for the future of the world and the objective of whale stocks to be increased so that they may be caught, so that they may be brought into the benefit of the economies of the whaling countries. The objectives themselves should allow of no dispute whatsoever. The difficulty is that there is a certain credibility gap in this, as occurs in other fields. The credibility gap where perhaps the whaling countries feel that the non whaling countries are unreasonably trying to restrict their freedom to take from the seas the mammals that they wish to do for their economies. On the other hand, there is another credibility here, and that is that many in the public at large in all our countries, and I suggest Sir, in countries that are not represented here as well, are most concerned that action should be taken in time to protect the species from risk of extinction. Now Sir, that second credibility gap is one which was referred to, I believe, in the opening statement by Assistant Secretary Johnson, not in so many words, but he expressed very well and very strongly a sentiment which informs very much thinking in very many countries. In theory there should be no difficulty in bridging these two gaps, by having the scientific evidence that is necessary to reconcile the interest of the whaler in preserving stocks, the interest of the environment concerned with the preservation of the world as we know it, come together in wishing to maintain and increase stocks of whales. When it comes to the practical assessments, we must

acknowledge that there are real differences of view honestly held by scientific advisers to different delegations here, and any conclusions that any one delegation draws must I think, be drawn on the basis of a certain degree of uncertainty with regard to the underlying facts. This leads to the United Kingdom to believe that this Commission should err on the side of safety, of cautiousness, and that in doing so, the interest of the whaling countries will not be undermined, it will be no disservice to the whaling countries if we err on the side of prudence. For those reasons Sir, and on the advice of the United Kingdom's scientific advisers, and after hearing the discussions we supported the figure of 2,140 which has been lost, and we acknowledge that it has been lost. We regret this, we regret this very much indeed, but with no spirit of reproach to the Commission in so doing, and the reason there is no spirit of reproach at all, is that I think that we can say in a number of respects this meeting of the Commission has accomplished some very useful progress and has laid the ground for more useful progress. As the distinguished Commissioner from Canada has remarked on a number of occasions in our Technical Committee meetings elsewhere, one has to consider the role of the Commission as a whole, and I think we may all congratulate ourselves, and from the United Kingdom we would congratulate the four countries most particularly concerned, with the very satisfactory arrangements and limits that have been proposed for the North Pacific. I think that this is a matter for congratulation for all those directly concerned, and I am sure the whole Commission will agree with me. We also have the prospect of ending the blue whale unit next year, that is another accomplishment. We have the prospect of an Observer Scheme that will really work, that is another accomplishment. Therefore Sir, against this background my delegation, although it has regret that the figure 2,140 did not find favour with the Commission, my delegation will vote in favour of the figure of 2,300 on the substantive of the vote that we are about to take. Thank you Sir.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Thank you Mr. Meynell. Any other comment?

The Chairman (Interpretation):

If there are no objections I will ask the Secretary to take a roll call regarding the proposal by the Norwegian delegation and seconded by Japan for 2,300 blue whale units. I must remind you that the revised proposal suggested by the United States was not carried. If this original proposal is not carried then we cannot make a decision regarding the catch limit for 1971/72. Will you now please vote.

The Secretary:

There are two amendments and perhaps we might take them both together. The amendment is delete "2,700" and substitute "2,300", delete "1970/71 and substitute "1971/72 in Paragraph 8 (a). Will you now give your votes.

Argentina	Absent
Australia	Abstain
Canada	Yes
Denmark	Absent
France	Abstain
Iceland	Yes
Japan	Yes
Mexico	No
Norway	Yes
Panama	Yes
South Africa	Yes
USSR	Abstain
UK	Yes
USA	No

Nine member countries voted 7 voted in favour, 2 voted against and the proposal was therefore carried.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

We have now disposed of Agenda Item 17(e), so therefore we have climbed up almost to the top of the mountain. I therefore suggest we take 10 minutes recess.

(Resumption following recess)

The Chairman (Interpretation):

We now continue the meeting. Agenda Item 18 has been dealt with and, we go to Agenda Item 19 - Election of the Chairman. As you may recall the term of the Chairman is three years, and this year ^{my} term as Chairman will terminate. May I ask any delegate to propose a Chairman. Japan?

Mr. K. Fujimura (Japan):

Japan moves that Dr. McHugh of the United States be nominated as Chairman.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Thank you very much. Is there a seconder to the proposal?

Mr. N.T. Nosov (USSR) (Interpretation):

We second. The Soviet Union supports the Japanese proposal to elect Dr. McHugh Chairman.

The Chairman (Interpretation):

Thank you very much.

The motion for the new Chairman by the Japanese delegate is seconded by the Soviet Union. Are there any comments or remarks about this matter? Please raise a hand if

you favour Dr. McHugh as the next Chairman. Our next Chairman is Dr. McHugh unanimously accepted by the members. (Applause) I would like to pass my Chairmanship to the new Chairman and in accordance with our usual practice taking this opportunity to say a few words. I am not familiar with english language and during the past three years as the Chairman, and before that as Acting Chairman at the Tokyo Conference, I have tried to do my best.

I understand this made some difficulties and disturbance for the members during the course of the meetings. However, I am hoping you understand and ask for your sympathy in this matter. I am so pleased that we elected a new Chairman who is very capable of handling these matters, and that I could leave the Chair before the crucial period commences. Before I leave I should say I sincerely appreciate the favour and sympathy shown to me. Thank you very much gentlemen. In accordance with our practice, I now ask Dr. McHugh, the new Chairman, to take over this Chair and to proceed with the Agenda. (Applause).

The Chairman:

Gentleman, I do not need to tell you how overwhelmed I am by this unanimous vote, and the confidence that you have shown in me as your new Chairman. I'm going to have a very difficult time indeed stepping into Mr. Fujita's shoes. One of the reasons is I think my feet are bigger than his are, but that is not the only reason. it will also be very difficult to step into the shoes that were vacated by his predecessor, Commissioner Sukhoruchenko of the Soviet Union. A man whom we all respected very highly and whom we all miss very much. It was a very difficult matter for me to accept the Chairmanship because I am sure you realise that we were not entirely satisfied with the outcome of this meeting. The United States position, as the Under Secretary of State told you at the opening plenary, had three main items in it. These were the International Observer Scheme, the blue whale unit

and what we consider to be rational quotas on the three species which are still being harvested in large quantities around the world. Looking at the outcome of our meeting in one way, we have not succeeded very well. We do not have an International Observer Scheme, we still have the Blue Whale Unit, and we have not reached the quotas that the United States would have liked to have seen. On the other hand, I agree with the distinguished delegate from the U.K. that we have made remarkable progress in this meeting; far more than I really expected. We were very encouraged by the fact that our amendment to the motion to change the Schedule with respect to the Antarctic quota almost passed - not quite, but almost - and I think that this is a real indication of the new spirit in this Commission, and the new desire that I can clearly see to move more rapidly toward our objectives. The outcome of our discussions in the North Pacific were particularly encouraging because now we clearly are going to attain the objectives that the U.S. came into this meeting with by next year. It is not entirely what we would have liked to have seen, but it is certainly satisfactory to us. We have many problems ahead of us, but I am confident that we will reach agreement on the Observer Scheme before the 1971/72 season begins and then I think this will be really a new day - a new era for this Commission. I will do my very best to see these things are achieved and I have confidence that all of you will do your best too. End of speech. I do not need to make my speech as long as I would have made it otherwise because the delegate of the U.K. did it so well in his recent address, and did it so much better than I could possibly do it. It would be unwise of me to even try, so that is all I have to say. Now I think I take charge of this meeting.

The next item on our Agenda is Item 20 - Election of the Vice Chairman and do we need to read the Rules of Procedure? I think it is very clear as to how we operate, the same procedure as before. Is somebody in a position to nominate? The Soviet delegation proposes to elect Mr. Rindal as Vice-Chairman of our Commission.

Mr Fujita (Interpretation):

Japan wishes to second the motion proposed by the Soviet delegation, in nominating Mr. Rindal of Norway.

The Chairman:

Thank you. It is moved by the Soviet Union and seconded by Japan that Commissioner Rindal of Norway be the Vice-Chairman of this Commission for the next three years. (Applause). Thank you gentlemen for helping me hurry on the work of this Committee. Would you like to say something Mr. Rindal?

Mr. I. Rindal (Vice-Chairman):

No, I am not making any speeches at all, I talk much too much as it is. I just shall thank you for your confidence and I / do my best to support Mr. Chairman and to contribute to the success and outcome of the next meeting in London. Thank you.

The Chairman:

shall

Thank you. That takes care of Item 20 on our Agenda. Item 21, I / ask the Secretary of the Commission to speak on this matter - Arrangements for a Press Release.

The Secretary:

Well after this meeting I shall proceed to draft a press notice, I shall then be in the hands of the Chairman I think.

The Chairman:

would

Oh, I was hoping you / do the whole thing.

The Secretary:

have

That is what I / done in the past, but I was wondering if on this occasion the Chairman would like to take a hand in it.

The Chairman:

Well I / ^{shall} be glad to correct your English - I / ^{shall} want to have it in American, not in English, but yes we can work together on it if that ~~is~~ the pleasure of the Commission. Mr. Fujita.

(Interpretation)

Mr. Fujita/(Japan):

It would appear I have to apologise. It seems I have forgotten to discuss this very important matter - that the adoption of the Report of the Technical Committee. May I ask the Chairman to adopt this please and I move that this Report be adopted.

The Chairman:

Thank you Mr. Fujita for calling that to my attention. Is there a seconder to this motion? Yes, the delegate from the U.K. seconds this motion.

Mr. B.W. Meynell (U.K.):

Mr. Chairman we are adopting, as I understand it, the totality of the report of the Technical Committee I.W.C. 23/11. I observe Sir, in paragraph 20, that in the discussion of the appointment of the inspectors on catchers functioning also as factory ships that the Commissioner of South Africa drew attention to the activities of catchers belonging to countries outside the Commission, operating off their coast. South Africa have recently taken action to control the activities of these vessels, but they believe the Commission should also make a direct approach to countries whose harbour facilities are presently used by these catchers. There is also a recommendation. In the course of discussion in the Technical Committee a particular vessel was named. I think it may be of interest for the record to state that the United Kingdom delegation has made enquiries and I am authorised to inform you that the difficulties that arose in applying the Whaling Convention, as amended recently,

to vessels like the one mentioned by the South African Commissioner in Committee which both catch and process whales, are being faced by the United Kingdom. The problem in the case of this vessel has been to obtain evidence that it has been taking baleen whales, in order to provide the basis on which prosecution can be taken in a Court. The United Kingdom authorities have been in touch with the South African authorities and have now appointed a British subject - who is in fact, working for the South African Government - as a whaling inspector under the terms of the United Kingdom's Whaling Act. Now the United Kingdom's Whaling Act, I am advised, extends its jurisdiction to vessels of British register, registered in territories for which Her Majesty's Government has the responsibility of the conduct of foreign relations which applies to these vessels ^{as much as it does to vessels} on the United Kingdom Register. The inspector so appointed, and I understand the South African Authorities will co-operate fully in this, will have the opportunity and the powers to investigate if the vessel should again call at a South African port. We are still in touch with South African authorities about the details of these arrangements with a view to bringing any illegal activities of the vessel in question to a conclusion and we are most grateful to the South African authorities for their help in this matter. Thank you Sir. I beg to second the adoption of the Report.

The Chairman:

I think this is a very encouraging statement and I think I speak for the Commission as a whole when I ask you to convey the thanks of the Commission to your Government and I would also like to convey the same thanks to the South African Government, and I would hope that all other member governments will see what they can do to try to control, or get some measure of control over these illegal whaling activities. Now if there are no more comments, I ^{shall} / call the motion to a vote. This is a motion to accept the report of the Technical Committee. I think a voice vote is sufficient. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Thank you.

Now we ^{will} / go on to Other Business. Now among Other Business, it ^{has} / been customary for this Commission, among other things, to call upon the observers who have sat here for a number of days without any opportunity to speak, and have listened to our tedious proceedings, and I would like to call on them one by one. But first of all I would like to know whether any of the other delegates here wish to say something about our meetings, or about the future Commission. Time is getting late and I would hope that we can keep our statements down to a minimum, but I donot propose to stop people from saying what they want to say. Then I think I can go on and call on the observers, and for want of a better scheme, I will start with the lady in the middle, then two gentlemen on my left and on my right. Sorry we ^{have} / gone on so long, and that the other observers have apparently had to leave. You have the floor.

Mrs. J. McIntyre (Friends of the Earth):

Thank you very much for the opportunity to say something. We have prepared a statement which has been signed by a number of people around the world, some of whose names may mean something you, some of whose may not. Rather than bore you at this late hour, or at least tire you further, by reading that statement I ^{have} submitted it to the Secretary and he has told me that he will include it in the official proceedings of the meeting, and I am sure you will all get an opportunity to read it. I would only say one thing, that although this meeting is taking place in a spirit of great good will, I want to remind you gentlemen that people throughout the world are extremely interested in what this Commission is doing and are very very interested in seeing this Commission accept fully its responsibilities to protect a resource which belongs, not only to the members of this Commission, but to the entire world. I very much appreciate the opportunity to be here and listen and I hope I can see you next year.

Statement by the
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH

An International Cetacean Decade

Whatever the fine and intricate force that wove sea and cells together to produce the great whales of the deep: whales that sing, that play, that court, love and nurse each other, - whatever that ancient special chemistry of gentle change that produced great whales, will never be duplicated in the lifetime of this planet. Once we allow the extinction of whales, we, and they, will never have another chance.

Yet by and large our efforts to prevent extinction are impoverished and shortsighted. We wait until a population attracts our attention because of its rarity, then make elaborate and often futile efforts to preserve some pitiful remnants: animals which are doomed to be zoological curiosities or museum pieces, but who have already lost their strong and rightful place in the integrity of a diverse ecosystem. We may have prevented biological extinction - for a while - but all too often ecological extinction has already taken place.

And that is what we seem to be fated to do about the world's whales. When it is too late; when the stocks are reduced to numbers so low that hunting becomes uneconomical then there will be a great scientific and humanitarian outcry and men and women throughout the globe will rush to the aid of the whales. By then it will be too late. So let us act now when the result of our actions will not be self-serving propaganda, but substantial events in the world of nature.

We the undersigned propose a ten year moratorium on world wide commercial whaling. We feel this, and no less than this, can guarantee man the company of whales for his long term future.

If we allow the present shortsighted and ruthless pattern of hunting to continue we will not have a whale fishery in ten years, and we will not have the whales. We will have nothing but more people, fewer resources, and a planet that is less productive and interesting. While we admire and commend efforts to set decent quotas, to eliminate the Blue Whale Unit and to establish and fund an observer program, we feel that these efforts are not adequate to solve the problem. Only a ten year total ban on all commercial hunting can provide the time necessary to properly assess the situation and arrive at workable long range solutions. Of course this will mean hardships and difficulties for the whaling industry. It will require developing short term alternatives for whale products. But these alternatives exist. If we do not find them now we will have to find them later. And if the industry persists in its present patterns it will have to face identical hardships and relocations once the whales are hunted out. The experience of the past has taught us that we cannot rely on an industry with an economic investment to police itself. The whaling will not stop until the industry finds it is no longer economically feasible to continue. By that time it will be too late. The whales will be gone, or so reduced in numbers that they will be evolutionary ghosts, swimming vainly through the worlds vast oceans, unable to find each other, unable to reproduce sufficiently to regain their ecological integrity, great shadowy reminders of our greed, and of our lack of intelligence.

Russia to Japan

Therefore we request of the International Whaling Commission that it immediately establish a ten year moratorium on all commercial hunting of all species of Cetacea. That it further establish a committee under its jurisdiction to administer such a moratorium and that it outline a program of research and investigation to be conducted during the ten year period. That such a committee be prepared to meet next year at this time with a proposal that will outline the research needs of the international scientific community with regard to the Cetacean order. That the IWC be the administering and coordinating agency for international whale research for the period of the moratorium, and that full scale population and behavioral studies be conducted.

We have learned all we can about whales from dead ones, we now desperately need the time to learn from the living. We need this time to investigate the complex interplay of a variety of pressures on whales; the long term effects of oil pollution, of pesticides, of mercury, of unnamed and unisolated contaminants. We need to develop a regulatory system that functions, that is adequately staffed and funded, that can set sustainable yields, find alternatives for whale flesh, bone and oil, that can set up a system for the hunting of whales that makes moral and ecological sense, or that can find new ways of relating to creatures whose powers and intelligence often surprise and move us. We offer our support, and our energy to gather the support of the peoples of the world.

The Chairman:

I think it is only proper for me to point out that your organisation, the Friends of the Earth, is a relatively new international conservation organisation which has chapters in three or four European countries as well as the United States, and which has on its membership list, some very distinguished names indeed, and appreciate you being here. You may take the message back to your organisation

that we intend to do everything we can to achieve the same objectives that you want to achieve. The objectives are the same, and I think the only quarrel we have is how quickly we get to them. Thank you very much indeed. I shall call next on the gentleman on your left.

Mr S R Seater (World Wildlife Fund):

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I am reading the Statement for Mr. John Walsh who represents the International Society for the Protection of Animals. Unfortunately he could not be here. The statement is as follows:

"Our Organisation is currently re-evaluating our policy regarding whaling. After considering the achievements of this session of the International Whaling Commission, our observations will be sent directly to the Commissioners of the member countries. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to again attend these meetings."

I might add that this is also the policy of the World Wildlife Fund, U.S. Appeal, and we will also send our observations to the individual Commissioners. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman:

Thank you sir. If I am correct, you represent the World Wildlife Fund - I do not think you mentioned that.

Mr S R Seater (World Wildlife Fund):

Yes sir.

The Chairman:

Thank you. And the gentleman on your left whom I think represents the Fauna Preservation Society.

Mr R Fitter (Fauna Preservation Society):

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have two statements to read, one on behalf of the Fauna

Preservation Society, and the other on behalf of Dr. Holloway who represented I.U.C.N. and has just had to leave. If I may start with the one from the Fauna Preservation Society. "The International Whaling Commission was the prototype of international bodies for the conservation of renewable natural resources and its deliberations are therefore of very special interest to conservationists. This interest has, in the past, been expressed as disappointment that the Commission has been unable to prevent a wholesale decimation of the commercial whale stock, especially in the Antarctic. Mistakes are perhaps inevitable in a pioneer activity. The mistakes there have certainly been in the recommendations made by the International Whaling Commission in the past. However nobody could attend the recent meetings of the Commission without realising that sincere efforts are now being made by all member countries to achieve a sustainable yield of the now rather small stocks of commercially hutable whales. Those with experience of international bodies will also realise that the manifold difficulties of achieving reasonable compromises are bound, from time to time, to result in less than optimum decisions. You will, however, not expect the voluntary conservation bodies to do other than continue to press for that optimum. At this 23rd Meeting, the Fauna Preservation Society commends especially, the abolition of the Blue Whale Unit for which we have pressed in the past. We nearly always find ourselves in the position of wishing the quotas had been fixed a little bit lower, this time is no exception; even though we welcomed the extension of quotas to the sperm whales. Finally, we do hope that the meeting to be held later this year will finally succeed in bringing the Observer Scheme effectively to birth. I thank the Commission once more for allowing the Fauna Preservation Society to be represented by an observer at this meeting.

And now Mr. Chairman if I may read Dr. Holloway's statement on behalf of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. "Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, may I first thank you most sincerely for the further opportunity to attend your Annual Meeting. As members of the Commission are aware, some seven or eight weeks ago, the I.U.C.N. took the liberty of informing each

Commission member of the three problems of current concern to the management of the prey whales to which the Union attached the highest priority, and which it recommended the Commission should give urgent attention at this their 23rd Meeting. These proposals were as follows:

1. Implementation of the International Observer Scheme.
2. The replacement of the Blue whale unit by quotas for individual species in the Antarctic.
3. A reduction in the quotas for southern stocks of the fin whale to enable this population to be rebuilt to the level providing maximum sustainable yield.

At this point it is impossible to comment on the outcome of the plan to implement the International Observer Scheme, but we applaud the proposal to abolish the Blue whale unit. Regrettably we must express disappointment over the Commission's present inability to agree to reduce the harvest of fin whales to a level at which their stock would be able to rebuild. During this meeting a number of references have been made to the Scientific Committee's inability to agree on the present size of the fin whale stock in the Antarctic. It is noteworthy however, that all scientists are agreed that the present population level is well below the size providing the maximum sustainable yield. Similarly, for the first time we have definite confirmation this year from the Scientific Committee, there is in fact, unanimous agreement, that the fin whale stocks in the North Pacific are also substantially below the level providing maximum sustainable yield. Such information as is available from the North East Atlantic on the fin whale stocks is equally gloomy. Mr. Chairman, in summary, we still have high hopes that the International Observer Scheme may be implemented before the start of the next season. We applaud the action taken in regard to the Blue whale unit, but still express concern over the status of the fin whale in the ocean to which I have referred, and would strongly recommend that more substantial reductions in the quotas of fin whales be given urgent consideration at the Commission's next meeting".

The Chairman:

Thank you sir. Well all I can say is that I hope all of your organisations will continue to press us. We appreciate your interest in the work of this Commission, and I hope that you will be more and more pleased as time goes on, with our performance. I think I see a distinct improvement already. Now is there anything else? Oh, I should announce that Mr. Stacey has been telling you some lies this last week. He just gave me a note which said someone forgot to switch on the taperecorder for our first two sessions and so there is not a verbatim record as he had been telling you. I do ^{not} / know what authority the Chairman has over the Secretary, but I must chastise him in some way, although he tells me the State Department was responsible for making the mistake, and not he. The proceedings of this session however, are being recorded, and I think in many respects this is our most important session, because it has dealt with substantive items and all of the matters relating to the amendments of the Schedule. Does any other delegate wish to make a statement? Commissioner Rindal?

Mr I Rindal (Norway):

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of all the delegates assembled here, I think it only natural that we ask you, Mr. Chairman, to convey to your Government our deepfelt and warm thanks for all technical assistance and hospitality shown us during our days in Washington. It's not your fault that the temperature ^{nasty} is / . I am sure that this assistance and hospitality has contributed most substantially to what we all think has been a very successful and very productive meeting. So I ask, Mr. Chairman, to convey our deep thanks to your Government for everything that has been done and shown us during our stay in Washington DC.

The Chairman:

Thank you sir, I certainly will. I shall call on the Secretariat now to see if they have any announcements or other matters to bring up.

The Secretary:

No Mr. Chairman, there's nothing more that we wish to bring forward. Thank you.

The Chairman:

Then I think the 23rd Meeting of the International Whaling Commission is at an end and we look forward to meeting with you later on this year to talk about the International Observer Scheme.