

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

THIRTIETH ANNUAL MEETING

London

26-30 June 1978

FIRST PLENARY SESSION

26 June 1978

Recorded from tape by:

**Calantype Organisation Limited**

10 Mews

10 Mews

10 Mews

London WC1N 2JP

Telephone 01-405 9162

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow Commissioners, Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen, I declare this Thirtieth Meeting of the International Whaling Commission open and it gives me great pleasure, on your behalf, to welcome the Minister of State of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, the Rt. Hon. Edward Bishop, who will welcome you here to this meeting.

THE MINISTER OF STATE, MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES AND FOOD (Mr. Edward Bishop): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be able to welcome you to London today on behalf of Her Majesty's Government for the Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission. This year marks the first occasion on which the Commission's own permanent Secretariat, under the able guidance of Dr. Ray Gambell, has convened and organised the arrangements in London.

The Commission has, for 30 years, performed an important role in the regulation of whaling, and in that time it has made significant progress towards its objectives. As you know, the Commission was set up in 1949 "to provide for the conservation, the development and the optimum utilisation of the whale resources". There are at present 17 member nations, including the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the major whaling nations - the Soviet Union and Japan. We cannot ignore the fact that there are many more states which are not members, some of which are engaged in whaling.

We must increase the influence of the Commission if conservation is to be properly enforced worldwide. There is rightly a growing interest and insistence on conservation in all parts of our environment, and this involves us all in seeking a proper perspective in the use and protection of our marine environment also.

Let us briefly consider what has been achieved over the years by the Commission, which is of course itself a body interested in conservation. Indeed, we are all interested in conservation. Probably the most important advance in the work of the Commission has been the adoption of the new management procedure which completely bans the hunting of certain species and regulates the catching of others in relation to stock levels. In those 30 years there can be surely no other area of marine activity in which so many changes have been brought about.

In 1947 the number of factory ships and shore stations of countries within the Commission was 52. In 1977, 30 years later, the comparable number was 14. In the same period many nations have ceased whaling operations, and yet the membership of the Commission has risen. I hope that more will join us. While the industry has declined the interest in the work of the Commission has increased over the years. This is no less true in the United Kingdom, where there has been what I think is a welcome upsurge in interest and concern for whales. There is probably no other international commission which has had such close interest - public interest - in its operations. I hope that its work, its

achievements and indeed its problems will be even more widely recognised.

There is, of course, even greater public interest this year in the outcome of your deliberations than in the past. This presents a challenge to your Commissioners, which of course will tax your wisdom and I feel sure that you will measure up to the challenge, though the task is not an easy one.

Before I close I would like to pay tribute to the work and the energy of your Chairman, Arthur Bollen, who retires after three years in office. He, as you know, has presided over meetings where difficult decisions have been taken, and at a time when public attitudes towards the work of the Commission have made themselves particularly widely felt. I am sure that you will join me in thanking him for his wise counsel over the past three years. We wish him and his successor well in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman and Members, you have a very long agenda and I shall not delay you further, except once again to extend to you a very warm welcome to London. I look forward to meeting you tonight at the Government reception in Lancaster House.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Firstly, thank you very much for your kind sentiments in regard to my activities in the Whaling Commission and the fact that I shall be retiring at the end of this session. I have enjoyed it and I thank you again for your compliments.

We thank you also for the invitation to Lancaster House. Those who have been there know just what British

hospitality is and we certainly look forward to seeing you tonight.

Before you go, Mr. Minister, I should just like to introduce you to some of our new Commissioners. You met most of them when we were here two years ago and we had the pleasure of attending your reception at the Government reception centre, but I should like to welcome Mr. Inglesias of the Argentine, our new Commissioner for this year, and I should like to congratulate Mr. Mercer on his promotion to the rank of Commissioner for the Canadian Government. At the same time I must say that I am pleased to see Dr. Robert Martin still on the Delegation; we are very pleased that you came, Dr. Martin. We also welcome Mr. Villasenor as the Mexican Commissioner, Mr. Lynch from New Zealand, Mr. von der Assen from the Netherlands, Mr. Decerega from Panama, Dr. Newman from South Africa, and we have another change in the United Kingdom Commissioner and on this occasion it is Mr. Gurd.

I could not conclude going round the table without saying how pleased some of our more senior members of the International Whaling Commission are to see Dr. Lafitsky of the Soviet Union Delegation back with us after a few years of absence. We trust, Dr. Lafitsky, your health is good and that we shall see a lot more of you, and no doubt we shall see you in Copenhagen.

As you say, Mr. Minister, a lot of activity is going on in the Palace of Westminster at the moment. I know your time is very short and we thank you for sparing the time to

come and welcome us here to London and to this meeting. If you so wish we will let you go - under duress - but we look forward to seeing you tonight. (The Minister left)

We will now move on to Agenda Item No. 2 on the preliminary agenda. This refers to the opening statements. I must remind you of our established practice that these must not exceed five minutes, except where translation is necessary. If I find anyone going over five minutes I shall be pointing to my watch, and I hope that you will act accordingly.

Firstly, are there any Commissioners who wish to make a statement?

UNITED STATES (Mr. Frank): I am pleased to be in London to discuss with you and other Commissioners the critical issues which will have an impact on the future of the International Whaling Commission, whale populations and human needs. Our meeting will be difficult, as have other meetings of the Commission been. The problems we face are complex and many are not susceptible to simple solutions and we must accomplish our work in five very short days. I would like to highlight several key issues apart from the critical quota determinations for commercial whaling which must be resolved at this Thirtieth Session of the Commission.

My Government is concerned about the ever-increasing length and complexity of the Commission's agenda. We are concerned by the fact that the Scientific Committee Final Report is not available at the start of these sessions. The Scientific Committee is both hard-working and competent. Its members laboured through long evening sessions at Cambridge and still they were unable to complete their work. We

Commissioners must all look very carefully at the possibility of extending the Scientific Committee meeting, increasing the efforts of our own staffs to prepare better for these meetings or increasing the capacity of the Secretariat to prepare the whaling data in a way that will assist the Scientific Committee and improve the efficiency of its operations.

Secondly, the Government of Panama has proposed two moratoria for commercial whaling. We will support both of these items as if they were one, because together they form the 10-year commercial whaling moratorium proposal that the United States first advanced in Stockholm in 1972, reaffirmed by President Carter at last year's Commission meeting. We urge that each of you consider Panama's proposal seriously and vote in their support.

Thirdly, we are pleased that a Working Group of the Technical Committee has made progress in helping the Commission cope with its difficult task. The Working Group will make recommendations to the Technical Committee that should improve both the technical advice available to the Commission and the efficiency of the Commission's deliberations. I hope these recommendations will be considered by the Plenary and approved and implemented in time for our next annual meeting. I think we must also consider revitalisation of our Finance and Administration Committee along these same lines, particularly in view of the precarious state of the Commission's budget.

Fourthly, the Commission will once again consider the

problem of bowhead whales and the hunt by Alaskan Eskimoes. The United States has prepared and is distributing a special report to the International Whaling Commission on the bowhead whale. This report includes information about our management and research programmes, which we believe were very successful. With regard to management the United States substantially reduced the take of whales while it increased the efficiency of the hunt. The spring hunt of 1978 resulted in a take of only 10 whales by our Eskimoes, with only 15 whales struck. Also our research programme has determined that the bowhead population is close to 2,300 whales, or almost twice the size of our best estimate of last year, and the estimate on which the Commission based its decision last year. My Government will request the Commission to allow an increase in the number of whales taken by Eskimoes. We will do this in the full knowledge of the concerns expressed by the Scientific Committee for the bowhead population. The Scientific Committee has noted that the Commission may wish to consider factors not considered by the Scientific Committee, and we are asking that the Commission do so. The risks imposed on the whale population by permitting a modest hunt are small when compared with the countervailing risks to human populations if the hunt is not permitted. We will present new information to the Commission which demonstrates the dependence of our Eskimo people on the bowhead whale hunt. In the simplest terms, no significant available substitute for the bowhead whale exists either in regard to elemental nutritional

requirements or for the cultural demands of the North Slope whaling communities.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we will once again urge that the Commission open its sessions more broadly to the Press and the public. Interest in the whaling issues remains high in many parts of the world. The Commission's work is in the public interest. The members of the Commission are competent professionals. The work of the Commission is accomplished in a serious and careful way. Not only do we have nothing to hide; we have a great deal to be proud of in regard to the successful pursuit of the Commission's activities. In this regard I acknowledge with appreciation Dr. Gambell and the Secretariat for having taken significant steps in the direction of making the Commission's work more broadly known. Not the least of their accomplishments has been the substantial upgrading of our annual report. Our new reports present the Commission's decisions and the necessary documentation in a thoroughly competent and attractive manner. We are all indebted to Dr. Gambell and his staff.

I look forward to the successful completion of our work, Mr. Chairman. The problems we face are indeed difficult. I pledge my Government's full energies to their solution. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Canada?

CANADA (Mr. Mercer): Mr. Chairman, fellow Commissioners, this year's agenda is long and the Commission will have a demanding week in fulfilling its responsibilities, nor is our work load likely to diminish. At our December

meeting in Tokyo Canada drew attention to the lack of a clear separation of the role and function of the Technical Committee from that of the Plenary. Canada recommended that an ad hoc Working Group be convened to develop a mandate and terms of reference for a reconstituted Technical Committee, and proposed appropriate action to the Commission. A productive Working Group meeting was held in Cambridge last week and we will be considering its recommendations.

Canada would like to see decisive action taken at this annual meeting to improve the efficiency of the Commission and to improve the development of technical advice on important issues such as evolution of management of commercial and aboriginal and subsistence whaling, and humane killing.

The issue of humane killing warrants increasing attention by this Commission. In accordance with the Canadian undertaking last year an annotated bibliography was prepared for the Scientific Committee which has now made proposals for further research. We should ensure that this research receives the necessary support, particularly to allow us to develop adequate criteria for assessing unconsciousness and death in whales.

Finally I would like to note that many of us will proceed from London to Copenhagen where, at the kind invitation of the Danish Government, we will return to the task of developing a successor to the present Whaling Convention. We hope that all Delegates will bring a positive approach to these deliberations. We must provide an adequate

scientific and management framework to deal with cetaceans and whaling in a context of changing fisheries jurisdiction. Canada has been giving further consideration to the problem, since our last annual meeting and will be bringing new proposals to the Copenhagen conference.

In closing I would like to express Canada's continuing support for the work of the IWC. The decisions which we take within this organisation are the key to ensuring the future of the world's whales. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Japan?

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): Mr. Chairman, my fellow Commissioners, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Japanese Delegation is pleased to be in London again for the Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission. On behalf of our delegation I would like to express gratitude to the Government of the United Kingdom for its hospitality.

We have many items on our agenda again this year, some of which are most likely to pose difficult problems to us. I hope these problems will be settled through our mutual understanding and co-operation which characterised the Special Meeting of the IWC held in Tokyo in December last year. In this regard I would like to state our views on some relevant areas before we start the detailed discussions at the meeting.

In the first place I would like to call your attention to the decision of the Scientific Committee that it does not support the moratorium on whaling. We really do not need to consider a moratorium on whaling at a time when whaling is

conducted under strict international conservation measures based on scientific evidence.

Secondly, I highly value the Canadian initiative for the registration of proper functions of the Technical Committee which we have discussed at the Working Group last week. I am convinced that it is essential for the Technical Committee to act as an active intermediary between the Scientific Committee and the Plenary Session in order to develop practical options for implementing the conservation measures based on the advice of the Scientific Committee.

Thirdly, I agree to some points of Dr. Allen's proposal for improvement of the management procedure. He proposes above all that a quota should be fixed for a standard term of years. The Japanese Government considers it necessary to adopt some measures to minimise fluctuations in the catch quota such as step procedures, a block quota system or setting quotas at the same level for a few years.

Finally I would like to associate myself with some of my fellow Commissioners who expressed at the Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the IWC the view that in order to overcome the problems facing us it is necessary to take a middle-of-the-road approach by avoiding any extremities in our positions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn my remaining time over to His Excellency, Mr. Kowichi Komura, Minister of Transportation in Japan and Envoy Extraordinary to the United Kingdom.

MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION, JAPAN (Mr. Komura):

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a great pleasure

for me to be present at this meeting and to express our position on whaling problems. The basic policy of the Japanese Government on whaling is to follow the objective of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, which is to provide for the proper conservation of whale stocks and thus make possible the orderly development of the whaling industry.

Japan therefore has been conducting its whaling operations under the resource management procedures of the International Whaling Commission. Japan intends to continue to co-operate with other members of the IWC for the conservation, development of optimum utilisation of the whaling resources. However, as a result of the sharp reduction in the catch limit adopted by the Twenty-Ninth Meeting of the International Whaling Commission, the Japanese whaling industry was forced to make considerable sacrifices, including the reduction of its mother-ship fleet from three to one. Any further reduction in the catch limit, therefore, would deal a serious blow to the continuation of the Japanese whaling industry.

In view of the severe plight of Japan's whaling industry, the Japanese Government earnestly hopes that the IWC will adopt a catch limit at a level similar to that which was adopted last year, at the lowest. The Japanese Government is firmly convinced that such a small catch limit will in no way endanger the world's whale resources.

Mr. Chairman, the Government of Japan fully supports the IWC resolution which asks the Member Nations to seek to

encourage membership by all non-member whaling nations in the interest of ensuring effective conservation and management of whale stocks. The Government of Japan therefore has been encouraging whaling nations outside the IWC to join the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling. In this regard I welcome the observers from Chile, Peru, Spain, Sweden and Korea at this meeting. I expect to see them as the Commissioners from their respective Governments at the Thirty-First Meeting of the International Whaling Commission. At the same time, however, I have to remind you that if the IWC is to be overrun with emotionalism and extremism it will never facilitate the entry to the IWC of these whaling nations now outside the IWC.

With respect to the resolution to prevent the import of whale products from non-IWC member nations, which was adopted at the Twenty-Ninth Meeting of IWC, I am pleased to state that the Director-General of the Fisheries Agency issued a circular notice in December last year to instruct the business circle concerned in Japan to refrain from importing whale products from non-IWC member nations.

In closing, I sincerely hope that the present meeting will help strengthen our mutual understanding and co-operation in promoting the objectives of the IWC for the proper conservation of whale stocks and orderly development of the whaling industry. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Whilst I have been listening to the statement from Japan I notice that in your delegation you have Mr. Fujita, who was, I think, the longest-serving Commissioner in the International Whaling Commission,

who was also Chairman for three years. Mr. Fujita, on behalf of the other Commissioners, we welcome you here and we are very pleased to see you. Soviet Union?

USSR (Mr. Nikonorov): Mr. Chairman, fellow Commissioners, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me to express on behalf of the Soviet Delegation our gratitude to the United Kingdom Government for its traditional hospitality during our stay in this country. We were deeply impressed by the welcoming address in which the Minister touched upon complicated problems of protection of the environment, and in particular those concerning conservation and rational exploitation of whales in the world oceans. The problems are complicated, for with the ever-increasing rate of scientific and technical progress there has been a dramatic change in the ecological situation. Man's effect on the earth's biosphere is becoming global, and this is a matter of deep concern in many countries.

In my country protection of the environment is among the objectives considered by the State to be the most important ones, and major principles of the environment protection are reflected in the USSR Constitution, the main law of our country.

The needs of the developing society have always required the use of natural resources. It has always been and will be so in future. The important thing is how these resources are exploited. For years in the past whaling has been conducted practically without any limitations or control. The consequences are only too well known. For 30 years whaling in the

world's ocean has been controlled by the IWC. Much work has been done and measures aimed at the rational exploitation of the whale stocks have been implemented. Among the successful measures taken by the IWC, according to the recommendations of the Scientific Committee, is the total quota reduction between 1974 and 1978 - that is, during the period of the new management procedure - by two times for the Antarctic and by 1.9 times for the North Pacific. At present whaling operations are restricted to the whale species with a level of abundance permitting whaling on a sustained basis.

In recent years the Scientific Committee, with the participation of prominent specialists from many countries and a number of international organisations, has developed scientifically-based recommendations followed in conducting whaling under international control. An ever-increasing number of scientists from both whaling and non-whaling nations take part in the Scientific Committee work. It is our aim to expand and improve research on whales.

We are becoming more and more aware of our responsibilities and duties in regard to whales, and it is our duty now to bring to the knowledge of the general public that every effort is made by the IWC, not only to conserve but to increase the whale stocks. As far as the use of ... policy in this field is concerned, it may be defined in a few words as that aimed at strengthening co-operation between the countries concerned in the matter of conservation and rational exploitation of cetaceans. It is more important now than it has ever been before for all countries to join their efforts to achieve this objective. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Argentina?

ARGENTINA (Mr. Inglesias): It is a great pleasure to partake in this Commission and particularly to have been nominated as Commissioner.

My Government is very concerned with all matters dealing with the environment and its protection and conservation. For this reason I should like to emphasise the best way to introduce here many of the worries of the international community concerning the extinction of the whale. The Argentine Republic is also in favour of a moratorium, thus permitting the whale in future to exist normally and even to increase in numbers.

On the whole, and particularly in the last year, my Government - particularly with the ships of our Navy - has been studying in offshore Patagonian and Argentine waters all details of the life of whales, particularly the Australian baleen, and in this matter is preparing a report to offer to the Commission in future.

Mr. Chairman, in \_\_\_\_\_ in 1972 Argentine was very concerned about a moratorium in order to avoid the extinction of these resources which are to be shared by all the communities. That is one of the reasons why we would support some kind of measure in this way.

This is a very important meeting here today and during this week. This is the reason that we try to support all the steps that carry on in this way. Particularly I would like to emphasise that my Government in the future will collaborate in many of the ways to maintain many resources and in orderly scientific activity. That is all for the

moment. I must emphasise that I have a problem in speaking English, but it is not my mother tongue. I hope you are able to understand our position. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. South Africa?

SOUTH AFRICA (Dr. Newman): Thank you for your warm welcome to newcomers to the Commission. As a newcomer my preparation for this meeting included the perusal of past reports and a striking feature of these was the recent tendency towards extreme positions within the Commission. But this appears to have had a positive effect for it seems as if more heed is now being paid to scientific advice, and also the wider interest which there is in the scientific findings of the Commission has resulted in more rigorous advice. Attention has also apparently been focused on the need for conservative decisions in the light of uncertainty, which accompanies any scientific prediction.

We also notice that important initiatives have been taken with regard to the strengthened Secretariat, new management procedures, revision of the Technical Committee's mandate, recognition of the possible requirement to revise the Convention. We feel that these initiatives, together with an increased awareness of the need to encourage non-member whaling nations to join the Commission, lead us really to the conclusion that we have the basis for a viable mechanism for the task of conserving whales.

We have also noted that, anticipating the exploitation of krill and fish and other resources in the Southern Ocean, an international programme which is termed Biomas has been formulated. As whales are a major component of the seven

oceans ecosystem, an understanding of their dynamics will be essential for the wise utilisation of other resources. So the Biomass programme - and indeed the signatories of any Convention which may be created to manage the resources of the Southern Ocean - will certainly look towards the IWC and its scientists for the provision of important cetacean information. This to our mind further emphasises the broader need for a viable and effective Commission.

In view of these recent developments, when making decisions about the management of whale resources South Africa will largely be guided by the advice of the Scientific Committee, but we are also acutely aware of the need for a strong and scientifically active Commission, and we will therefore very carefully consider the impact which extreme actions could have on the Commission and ultimately on the resources.

In conclusion we also believe that investment in good research through IWC is essential for the protection of whales, and it is for this reason that we are continuing our whale research even although we no longer have a fishery. We also understand that maintaining groups of scientists, such as those who serve on our Scientific Committee, without providing them with adequate financial support is really false economy. Accordingly I am pleased to be able to report that South Africa has budgeted the sum of \$20,000 for joint international whale research in 1978-79. The only provisos attached to this expenditure are that the research be conducted in areas of interest to the Republic and also that this research be done in co-operation with South African scientists. Thank you

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Netherlands?

NETHERLANDS (Mr. von der Assen): Mr. Chairman, fellow Commissioners, Ladies and Gentlemen, in Canberra just after the Netherlands had rejoined the International Whaling Commission last year the Dutch spokesman, Dr. van Bree, made a statement about the attitude of the Dutch Government to whaling. This attitude has not altered, which means that we think that it is in the best interest of mankind that whale stocks are managed as carefully as possible. Furthermore, the Netherlands Government accepts that the 10-year moratorium is a form of managing whale stocks. We are not certain, however, whether this is the best way of doing it. We think that a moratorium might be useful only if all whaling nations would abide by it. We also think that although we understand and appreciate the difficult situation of the native peoples of the North, we should accept the recommendations of the Scientific Committee of this Commission with regard to aboriginal whaling.

Another issue to be discussed this week concerns the methods used for the killing of whales. We consider this an important matter and my Government urges that more research be done on this subject to ensure that the killing of whales will be as painless as possible.

Mr. Chairman, rumours circulate that more countries will become parties to the International Whaling Convention. We sincerely hope that this is true and that eventually all nations interested in the management of whales will together decide about the future of this valuable group of animals. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Australia.

AUSTRALIA (Mr. ): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Fellow Commissioners, Ladies and Gentlemen, 1978 is a significant year for Australia and its connection with the International Whaling Commission. We have, as you know, been a member of this Commission for many years, and Australian Delegations have, I believe, worked always towards making the Commission a responsible international body, bent on ensuring the proper management and conservation of the world's whale populations. The present delegation will continue in this way.

Accordingly Australian whaling policy has been directed to this end, and this year the Government has set up an independent inquiry under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Sir Sidney Frost, to conduct a far-ranging inquiry into whales and whaling in Australia. The inquiry report will, of course, be the basis of a review by the Australian Government of its policies in this field. I would point out that Sir Sidney Frost and two of his staff are members of the Australian Delegation and that he will appreciate the opportunity to see the Commission at work and to meet with members of the Commission.

Another matter of some importance has been the introduction of legislation into the Australian Parliament to empower the Government to extend Australian fisheries' jurisdiction to 200 miles. In doing so we shall amend, among others, our Whaling Act; firstly, to ensure that the latest changes to the Schedule of the Convention are given effect under our legislation; secondly, to provide that we control whaling within our 200 mile fishing zone in such a

way that the Convention members operating within the terms of the Convention can do so. However, non-members or members operating outside the Convention's terms will be subject to control by Australian law.

Finally, a word on the International Observers scheme. As we have previously reported we have, since our South African friends withdrew from active whaling, been negotiating an exchange of Observers with Brazil. Regrettably we have not yet been able to conclude an exchange, although I would add that Australia did send an Observer to the Brazilian station in 1977. He was, however, there unofficially. Fortunately we have been able to conclude an arrangement with our friends in the United States whereby an Observer was stationed at our Albany station in the latter part of 1977, and one is there for this 1978 season. We are indebted to the Americans for their co-operation and thank them very much indeed. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND (Mr. Lynch ): First allow me to convey to his fellow Commissioners around the table the best wishes from John Scott, the New Zealand Commissioner who, if other things had permitted him, would certainly have been here this week.

It is now nearly two years since New Zealand rejoined the Commission. May I place on record our conviction that the decision we took to do so was thoroughly justified. We have been again this year impressed by the efforts being made to enhance the effectiveness of the Commission and we do hope that the membership of the Commission will grow.

Speaking of the effectiveness, could I say that we were pleased to take part last week in the Working Group which was examining the role and mandate of the Technical Committee. That Group was set up on the initiative of the Canadian Government. It was an initiative we supported, and in the light of the Working Group's report again we feel was justified. We are certain that as a result of that work the Technical Committee will become a more effective body, without detracting in any way from the role of the Scientific Committee, and we do see, arising from this examination, enhanced effectiveness for both of those Committees in an essentially complementary way.

A number of speakers have mentioned the moratorium proposal and clearly that will figure prominently in our discussions. Could I say that for New Zealand's part we have not taken a final position, but that our essential approach is to ensure that the whale population of the world is restored to levels that are likely to guarantee the continued wellbeing of whales and of the environment in which they live. Our disposition in this matter is to accept the advice of the Scientific Committee. We shall certainly be listening with interest to other speakers speaking in support of the moratorium proposal.

Also as an affirmation of our support for the work of the Commission I am authorised to say that the New Zealand Government has taken a decision to make a financial contribution to the decade of cetacean research with a view to that contribution being spent on research in the South Pacific.

Finally, I should like to join other speakers in thanking Dr. Gambell and the Secretariat for the effort they have put into preparing for this meeting of the Commission. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any other Commissioners wishing to make a statement? I take it that there are no further speakers and this is a convenient time to break for coffee.

(Coffee break)

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow Commissioners, Ladies and Gentlemen, we will continue this first Plenary Session by the Opening Statements from Observers from non-member countries if any of those people wish to make a statement. Do any observers from non-member countries wish to make a statement? Apparently not.

We can now move on to Observers from accredited international organisations. We will start with the World Wildlife Fund and I think Sir Peter Scott wishes to represent them.

WORLD WILDLIFE FUND (Sir Peter Scott): Mr. Chairman, distinguished Delegates, thank you very much for the courtesy in allowing me to address you. The meetings of this Commission are historic. Mind you, the pages of history written each year at these meetings will make pretty gloomy reading for the generations to come, not only for what is still being done to the great whales but for the evidence it gives that man's incredible improvidence remains with us.

It might be useful to remind the Commission of some of the historical details. When whaling began in the Southern Ocean it has been estimated that there were more than 1,300,000 great whales for the whaler to exploit. Almost half of them were sperm whales. Today there are thought to be about 600,000 great whales in the Southern Ocean, and of these 415,000 are thought to be sperm, leaving a total stock of only 185,000 blue, fin and sei whales combined. The proportions of the original whale population surviving in the Southern Ocean are thought to be 2.5 per cent. of the blue whale stock, 19 per cent of the fin whale stock, 50 per cent. of male sperm whales, 55 per cent. of sei whales and 78 per cent. of female sperm whales. By 1977 all blue whale stocks and the great majority of the Southern fin whale stocks, which were until recently the mainstay of the industry, had to be classified as protection stock. This is what the whaling industry over the years has done to one of the richest natural resources in the world. It is this continuing decline in whale stocks, delayed to some extent by the quotas set by the International Whaling Commission, that forms the basis of the public demand for a moratorium on whaling. The fact that the stocks go on falling despite the quotas set by the Commission is a clear indication that these quotas are still in general too high. The exclusive quota for the North Pacific sperm whales fixed in Tokyo last December, on the basis of strikingly unsatisfactory data, is only the latest of many unwise decisions. The reason why the quotas are too high is that their data base is wholly inadequate. In particular there is a profound

ignorance both of critical survival levels and of the definition of local stocks. No scientific model can do a job if its data base is inadequate.

An important reason for this inadequacy is that some members of the Commission produce too little information too late, and others produce next to no information at all. If the Scientific Committee had the courage of its convictions it could either refuse to set any quotas with such inadequate information or set quotas with an extremely conservative bias. The continued fall in whale stocks year by year shows how wrong they have been to go on making these over-optimistic assessments. Until the data base can be approved, the World Wildlife Fund continues to call for a moratorium.

We understand that certain pressures have been exerted for the withdrawal of Item 9 of the agenda. I would beg the distinguished Delegates not to accept such withdrawal, which would remove any last vestige of credibility which the Commission may still have on the world stage. The subject of the moratorium must be discussed.

In this connection I should like to congratulate the distinguished Delegate from Argentina, not only for his country's success in the World Cup last night but for his constructive comments about the moratorium.

Even a moratorium of one year would enable efforts to be concentrated on data gathering. But time is rapidly running out. Already the number of employees of one country's whaling industry have recently been halved. It is strange that the whaling industry should not wish to

protect itself and its employees from imminent extinction by pressing for a course of action that would lead to a rebuilding of the whale stocks. The present policies are serving the interest neither of the whales - which are steadily becoming commercially extinct - nor those employed in the whaling industry - who are being steadily eliminated. It is difficult in fact to see whose interest is being served by the present policies. It seems that whaling is likely to continue unabated until all whale stocks are commercially extinct. This will be the ultimate indictment of the IWC and its policies.

On the special case of the bowhead whale, WWF recognises the difficulties that face the Commission in regulating the catch off the Alaskan coast. There appears to be little doubt that unless some striking new figures have emerged from the Scientific Committee's deliberations, the quota should, from a strictly conservation point of view, be nil. However, the decisions the Commission makes are basically political rather than scientific, and WWF urges the Commission most strongly not to allow political factors to bring the bowhead whale any nearer to extinction.

As regards the allegations of infractions of the regulations made recently in a British Sunday newspaper, the World Wildlife Fund urges the Commission to ensure a full investigation of these by the Infractions Committee. Unless there is a full and satisfactory answer, public opinion will inevitably draw the conclusion that the Commission's procedures are inadequate. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. After the calling of speakers from non-members of the IWC I should have called for inter-governmental organisations like UNEP and FAO. Would any Observers from such organisations wish to make a statement?

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (Mr. Evteev):  
Mr. Chairman, Commissioners and distinguished participants, it gives me great pleasure to have the opportunity to address this Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission on behalf of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme. UNEP activities in the coming years will continue to be directed towards achieving proper management of human activities affecting the environment, especially those having international implications. UNEP holds the view that the development process should be undertaken with a view to meeting basic human needs without depleting the natural resources base upon which the survival of mankind depends.

We live in a world of limited resources. Those ecosystems have a limited capacity to meet man's needs and absorb the waste products of man's activities. Living marine resources are a natural resource with considerable economic and scientific value. Not so long ago the oceans seemed an inexhaustible food resource, but some more accessible parts of them have been subjected to such over-exploitation that certain populations may be threatened with extinction because of intensive and unregulated or inappropriate exploitation and increasing human disturbances.

Effective management action could result in the recovery of depleting species. Unfortunately, there appear to have

been recently rather more failures than successes. We therefore look hopefully to this Commission for signs of reversal of this trend, at least as far as whales are concerned.

As I am sure you will all know, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm, Sweden, in June 1972, recommended that Governments strengthen the IWC and increase international research efforts and called for a 10-year moratorium on commercial whaling. The first session of the Governing Council of UNEP in 1973 endorsed that recommendation. The subsequent Governing Council sessions always gave special attention to wise management of living marine resources and protection of whales. Under the general authorisation that UNEP promotes the study, conservation and wise management of living marine resources, the Governing Council in 1975 endorsed joint activities between UNEP and FAO with regard to marine mammals, the results of which were reported to you last year. This co-operation is continuing and UNEP is in the process of formulating a plan of action for the follow-up steps to the FAO/UNEP scientific consultation on marine mammals in Bergen in September 1976. Our Governing Council has also expressed encouragement for states concerned to proceed with the development of new arrangements for the effective conservation of all cetaceans.

In this connection UNEP was pleased to accept the invitation from the Government of Denmark to participate in the forthcoming conference in Copenhagen.

While some species and many stocks of threatened whales are now virtually protected, at least so far as IWC Member

States are concerned, in all areas, other whales are not yet being managed and exploited on an ecologically sound basis. UNEP feels that it is important that whale populations be managed, taking due account of such important factors as natural fluctuations and human-caused changes in supply of food from whales, the genetic separation of stocks of almost all species of larger whales, social behaviour of whales of importance to successful reproduction, among other factors.

From what I have said a little earlier it is clear that we have been repeatedly instructed to work for ecologically sound management and protection of living marine resources. We know that the subject of a moratorium is on the provisional agenda for this meeting and we shall follow with great interest the discussion of this subject. It seems inevitable that scientists using different approaches in estimating the sustainable catch of whales from the present population, and of the rate at which a catch less than this would allow the population to increase to the level giving the greatest sustainable catch, should differ in their conclusions. It therefore seems reasonable to insist that great restrictions should be placed on whaling until better assessments have been made of whale populations, including the full use of existing data.

For all critical cases a data base is all-important. Whereas the provision of biological data and information about whaling operations and the ability to interpret this have undoubtedly improved in recent years, further improvements are needed if the management policies of the Commission are to be efficiently implemented and on a sound scientific basis.

May I close by saying that UNEP is certainly concerned that there be no risk of further extinction of species or of genetically distinct populations. The new management procedure would reduce this particular risk to negligible proportions if it were applied by all whaling nations. UNEP is also not oblivious of the fact that stringent conservation regulations applied after the industry has been built up over a considerable period could cause local economic and social problems. However, UNEP's main concern is that shared natural resources, of which the whales are an excellent example, should be maintained in such a state that future generations of mankind will have the option for continued use of them that our generation has enjoyed. I know that you all share this basic objective. We look forward to increased opportunities in which we can work together to bring about the realisation of this objective.

I wish every success to this annual meeting of the Commission. Thank you very much for your attention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I wish to remind the Observers please adhere to the five minutes. There are over 20 Observers' groups here today and we have over 30 items on the agenda. It is my job to complete this work by Friday afternoon. Please co-operate and keep your time down to the five minutes. The Commissioners stuck strictly to five minutes and I expect the Observers to do likewise. Would FAO like to make a statement?

FAO (Dr. Holt): Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Ladies and Gentlemen, FAO continues its policy of assisting the IWC to implement its task of conserving whales and

managing whaling on scientific principles so that these valuable resources can continue to benefit humanity and so that future generations may continue to have options with respect to them. To this end FAO has concentrated on assisting your Scientific Committee in its difficult task of providing reliable advice on the state of the whale population as well as on the scientific basis of the procedure and policy alternatives for management.

FAO is, however, aware of changing attitudes towards whales, as indeed towards all cetaceans and the marine mammals in general, and has therefore accepted with pleasure to be represented at the meeting in Copenhagen immediately following this meeting to study amendments to the Convention under which the Commission functions.

The survival of some marine mammals continues to be threatened by human activities in the ocean and in coastal zones. Where their survival is not directly at stake, many of them have been reduced to levels below those at which they play their natural part in biological processes in the sea, and at which they can safely continue to provide substantial economic benefits to man. One such threat is our own ignorance. It must be acknowledged that despite efforts in recent years we still know very little about most marine animals, and what we do know does not in most cases really provide an adequate scientific basis for predictions.

We are increasingly aware of natural trends in the quality of the ocean environment and are led to wonder about the effects of those trends on our calculations, whether

these concern the future of fishing or of whaling. We are becoming more conscious of the inter-relationships between animals in the sea but we are not much better at understanding the consequences of these interactions than we have ever been. We are still very far from being able to agree on management policies which take such factors into account.

It is in full recognition of this situation of uncertainty that FAO believes decisions regarding whales and whaling should be made. Reasonable action requires the very best possible data base, and that available to this Commission is far from being the best possible, as the reports from your Scientific Committee make abundantly clear.

At the same time other potential threats to marine mammals, including whales, are appearing on the horizon - industrialisation of coastal zones near breeding places, tourism and boat traffic and so on - but particularly the harvesting by man of their food supplies. FAO has recently been concerned particularly with the events in the Southern Ocean, where the krill, the main food of the baleen whales, is beginning to be harvested by ships from several nations, including many members of this Commission. For the time being this activity is at a low level and the parties to the Antarctic Treaty are working rapidly towards establishing a conservation regime for that part of the ocean. Such a regime would in principle would permit, but would limit, the catching of krill, fish, squid and so on. Eventually, if the demand for protein from the sea continues to increase, the recovery of whales may depend as much on the success of that regime as on the management of whaling.

The Member Governments of FAO have just confirmed that we should co-operate actively with interested States and scientific organisations to assist in improving understanding of the ecology and productivity of the Southern Ocean. In the meantime, however, the fate of the great whale resource rests in the hands of this Commission, and FAO hopes that it will now, as it has in recent years been doing, take very seriously its responsibility as spelled out in the preamble to the International Convention on Whaling, to recognise the interests of the nations of the world in safeguarding the whales for future generations. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any other inter-governmental organisations?

INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION (Mr. Allen): Mr. Chairman, this is, I believe, the first time that the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission has had an Observer at a meeting of this Commission and I would like to thank you very much for your kind invitation to us. Because we are a newcomer to this meeting I think I should probably explain the background to our interest in the work of the International Whaling Commission.

At its Thirty-Third Meeting in 1976 the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission took up the problem of mortality of porpoises incidental to the capture of yellow fin tuna by purse seiners, and concluded that there was a legitimate rationale for involving itself in the conservation of the species involved in the fishery. In this endeavour our Commission has three basic objectives. These are, firstly, to maintain tuna production at a high level; secondly, to

maintain stocks of porpoises and other marine mammals at or above levels that will ensure their survival in perpetuity; and thirdly, to make every reasonable effort to ensure that porpoises are not killed needlessly or carelessly in fishing operations.

At a subsequent meeting in 1977 the Tuna Commission agreed to set up a programme to monitor the mortality due to the fishery, the size of the porpo. population and to start a programme of gear and behaviour research and education to try to eliminate further mortality. We expect these programmes will commence later this year.

The International Whaling Commission has been involved in the management of whales for many years, and we in the Tuna Commission are looking forward to learning from your experiences and we hope that we shall be able to co-operate with you in future years. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any other inter-governmental organisation?

Then we can go back to the international organisation Observers, and working from my list the next one would be the World Federation for the Protection of Animals.

#### WORLD FEDERATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF ANIMALS

(Ms. Forkan): It is very nice to be here again and good to see some of the Commissioners and Delegates from past years. For many years the International Whaling Commission has been held up as exemplary of one thing: how to systematically extirpate species after species of whale and call it management. Happily, in the past several years there has been a new management procedure. However, the wildly fluctuating quota

of the North Pacific sperm whales last year illustrates the difficulties inherent in trying to manage cetaceans, given the current state of the art. In view of this the World Federation for the Protection of Animals and its affiliates in dozens of countries throughout the world calls upon the IWC to vote in favour of the 10-year moratorium on all commercial whaling. The time has come for the suspension of commercial whaling and for the encouragement of more scientific studies to determine not only populations of whales but also the uniqueness of whales. If the 10-year moratorium is defeated or, as we hear this morning, even withdrawn, this body has a great deal of work to do in order to gain credibility and support throughout the world.

Of primary consideration, of course, is the strengthening of the new management procedure, particularly regarding the margin of safety and its adequacy. WFPA recommends that only the most conservative quotas be adopted. As always we support the admission of the public and Press to IWC meetings. It is only in face of public scrutiny that the best conservation of whales will be achieved.

The WFPA continues to be greatly concerned about the inherently cruel method of slaughter used in whaling. Our organisation constantly works to improve the lot of all food animals. The use of the explosive harpoon under the adverse conditions found in the sea cannot be deemed to be humane. In fact this method is probably not in compliance with your own countries' humane slaughter laws which are on your books for domestic animals. It is our opinion that whaling should be stopped on the humane issue solely.

The IWC must also be more responsive to other actions under way which directly affect whales. Specifically all of you have an interest in the survival of whales. However, what are your Governments doing to ensure that the Antarctic Treaty now being negotiated will adopt the conservation for krill which allows baleen stocks fully to recover? Are you working within the framework of the law of the sea to be sure that whales are not caught by coastal states at a rate in direct conflict with and damaging to the global plan of IWC? What is being done by Mexico, Canada and the United States to ensure that gas and oil development in the calving grounds of gray whales and bowhead whales will not irreparably harm these whale stocks? IWC ought to be considering and ought to be active in all of these issues.

Finally, we hope that the worldwide public outrage expressed at the mass killings of dolphins at Iki will further convince not only Japan but all of you that the killing of these animals is no longer acceptable as it may have been in years gone by. The ethics of whaling is no longer a concept to be ignored. Is it ethically and morally acceptable to the world citizenry for whales to be systematically killed and even exterminated solely for economic gain? What makes cetaceans different from any other resource? To many it is their potential; the possibility that they are highly intelligent, that they can offer something to mankind other than food. It is a kind of selfishness on the part of those of us who want to save whales, because it may be for our own good too. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Whale Centres International.

WHALE CENTRES INTERNATIONAL (Ms. McCloskey): Whale Centres International feels that the IWC stands at an important crossroads. Four years ago it made the decision to implement the new management policy to manage scientifically the whale populations. This was a great step forward, particularly since the new management policy has been followed during the last three years by the Commission.

It is evident now that it is time to evaluate the new management policy. Having attended the Scientific Committee for the past two weeks, I can say that that Committee is a most resourceful, resolute, responsible and responsive group, but it suffers greatly from a lack of sufficient data. It lacks sufficient data unequivocally to determine quotas. You may notice the absence of the Scientific Committee from the Commission's meeting this morning. Specifically it lacks sufficient information to assess current populations, extrapolate initial populations, determine geographic boundaries between whale populations, assess whaling effort, measure whale populations' response to that whaling effort - i.e. pregnancy rates and recruitment - and to specify critical or minimal populations from which whale populations could not recover. In addition - and some feel more seriously - the models used to determine populations are untested and perhaps even incorrect. There seems to be an inherent 10-year lag between implementation of a management decision, like a quota, and the ability of anyone to assess that effect. Further, there is little information on behavioural and social aspects of whales, and its consequence to management. Many feel that whales are certainly much more than just numbers. Further,

there is great uncertainty over important environmental questions - the Southern Oceans, the bowheads in the Arctic, the gray whales in the Pacific, inter-species competition and inter-species management and how this should be handled, for which there are no current models being used.

Finally, a developing krill fishery in the Southern Ocean may make the next few years critical in the recovery of whale populations in that area.

As a result of all of this there are wide fluctuations in quotas, over 700 per cent. in last year's sperm whale quota. Further, the confidence limits of some of the quotas is so great as to make meaningless the accuracy of the quotas. And finally there is a general lack of credibility of the Commission and the Scientific Committee. This is a most critical situation which needs your immediate attention.

As an ethical and management principle, perhaps it should be accepted that it is the responsibility of those who whale to collect necessary and sufficient data. Further, it would be a monumental step forward if it were established that, where lacking sufficient data adequately to determine quotas, a zero quota be set. As an aside I feel that it is important to recognise that the Japanese provide more usable data than all the other Member Nations combined currently. They however catch only 30 per cent. of the pelagic whale. The USSR catches the other 70 per cent. It would similarly be a monumental step forward if the Soviet were to provide as much usable data as the Japanese.

Further to enhance its credibility, the IWC needs to expand its International Observer programme. Whether true or

not, the Press release of last week regarding the over-killing of whales needs to be countered by a truly unbiased International Observer programme. Further, scientists - preferably international scientists - should be aboard vessels and at land stations to collect or to see that sufficient data is collected. The Press should also be invited to all the meetings. The IWC has nothing to hide. But human nature dictates that as long as the Press is excluded, there is the assumption of something being hidden.

Finally, there should be a greatly expanded and well-funded international whale research programme, such as envisioned in the international decade of cetacean research.

You will recall that the new management procedure was an interim measure substituted for a moratorium. Unless you can immediately correct the outlined deficiencies of the new management procedure you could prudently elect to adopt the moratorium. International Whale Centres supports the current moratorium proposal. The suggestions that I have made are large, expensive, and an important task, but they are no larger than the responsibility of the IWC and they are not so expensive as the loss of whales.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Sierra Club. Not here? We will move on to Project Jonah.

PROJECT JONAH (Ms. Roberts): Project Jonah would like to thank the International Whaling Commission for the opportunity to address this meeting. For our organisation the most important recent development was the Australian Government's decision to hold an official open inquiry to examine all aspects of whales and whaling. For a nation where whale

exports contribute less than 0.018 per cent. of total exports, the decision to invest well over 100,000 Australian dollars to seek out all available information deserves much praise.

Project Jonah in Australia willingly accepted the challenge to present the case for the whales. This involved many of our supporters in countless hours of literature research, economic analyses and product surveys. The Australian Government also made a most generous grant of 25,000 Australian dollars to enable our organisation to seek legal help in preparing its submission and to cover the expense to be incurred shortly of bringing to Australia leading world authorities in the fields of whale behaviour, whale brain structure and whale population estimates. These experts will participate in public hearings and opposing parties will have the opportunity to question them. The inquiry is headed by a distinguished Australian, Sir Sidney Frost, who recently retired from the position of Chief Justice, Papua New Guinea. Written submissions from leading scientists and organisations knowledgeable on whales and whaling have already been received.

The major parties in the inquiry have been defined as, one, Cheynes Beach Whaling Company; two, the Government of Western Australia, where the whaling station is located; three, the Department of Primary Industry, which controls whaling policy; and four, Project Jonah, to represent the whales. The submissions of major parties are now being circulated and questions on any issue that is not clear to any party forwarded to the inquiry. Judge Frost is currently attending the IWC meeting to observe its proceedings.

On completion of the public hearings in August a report will be compiled and hopefully by the beginning of October the final decision made on whether whaling will continue or cease. This report will represent the most comprehensive examination and evaluation of information provided by all parties yet carried out. The evaluation of the information will be made by an independent person of impeccable reputation. Project Jonah, on the basis of information compiled for its submission, firmly believes that there is no question that the evidence calls clearly for the cessation of whaling. However, the other three parties are probably equally confident. The final answer will not be known until September/October. If a decision to continue whaling is brought in, Project Jonah will accept the verdict, as it will mean that our arguments were not sufficiently strong. However, if Australia decides, on the basis of the report written by Sir Sidney Frost, to cease whaling, there is no question that millions of Australians will take a new pride in their nation.

But will it really help the whales if the Soviet Union, Japan, Iceland, Denmark, Brazil and Spain continue to kill them? Project Jonah would like to challenge the Governments of these countries to accept the Australian decision as pertinent to their nations, as most of the information would be directly applicable. The people of the USSR are well educated and economically successful. They have a tradition of great literature steeped in deep spiritual values. Their dolphin law is the strongest in the world, and if they were to agree to follow the recommendation for cessation, if brought in by the inquiry, they would eliminate a puzzling inconsistency

in their people's pride, and their people's pride in their nation would be increased. The Japanese people also have much of which to be proud. They have great writers, poets, philosophers, scientists and businessmen who have built their nation into the most successful trading nation the world has ever seen. The whaling companies could bring further honour to their people by urging their Government to accept this challenge. Project Jonah urges Mr. Fujita, who has represented the whaling interests so successfully in the past, to urge personally the Minister for Agriculture to accept this challenge. Such an action would not only bring greater honour to the Japanese people, but would bring much joy and happiness to millions of people across the world. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. International Youth Federation for Environmental Studies and Conservation.

INTERNATIONAL YOUTH FEDERATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES AND CONSERVATION (Mr. Cooke): Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the first time that the International Youth Federation for Environmental Studies and Conservation is represented here and I would like to express our gratitude to the Chairman for granting our organisation the opportunity to observe at this meeting. I am here because young people throughout the world are showing an increasing concern for the plight of the whale. We are especially concerned because, to an outsider, the International Whaling Commission does not give the impression that it knows how to manage whale populations. For example, the decision taken in Tokyo to raise the catch quota for North Pacific sperm whales from 763 to over 6,000 appears

to have been based not on the availability of new data since the annual meeting in Australia, but simply on a different interpretation of the same data. I do not know enough to say which interpretation is the more correct one, but such large changes in quota, due simply to reinterpretation of existing data, demonstrate that in spite of the complicated population models used to derive them, the quotas set by the Commission are in reality fairly arbitrary. This indicates that we simply do not know enough yet about whales to justify the continuation of whaling on a large scale. We are therefore very disappointed indeed to hear that the Panamanian proposal for a moratorium may be withdrawn. We urge all the Commissioners to support this moratorium, and in so doing affirm the credibility of the International Whaling Commission as an effective body capable of conserving the world's whales.

We are also concerned, of course, about the whaling which goes on outside the controls of this Commission. For example it has recently been brought to my notice that some of our members in Spain have seen a whaling station there taking humpback whales, which are protected by the regulations of this Commission. Our members will be keeping a close watch over the coming year on the activities of that whaling station and on other shore-based whaling stations around the world. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. International Transport Workers' Union?

INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT WORKERS' FEDERATION (Mr. Aso):  
Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, on behalf of the Inter-

national Transport Workers' Federation, which represents some 300,000 fishermen all over the world, I am very happy to have an opportunity to present our view and contention at the Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission which has long been playing a most respected role in the preservation and effective control of whale stocks of the world.

In recent years the general trend of the IWC has been towards continuous confrontation between groups of people who advocate effective utilisation of whale stocks and appropriate measures for protection and management because of the natural consequence of their geographical and traditional circumstances, and groups of protectionists who insist on complete protection of whales from a philosophical point of view arising from the relative value of the life of human beings and animals.

The earth is inhabited by many ethnic groups who each have their own custom and culture, which is a priceless heritage of their nation. Beyond any doubt such culture and custom among ethnic groups ought not to be denied or be eliminated by undesirable assumptions of their parties.

We are confident that all Member Nations of IWC will give further thought to producing a constructive consensus through mutual understanding of the other parties' position. We are convinced that it is the only way to devise the harmonious and peaceful coexistence of all nations in the world.

Unemployment among the whaling workers who are members

of the Japanese Seamen's Union - which is one of the major unions affiliated to the International Transport Workers' Union - is assuming huge proportions year by year as a result of further restrictions of the catch quota. At present the number of workers in this industry has decreased to one-tenth of the number in peak years, and the livelihood of many unemployed seamen and their families is threatened by the critical state of the industry.

As was demonstrated in the campaign throughout the Special Meeting of IWC in Tokyo in December 1977 by members of the Japanese Seamen's Union, it is only natural for someone to react in defence of his job when he is about to be deprived of his way of living without satisfactory explanations.

I should like to add that at the same time the Japanese Government decided to take adequate measures for the research of whale resources, to prohibit the import of whale products from non-member countries and to promote the affiliation of non-member nations to the IWC.

I should like to point out that the members concerned in the Japanese union are trying to protect their jobs and their livelihood in compliance with the decision taken by the IWC, as is evident from the position which we have stated.

In the last few years the views of environmentalist groups have been largely included in the policy of IWC. As a consequence, the measures to secure the preservation and management of whale stocks have achieved remarkable progress in recent years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you conclude now, please. You have gone well over your time.

INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT WORKERS' FEDERATION (Mr. Aso): Judging from the present condition we are confident that the recovery of whale resources will soon be attained. It seems therefore that it is an appropriate time to consider the position of groups who advocate the effective utilisation and protection of whale resources. At the Twenty-Ninth General Assembly of the IWC which was held in Canberra I presented a resolution on preservation and the effective utilisation of whale stocks which was taken by the Fishermen's Section Conference of the ITF in June 1976.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you please conclude now. You have gone well over your time. You have had nearly 10 minutes.

INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT WORKERS' FEDERATION (Mr. Aso): On this occasion, as the representative of the International Transport Workers' Federation, I sincerely hope that the Thirtieth Annual Meeting of IWC, London, will take into consideration the deep conviction and aspirations nurtured by the whaling workers, which we feel are in line with the original purpose of the International Whaling Commission, and also the aforementioned resolution of the ITF. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Observer for the Republic of Korea wishes to make a statement. Would you like to do that now and would you please keep to five minutes.

KOREA (Mr. Lee ): Mr. Chairman, distinguished Commissioners, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a great pleasure and privilege for me to have an opportunity to speak on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Korea at this important meeting of the Thirtieth Annual Session of the International

Whaling Commission. I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to the Secretariat of the Commission, as well as to Her Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom, for the excellent preparation of this meeting and the warm hospitality rendered to all of us. It gives me a particularly significant opportunity to make public the position of my Government on international whaling for the first time, and to convey to the Commission the decision of my Government to adhere to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling within the end of this year.

I am particularly honoured to reveal at this juncture this epoch-making policy of my Government which has been greatly motivated by the need to conserve world whale resources at the optimum level and to enhance international co-operation in their rational exploitation.

The Republic of Korea, one of the world's leading fishing states, has started catching whales since late nineteenth century on a small scale by coastal fishing. However, the size of its whaling vessels are 100 gross tonnes, despite about 100 years' history and their total number amounts only to 21, limited by the recent action of my Government.

Furthermore, my Government took an initiative to restrict catches of whale on an international plane as early as 1965 when it concluded an agreement with Japan, the neighbouring country.

I would like to emphasise some important aspects of whaling, bearing on the interest of my country. Firstly, the small scale whaling by the fishermen of Korea has been conducted off its coastal area not exceeding 200 miles from its

coastlines within which it is recognised to exercise its sovereign rights under the emerging international law of the sea. In this regard I wish to bring particular attention of the Commission to the present international regime which does not address itself to the whaling ground of our whalers. None the less, my Government is deeply conscious of preserving whale resources in our area in clear recognition of the question of conservation in particular.

Against this background Korea's decision to become a member of the Commission should be understood, and the necessary consideration should be given to its membership when the Commission takes its relevant measures, including the allocation of quotas and the geographical distribution following the adherence of the Republic of Korea to the Convention of 1946.

Secondly, the conservation measures taken by the Commission must take into account the special needs and interests to avoid economic dislocation in Korea of fishermen who are engaged in whaling. Currently the number of Korea's whaling population amounts to about 2,000, which depend

upon a small-scale family industry. While recognising the urgent need to conserve whale resources at the optimum and reasonable level, the Republic of Korea is of the view that an extreme philosophy on the matter should not be approved. We believe that the conservation should not disrupt the exploitation in its entirety in such a radical manner as to kill the whaling industry itself. In this respect we are opposed to a 10-year moratorium.

Mr. Chairman, it is the sincere hope of the Government of the Republic of Korea that the Commission's work at this session, as well as in the future, will ensure the conservation and the rational management of whale resources in an orderly manner which promotes genuine international co-operation in this unique field of human industry.

Before concluding I wish to express the desire of my Government that it could make best use of valuable scientific information and data obtained through the work of the Commission, after becoming a member of the Commission. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The International Federation of Institutes for Advanced Studies - do they wish to make a statement?

THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF INSTITUTES FOR ADVANCED STUDIES (Mr. Kelly): Only to say that we appreciate our status as an Observer. We recognise our status as Observer, and take it quite literally. We make no statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: I appreciate the brevity of your statement. Greenpeace - I think you wish to make a statement at the end of the meeting; is that right?

GREENPEACE (Mr. M'Gonigle): I will do it now. For four years our organisation has expressed its opposition to whaling by confronting the whale catchers on the high seas. Right now we have a boat, the "Rainbow Warrior", in the North Atlantic protecting the fin whales against Icelandic harpooners. We feel strongly about the issue of whaling.

At the outset, therefore, I would like to stress our

support for the moratorium, not only because of the vastly declining numbers of the whales but because of their special nature.

There are many other things that I could talk about here today but I want to use the very short time that I am allowed to address one specific issue - the revision of the Commission's charter. This proposed revision is Agenda Item No. 27. More importantly it will be a topic at a preparatory conference to take place next week in Copenhagen. In light of the adverse criticism that this body draws year after year, it is of utmost importance that the opportunity soon available to us to improve this Commission be not wasted. Unfortunately, most of the changes now proposed in the Convention are very small ones reflecting little vision. I would therefore like to identify a few areas where the members of this Commission must act if you are to salvage the Commission for the future.

A new Convention should grow from a couple of very basic premises. First, it must be appreciated that economic exploitation is not the most important issue at stake. The Convention must primarily be concerned instead with the long-term conservation of whales. This would be a radical transformation. Secondly, the preservation of these animals is desired to ensure that they can be enjoyed for aesthetic, non-consumptive reasons as well as for the more traditional concern. At present the basic assumption pervading this Commission is that the whale is simply a resource, a stock to be harvested. This is a consumer ethic that has dominated our economic life for the last 30 years. We must appreciate

that we are now entering a new age. We are beginning to push the limits of our planet as we have never done before in history. Our old exploiting ethos grows daily more dangerous and more antiquated. With conservation and non-consumptive values embedded in the foundations of the Commission, a new regulatory system must be designed to control the economic pressure for exploitation that inevitably accompanies any management system. To do so it must provide, first, a scientific basis for decision; secondly, strong provisions for the control of exploitation; and thirdly, realistic enforcement controls.

First, the scientific basis for decisions of the IWC has been unreliable, at best. The single species model of maximum sustainable yield must be replaced with an understanding of whales and their entire ecosystem. Commercial exploitation should not be allowed without a full understanding of this ecosystem, in advance, especially of the impact of whale killing on whale survival. The onus here must be on the exploiter. Why is it that it has been the conserver who has had to justify his objections while the exploiter has been free to wreak havoc on the whales? To make this change a reality a new Convention must also therefore require that full data of all kinds be made available for analysis. This must be mandatory.

In approving the scientific basis for decision making the Commission should also be restructured to give it a far larger independent role. To expand the role of the Commission into a real research body concerned with non-consumptive as well as consumptive aspects of whaling would provide it with an extremely valuable mandate, even if whaling were to end

altogether, which it will when the profit goes out of it. At present there is such a lack of information on the non-consumptive aspects that there is much work for a new Commission to do.

The second major change needed in the Commission concerns the control of exploitation. Common property resources such as high seas and marine life have always been over-exploited, and attention must be paid to reversing this. There are a number of possibilities. Whales are, in fact if not yet in law, the common heritage of all mankind and should be protected as such; that is, the present freedom to whale should be revoked and a concept of global responsibility and control substituted. This is a tall order but we must begin to move in that direction if real progress is to be made, and this Commission should lead that movement.

While the new Commission should strive to take away the right to whale, they should also seek to control on a nation-by-nation basis any whaling that is still occurring. With control over the whales on a global basis and over each nation's access to them, the Commission would have a real basis for protection. It is up to the countries listening here today to confer these powers on the Commission.

In considering the control of exploitation the relationship of the Commission to other bodies must also be considered. Affiliation with the United Nations would do much to assist the new Commission to protect the whale for all mankind. This new Commission must also pay attention to its relationship with the Southern Oceans Convention being drafted under the Antarctica Treaty. They must also be

concerned with the action of various Fishing Commissions. As we move towards an ecosystem approach in marine management it is imperative that continuing contact be maintained with Fisheries Commissions whose work might affect the stability of whale populations. This role would be an integral function of an expanded Commission Secretariat and it would require much effort.

The third area for major change in the Convention is enforcement. Little detail is needed here for this is all too familiar a problem. The objection procedure should be removed. Observers from non-whaling nations should be allowed on board the vessels of whaling nations and be granted wide freedom of access to information. The reporting and prosecution of infractions should be strengthened and made reliable. Sanctions should be applicable to members trading with non-members. Loopholes such as that allowing for the issue of scientific permits should be blocked.

The new draft Convention contains few of these proposed changes. Exploitation, not conservation, is clearly still the thrust of the draft Convention. The scientific basis for decision making is only to be marginally improved and certainly with little new onus on the exploiter and no new functions for the Commission. There is no basis for tightening control over exploitation and there are only minor improvements in enforcement. This Commission has had an undistinguished history. The numerous problems confronting us this week and the many attacks we have heard today are tests to the truth of this statement.

In looking ahead there is an opportunity for turning

this Commission from an object of criticism to a source of strength and education. It is in the Commission's own interest to work for this goal. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The International Ocean Institute.

INTERNATIONAL OCEAN INSTITUTE (Mr. Barzdo): Since its foundation in 1970 the International Ocean Institute has followed the efforts of people throughout the world to ensure that the great whales survive, and that future generations of mankind can enjoy them, whether to study, to watch or, if necessary, to provide food.

One of the founders of our Institute, Ambassador Harvey Pardee, was responsible for the introduction into the United Nations General Assembly of the proposal of a new regime for the ocean, and the recognition of ocean resources as the common heritage of mankind as the basis for such a regime. Since that time our Board and Council have included leading national representatives in the United Nations Law of the Sea Conference, as well as eminent scientists, lawyers, explorers, economists, engineers and diplomats. They, and participants in our annual conferences, called *Pace in maribus* - Peace in the sea - have, since Stockholm in 1972, supported strongly the demand by the majority of the nations of the world for a moratorium on commercial whaling. The Institute believes that this is increasingly shown to be necessary - the only rational policy - as the enormous uncertainties of knowledge about whales and the ecosystem they inhabit are revealed, despite - perhaps even because of - the best efforts by scientists associated with this

Commission. We do not believe that the present demand for food and other products justifies the continued exploitation of this once great and now greatly depleted resource by a few nations. The contribution of whales to human nutrition is very small indeed and extremely localised. Unfortunately they are still a source of profit for a few.

Continued whaling in the present world by a handful of nations is contrary to efforts to achieve a new order in the ocean and a new economic order for the world. The Institute would like to see much greater efforts devoted instead to the study of the life of whales and to serious work to answer questions that have legitimately been raised about the mental abilities of at least some of them.

In working for a new ocean regime the IOI has always emphasised the responsibility taken by nations for its utilisation resources, a responsibility to undertake adequate research and provide data to appropriate international organisations. It is well known that whaling nations, with perhaps the notable exception now of Japan, are failing badly in providing adequate data. We have also emphasised the need for proper international control of use of common heritage resources - in fact, of any shared resources.

The present exchange of national Observers between a few whaling nations does not meet this need for authentication in confidence and statistics and other relevant information. The IOI hopes that this Commission will take account of such deficiencies in knowledge, in enforcement and control and in imperatives for whaling in taking its decisions this week. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The International Society for the Protection of Animals.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF ANIMALS  
(Mr. Carter): Mr. Chairman, distinguished Delegates, we all know that if a group of animals may be described as international, assuredly it is cetaceans. However, the International Society for the Protection of Animals - ISPA - reminds the Commission that 80 per cent. of the international whaling industry now lies in the hands of two of the world's most industrially developed and wealthy nations: Japan and the Soviet Union. If the well-documented acts of whaling activity of Japanese interests is considered, this 80 per cent. proportion is yet higher. If it is indeed the purpose of the Commission to maintain whales as an international resource, indefinitely renewable under effectively applied scientific management, ISPA submits it is proper again to consider the application of a moratorium on commercial whaling.

Clearly it is neither moral nor just for an international Commission to continue to consent to the bi-national rather than the international exploitation of this grossly depleted international resource when its Convention states that the object is to manage it in the interests of all. At present two powerful nations are taking according to their ability and giving nothing to the needs of others. The less privileged nations of the international community who have no voice here but whose entitlement to international resources is equal to that of anyone else are aware for whom, in practical terms of commerce, the Commission is managing whales.

In terms of gross national product they know a cessation of commercial whaling by all at present engaged in it would constitute an insignificant loss for them.

Under-developed countries, many afflicted with chronic present and impending food and other shortages, will note the decisions of the Commission this week. Doubtless their stance on conservation affairs in the Law of the Sea discussions will reflect what the Commission is able to achieve here, and they will note also the practical consequences to emerge from the forthcoming meeting in Copenhagen to revise the 1946 International Whaling Convention. May one believe that a rich nation with over 100 million people finds the meat taken from a few thousand baleen whales an indispensable food item? Or that modern technology is unequal to replace the oil taken from the depleted herds of sperm whales? Are such animals so essential for mink or chicken feed? Is the body of such intelligent animals as whales so necessary for the production of dispensable items like luxury leather?

Since 1970 the United States, Germany and Spain have developed substitutes for sperm oil. Are the technologies of others so much less developed that they cannot do likewise? May one accept, for example, that the United Kingdom, which annually imports sperm oil equivalent to that taken from over 2,000 sperm whales - some of it from non-IWC sources - is unable to find substitutes when official statements in 1972 referred to active research? On the basis of incomplete evidence, models based on assumption and surmise, the chances of inaccuracy between 50 and 100 per cent., is it possible

scientifically to justify continued over-exploitation? If it proves possible indeed for the now protected baleen whales to recover, are the technologically advanced countries justified in exploiting the krill on which the recovery of the great whales depends? Is the right to exploit international resources always to continue to be based on might, in effective disregard of nations without the power to affect such issues?

Mr. Chairman, ISPA recognises the International Whaling Commission is able to be as effective in conserving the world cetaceans as its members are prepared to make it. Recognising the progress made by the Commission since 1972, with all the difficulties, ISPA continues to urge the adoption of the moratorium, since this unequivocally is in the international interest. Whatever the justification by whalers, manifestly their operations serve no interest but their own.

ISPA recognises the excessive pressures laid upon the Scientific Committee, whose members are so constrained by the lack of sufficient reliable research data on which to advise the Commissioners, whose function it is to make the decisions. ISPA considers a moratorium in the international interest by removing such pressures may enable the Committee scientifically to address the more urgent problems free of such constraints. In advocating the moratorium ISPA asserts the need for justice in the international management of whales, for right action to ensure the nations abide by such management and for the exercise of practical compassion to the development of humane killing procedures acceptable to the animal protection movements internationally if or when it again becomes justifiable for whales to be taken at all.

For these and its other constructive purposes ISPA wishes the Commission every success with its work during the coming week and offers its appreciation for the opportunity to make these observations. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Centre for Environmental Education.

CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION (Mr. Kardash):

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Ladies and Gentlemen. In speaking on behalf of the Centre for Environmental Education's Whale Protection Fund I would like to address three major issues which bear heavily on this meeting.

First is the paucity of substantial scientific data which provides the basis for the Scientific Committee's continuing decisions each year. It is difficult enough adequately to assess stock sizes and the accompanying biological data without good information, but it is virtually impossible even to attempt such assessments without full and complete data each year. Given the recurring reluctance by some nations to provide any data, and by other nations to provide only selected or incomplete data, it seems both reasonable and equitable that no quota be allocated to those nations who refuse to provide accurate data to the Scientific Committee each year.

Secondly, the recent charge against the Soviet Union and the possible substantial infractions, as alleged, provides an excellent opportunity for the IWC to demonstrate its leadership. If the IWC is to demonstrate to the world that it is more than a whalers' club, then it owes to everyone a full and complete

investigation immediately. I strongly suggest that the Infractions Committee provide a full report to this assembly before the close of this week's activities.

Finally, to my own delegation from the United States, I wish to remind them that while many conservationists are sympathetic to the plight of aboriginal peoples, and are hopeful that a quota can be realised for them, many issues before this Thirtieth Meeting are not limited to the acquisition of a bowhead quota for the Inupia. It is vital, indeed critical, that everyone recognise that last year's bowhead quota accounted for less than four-tenths of 1 per cent. of all whales slaughtered worldwide. Accordingly I suggest that all delegates place this issue in its proper perspective and direct more complete attention to other whale species and to the other issues. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. African Wildlife Leadership Foundation.

AFRICAN WILDLIFE LEADERSHIP FOUNDATION (Ms. Stevens):  
Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, members of the Delegations, I would like to remind those of you who were there at that time of the Mexican Commissioner's - Miss  
farewell to this Commission. She sadly predicted that the Commission would go down in history as a body that put the interests of a few whalers ahead of the interests of thousands of whales.

Now the situation has changed from prejudiced actions to outright scandal, as we learn that the two biggest whaling nations are no longer satisfied to argue their case in the Commission but are now ruthlessly circumventing it. You

have before you the news of Japanese economic pressure on Panama to withdraw the Agenda Items 9.1 and 9.2 for the 10-year moratoria. Japan is apparently acting to prevent a properly scheduled vote which member nations have carefully considered. To quote from ECO, three weeks ago Mr. Kunyako Asamura, Director of the Fisheries Division of the Economics Bureau of Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in meetings with Panama's Minister of Industry, Mr. Julio Sosa, described Panama's moratorium proposal as "an unfriendly action" which, if adopted, would force Japan to quit the IWC. He then threatened to cancel Japan's planned purchase from Panama of 50,000 tonnes of sugar - a \$5m deal - if the moratorium proposal was not withdrawn. The threat was effective, apparently. Last week Minister Sosa cabled Panama's Ambassador to London ordering that the moratorium be withdrawn.

As for the Soviet Union, I would quote from the London Sunday Times of June 18th:

"Russian whalers have slaughtered nearly 2,000 more whales this year than their international quota allows, according to a unique protest by a new type of Russian dissident which has just come into the hands of the Sunday Times. In an open letter addressed to the British Press an anonymous Soviet scientist with conservation on his conscience accuses his fellow countrymen of having committed a crime against nature by violating the quotas established under the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling. The letter reads: 'The Captain (blank) and the National Inspectorate are breaking the

laws of the whaling industry. As a result of the 77/78 season there were obtained higher than their quota of whales 1,095 sperm, 167 sei whales, 654 minke whales, and similarly they are hunting young animals and females accompanying their young."

I stop the quotation to remind you that this sounds like the wild killing that Aristotle Onassis indulged in who, be it remembered, was forced to pay \$2m for the infractions that he committed at that time. I will continue the quotation:

"Scientists must prevent the cruelties. Stop the murderers' crime against nature. I ask you to print my letter in the Press.' The letter - in Russian and written on a Russian character typewriter, is signed 'A scientific worker'. It was sent to a British scientist who has no connection with whaling research or the whaling industry. It gives - and the Sunday Times has - the name of the accused Russian captain and his ship, and there is more material on this in ECO also. This is my no means the first time that protests have been made about the killing of undersized or protected whales, and it is unlikely to be the last so long as the present monitoring system, so clearly open to abuse, remains in force. Most whales are killed by Russia and Japan, both IWC members, and the only way a check is kept on their ships is by the exchange of observers - Russians on the Japanese ships, Japanese on the Russian ones. The accusations of the anonymous scientist are stunning. The figures amount to a total overkill of nearly 2,000 whales. If this is true, then not only are the Russians breaking the rules but they are

doing it with the full knowledge and connivance of the Japanese, which is certain to cause speculation as to whether the Japanese are also killing whales off the record in similar numbers. Violations of the kind which the unknown Russian alleges would put yet more pressure on the world's vanishing whale herds. For years the World Wildlife Fund, Friends of the Earth and other responsible scientific bodies have been calling in vain for a moratorium on all whaling to give the ocean's gentle giants a chance of survival. It is highly unlikely that such a miracle will be announced when the IWC meets at London's Mount Royal Hotel on Monday to haggle over the scale of next year's killing."

That is the end of the article. If this Commission conducts business as usual at this meeting, if it fails to examine seriously the charges, one, of economic blackmail by Japan, and two, illegal whaling by the rogue Russian captain, the 15 nations who lend their names to this body will be acting out a grotesque parody of an international agreement and submitting their names as sovereign states to an impotent rubber-stamping of wilful, immoral actions by the Soviet Union and Japan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Friends of the Earth.

FRIENDS OF THE EARTH (Ms. Durrant): I would like to thank you for giving Friends of the Earth an opportunity to address the Commission. As for so many years before, the moratorium has been tabled and the Commission has failed to make improvements in time. If sperm whales were managed to give a maximum sustainable yield by weight you would see a

significant in yield with a decrease in risk of their over exploitation, a risk that is presently far too high.

This matter has been before the Commission for some years now yet they have failed to act. The Commission is not able to obtain from its members the data essential to improve management of whales. Soviet data is said to be virtually unusable, and Japanese data on all North Pacific sperm whales has not, despite requests in Tokyo, been provided.

We know of the huge uncertainties in estimates of population sizes and MSY levels, and in the correct modelling procedures to adopt. There is almost total ignorance of the critical survival levels of whale species and of the areas occupied by their separate breeding populations. We are only too aware of the expanding exploitation of the baleen whales' food base, krill.

We would challenge the Scientific Committee to consider seriously what scientific sightings programmes, on what scale, and for which populations, would provide the information which at present is claimed only to be obtainable if whaling continues. We would also note the minimal progress in the international decade of cetacean research, six years after it was called for.

Furthermore, we note with regret the continuing efforts of the Commission to maintain a cloak of secrecy over its proceedings. We would remind you that the fate of the whale is a matter of concern to the whole world, member or non-member nations, governments and citizens. How that fate is determined as well as what that fate is must be a matter for legitimate concern to people everywhere. It is inconsistent with the

high duties with which this Commission is charged that its proceedings should occur behind closed doors. We would therefore strongly support the urging of others that the Commission admit both public and Press to all its meetings.

A moratorium on commercial whaling is both necessary and practical. We learn with amazement from ECO of the pressure brought to bear on Panama by Japan to withdraw the moratorium. Nothing could more clearly destroy this Commission's credibility than a withdrawal of the moratorium proposal. The people of the world have little enough faith as it is in the will of the Commission to discharge this duty to conserve whales. It will have, and deserve, none at all if this action is dropped now. We hope that other nations better placed to resist this crudest of pressures will do their best to see that the moratorium remains on the agenda and is debated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF NATURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES (Mr. Mence): The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources is committed to the sustainable use of natural resources, including the living resources of the seas. It believes that it is possible to manage whaling on a sustainable basis, and is concerned, therefore, that after three years the IWC's new management policy has not been able to achieve this goal. Although the Scientific Committee and the Commission have made commendable efforts to improve management procedures, the outcome has generally been unsatisfactory, and there have been some extraordinary lapses. Witness the manner in which the quota for

North Pacific sperm whales was sharply raised in December last year on the basis of questionable data and an inadequate model.

IUCN is also deeply concerned that certain member states so far have not met the IWC's requirement that full and accurate data and analyses be furnished to the Commission. Those few states complying with this requirement find their data subjected to intense scrutiny, while those not complying may be awarded quotas in line with past custom, rather than with the present conditions of the stocks. The work of the Commission is undermined by member states when they do not provide requested data, and when they encourage whaling activities of non-members, and report less than their total catch.

IUCN suggests to the Commission that to end such practices and to allay public suspicion, it require its members to produce original catch records and it reopen discussion of the possibility of placing truly international observers, accredited by the Commission itself, to all whaling operations. IUCN urges the Commission and member states, firstly, to ensure that the quotas they set this year are conservative, particularly with respect to those stocks about whose status there is considerable doubt and those stocks which are part of multi-species fisheries; secondly, to ensure that the current management policy is thoroughly revised in time for greatly improved procedures to be applied in 1979; thirdly, to make good their commitment to gather adequate data on whales under the ecosystems of which they are part, by implementing without further

delay the international decade of cetacean research; and fourthly, to accelerate the revision of the Convention and ensure that its conservation provisions are considerably strengthened and that the needs of whale conservation are adequately catered for in related instruments for the management of marine resources. Failure to take these measures will confirm IUCN and the rest of the international community in their view, expressed repeatedly since 1972, that there is no rational alternative to a moratorium on commercial whaling.

IUCN wishes to recall to the Commission that, with the support of the United Nations Environmental Programme and the World Wildlife Fund, it has embarked on an expanded programme for marine conservation. Three of the objectives of this programme are, to launch an international system of cetacean sanctuaries, to promote the conservation of the living resources of the Southern Ocean, and to develop improved principles and procedures for the management of whaling, together with recommendations on the institutional requirements for their application. IUCN hopes that the results of this work will be helpful, both to the Commission's efforts to improve management and to the revision of the Convention. In this connection IUCN notes with appreciation that it now is able to participate as an observer in the work of the Scientific Committee and would like to stress its desire to continue co-operating in the work of the Commission in any way it can.

IUCN also welcomes the participation of the Commission in the operation of the Convention on International Trade in

Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, and hopes that through this and other joint endeavours by concerned governments and international bodies the current problems of the conservation of whales will be satisfactorily resolved.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Have I overlooked any accredited organisation?

INUIT CIRCUM-POLAR CONFERENCE (Mr. Edwardson): On June 15th 1976 the Eskimoes of the world convened at Point Barrow to talk about their mutual problems. A meeting was occurring in Canada which racially isolated the Eskimoes to a zero quota on Eskimo whaling. The nature of Eskimo whaling is a subsistence whaling and we have been caught under the jaws of international politics and jaws of conservation. The Eskimoes did not like the indictment which came down from the International Whaling Commission and its Scientific Committee. The aspect that we have on the whale, on the bowhead species, is a correct one. We have moved into research of our own, and the Eskimoes have dedicated in the neighbourhood of about \$300,000 for bowhead research. The Eskimoes at this time are happy to announce that the bowhead stock is over and above the designated number that the International Whaling Commission set, although in its environment it is recommending a "no quota" on the bowhead.

From time immemorial the Eskimoes have had a memorable longest experience with the bowhead species longer than any other country at this time. The Eskimo wishes that the whale be secure from further commercialisation, and at this time the Eskimoes would like to suggest the rest of the world and

the participating members to designate a portion of the globe 40°N as an international sanctuary for the dedication of the bowhead species once and for all, without limiting itself to oil and gas potential. The Eskimo is not going to exterminate the whale. The jaws of exploitation are in the petrochemical environment. The most threatening activity on the bowhead species is about to occur on the Canadian side in the Beaufort Sea with the present oil leases going on. The United States Government is not too far from Canada. She is about to lease some land at Beaufort Sea. So if those people who are for the conservation of the bowhead species, we wish your equal concern for the conservation of the Eskimo as a species.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any other accredited organisation that has not spoken? Japan, did you want to make a comment?

JAPAN (MR. YONEZAWA): Just to make use of the right of reply to the abuse directed towards my delegation with respect to what has been reported on ECO. It is quite unusual for my delegation to speak up with respect to the statements made by international organisations, but this time I think I have to state that what has been reported in ECO is as usual, I would say, in many cases at least; it is very groundless.

It is very true that we have exchanged views with other delegations prior to the meeting, as other delegations have done this year and in the past. It is a normal diplomatic consultation to exchange views on various issues. I do not know where they get this. ECO states that we have put pressure on Panama, threatening the cancellation of

purchase of materials. A representative of one of the organisations quoted from ECO saying that a Japanese representative threatened to cancel Japan's planned purchase from Panama of 50,000 tonnes of sugar and so on if the moratorium proposal was not withdrawn. I do not think we need to comment on this but I have to make it quite clear that we have not placed any such threatening on any of the delegations in our exchanges of views in the consultation. This is an insult not only to Japan but also, I am quite sure, to Panama.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I think that concludes the statements. There are two speakers, I think, who are at present in the Scientific Committee and we will give them an opportunity to speak towards the end of the meeting.

We now move to Agenda Item 3, which is the Adoption of the Agenda. According to Rule 11 in the Rules of Procedure the provisional agenda was circulated by the Secretary during April 1978 and the necessary timescale was adhered to. We need to move and second and adopt this agenda, but before I call for that does anyone wish to suggest any amendments to this agenda? Panama.

PANAMA (Mr. Decerega): The Panamanian Delegation would like to inform the Chairman and all the Commissioners that we wish to withdraw Item 9 of the agenda. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I would like to explain to the Commissioners that the Panamanian Government was the only Government that placed this matter on the agenda. I accept their right to withdraw. Had there been more than one

Government putting this item on the agenda we would have had to look at this in a different way. But I accept that the country which placed this item on the agenda has the right to remove it from the agenda.

Are there any other comments in regard to the agenda? Argentina.

ARGENTINA (Mr. Inglesias): I am extremely sorry but I would like to receive some explanation concerning the agenda. I have not been in this Commission before, but I thought - because I have participated in many forums - that when one point is put on the agenda all the Commissioners should discuss whether to put it in or out. In this case one delegation makes a proposal to delete one point of the agenda. This is right and we accept it. But I would like to be informed, if some delegation here liked to maintain Item 9 on the agenda, what is the procedure in future?

THE CHAIRMAN: If my memory serves me correctly, you have to give 60 days' notice in putting something on the agenda. The way that I am interpreting this now is that it has been removed from the agenda by the Government that placed it on the agenda, and now it cannot get back on the agenda, according to my interpretation of the Rules of Procedure, for another 60 days.

Any other comments? Then can I have a mover and a seconder that we adopt this Agenda? (Moved by Norway, seconded by Iceland) That is carried.

Now we will proceed to allocate the items on the agenda to the different Committees that will be established in a few minutes. We have dealt with 1 and 2 on the agenda and I will

move to Item 4 - the admission of the Press and Accredited Observers. As in the past I intend to refer this to a Special Meeting of the Commissioners. So I suggest you mark that with a C for Commissioners, and we go on to 5 - arrangements for the meeting. United States?

USA (Mr. Frank): Mr. Chairman, you have mentioned that you wish to have Item 4 considered by the Commissioners. I would very much like to have other members of my delegation present when this issue is discussed, because other members are interested in the subject. I would like to suggest that you reconsider what you have just said, with the thought that we consider this issue in the same fashion that we consider other issues.

The issue, interestingly enough, is one of openness of the Commission, and there is a certain irony if the issue of openness is considered in a closed session. I believe there are a variety of ways in which some of your objectives could be achieved; that is, even if the full Technical Committee, for example, were to consider this issue, so that other members on delegations could be present; perhaps a drafting committee of a few Commissioners could present proposals to the Technical Committee.

I am suggesting, in sum, that rather than having a special and more secretive means of debating this issue, we follow what the Commission traditionally follows and allow this issue to be considered by the Technical Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: I might make a comment here before I call for further discussion. The problem, I see, of putting it to the Technical Committee - it is not necessarily so that

all countries will be on the Technical Committee, by nature of the size of their delegations. It is most likely, as in the past, that the Technical Committee will not include all nations that are members of this organisation. We do have to have a Commissioners' meeting to consider Agenda Item 23.3 - the confirmation of Secretary's contract - so there will be a Commissioners' meeting. Would it satisfy the United States Commissioner that if we raised this item at that meeting, which I am going to hold anyhow, possibly form a Drafting Committee, and then, if it is the view of the Commissioners, bring it back to the Technical Committee after all the Commissioners have had the opportunity. Does anyone wish to express a view on this? Then is my suggestion acceptable?

USA (Mr. Frank): Mr. Chairman, that suggestion would be acceptable to me, if we could put the issue on the Technical Committee agenda with adequate time for the issue to be considered by the Technical Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: As a point of clarification, Mr. Frank, do you agree with me that we put it to the Commissioners early in the first instance?

USA (Mr. Frank): As I understand your proposal, Mr. Chairman, it is that the Commissioners consider this in the first instance and then the issue is brought before the Technical Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

USA (Mr. Frank): I would be happy for that to occur, Sir, as long as the Technical Committee has an opportunity - and will have an opportunity - to debate the issue.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other view on that suggestion?

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): I have some procedural difficulty in accepting the United States' proposal that this matter be taken up at the Technical Committee. Of course we do not have any difficulty in accepting the Chairman's proposal that this be discussed amongst the Commissioners. This urgent item is, in my interpretation, within the prerogative of the Finance and Administration Committee, if we are to refer to the Committee before it is taken up by the Plenary for its final decision. I have here the terms of reference of the Technical Committee, none of which covers the question raised by the United States.

So I propose that this question be discussed by a forum of the Commissioners. Then we discuss how to proceed from there on this issue.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The Icelandic Delegation also agrees that this is a matter that should be discussed by the Commissioners. We favour your original proposal that the Commissioners get together and discuss this matter. They may decide to have it discussed in a broader forum but I doubt very much if the Technical Committee is the right forum. I do not see this as a Technical Committee. If the Commissioners wish to discuss it in another forum I think it should be the Plenary itself.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Does any other person wish to make a comment? As a compromise would you accept that we refer this to a meeting of Commissioners and they will then decide what process they will employ to bring this back through to the Plenary session?

USA (Mr. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I would find that solution acceptable. As I understand it, there would then be a debate in the Plenary. We would simply decide - the Commissioners would decide - how to bring it to the Plenary. Is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

USA (Mr. Frank): Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that acceptable? I see no dissent. We will proceed on that basis with Agenda Item 4. Agenda Items 5 and 6 are for the Plenary session.

Item 7. There is quite a long list of technical items here. You will notice that the Secretariat has arranged our agendas so that you have quite a bloc of Technical Committee items here. It extends from 7 to 22 inclusive. Then Item 23: 23.3 is one for the Commissioners, and 23.5 is a Plenary session item. The remainder in that group are for Finance and Administration. Item 24 - date and place of next meeting - for the Finance and Administration Committee. Item 25 is in two parts; 25.1 should be in the hands of the Finance and Administration Committee, whereas 25.2 and 25.3 should be with the Technical Committee. Item 26 I place straight back to the Plenary session - adherence of non-member whaling and other countries to the Convention. Item 27 is a Plenary session item. Item 28 also, and the remainder - 29, 30, 31 and 32.

Do you agree with my assessment of the allocation of the work? I see no objections.

I should now like to hand over to our Secretary on the arrangements for the meeting. He asked me some time ago to announce - and I completely forgot - that when you are speaking

would you please hold up your name tag fairly high so that the gentleman working the electronic equipment here can see quite clearly who it is.

THE SECRETARY: The Secretariat is under extreme pressure because the Scientific Committee has not yet finished its meeting, so we are serving two meetings simultaneously. So I would ask, please do not go into the Secretariat room or ask them for things which can reasonably be delayed for a day or two. We must get out the Scientific Committee report for them to look at before you can look at it. If you just stand and talk in the Secretariat room or ask for things which could be reasonably delayed, you will hold up the whole proceedings. So please can we have some co-operation from you on that, to leave the Secretariat alone as far as possible. However, if you do have anything urgent we shall be only too pleased to do what we can. Please will you see Mr. Harvey, who is your Executive Officer, or Mrs. Pitt, but I encourage you not to go into the Secretariat room if you can possibly avoid it.

The papers which have been circulated so far are in the pigeon-holes in the entrance area. The Scientific Committee report, as I have mentioned, is not yet available in total so we have distributed the parts which are available. We are not following the system which was used in Canberra last year; we are identifying pages by the Scientific Committee agenda numbers. They will all have on the top righthand corner IWC/30/5, which is the Scientific Committee report number, and then the agenda items which those pages cover.

Also distributed are the relevant annexes to the

Scientific Committee report covered by the pages of the report itself. We have tried to help you find what is available by colouring the edge of Annex A, which is the Scientific Committee agenda with yellow. I am afraid it has not come out very well but there should be some sort of yellow streak down the edge of Annex A so that you can find what the agenda items are. They have a different number system than the main Plenary agenda. (Then followed details of social arrangements, etc.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We can now move on to Agenda Item 6, which is the appointment of the Committees. In accordance with Rule 17 we conduct a poll to determine the Commissioners who wish to be represented on the Scientific and the Technical Committees. We will deal with the Scientific Committee first. Please answer "Yes" if you wish to be represented. The Secretary, who is an ex officio member of that Committee, will now call the roll.

THE SECRETARY: This is for countries which wish to be represented on the Scientific Committee during the coming year. I will run down in alphabetical order. Argentina?

ARGENTINA (Mr. Inglesias): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Australia?

AUSTRALIA (Mr. ): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Brazil?

BRAZIL (Mr. de Moura): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Canada?

CANADA (Mr. Mercer): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Denmark?

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: France?

FRANCE (Mr. Roux): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Iceland?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Japan?

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Mexico?

MEXICO (Mr. ): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Netherlands?

NETHERLANDS (Mr. von der Assen): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: New Zealand?

NEW ZEALAND (Mr. ): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Norway?

NORWAY (Mr. Rindal): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Panama?

PANAMA (Mr. Decerega): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: South Africa?

SOUTH AFRICA (Dr. Newman): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: USSR?

USSR (Mr. Nikonorov): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: United Kingdom?

UNITED KINGDOM (Mr. Gurd): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: USA?

USA (Mr. Frank): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: All 17 members of the Commission wish to be on the Scientific Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we will take nominations for the Technical Committee.

THE SECRETARY: This is for countries wishing to serve on the Technical Committee from this time onwards. In other words, it is essentially for this meeting, since the Technical Committee at the moment has no plans for in between annual meeting sessions. I will start again at the top of the list. Argentina?

ARGENTINA (Mr. Inglesias): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Australia?

AUSTRALIA (Mr. ): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Brazil?

BRAZIL (Mr. de Moura): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Canada?

CANADA (Mr. Mercer): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Denmark?

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: France?

FRANCE (Mr. Roux): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Iceland?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Japan?

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Mexico?

MEXICO (Mr. ): No.

THE SECRETARY: Netherlands?

NETHERLANDS (Mr. von der Assen): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: New Zealand?

NEW ZEALAND (Mr. ): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Norway?

NORWAY (Mr. Rindal): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Panama?

PANAMA (Mr. Decerega): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: South Africa?

SOUTH AFRICA (Dr. Newman): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: USSR?

USSR (Mr. Nikonorov): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: United Kingdom?

UNITED KINGDOM (Mr. Gurd): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: USA?

USA (Mr. Frank): Yes.

THE SECRETARY: All countries except Mexico will constitute the Technical Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would the Vice-Chairman of the Commission please convene this group and commence work at a time I will mention in a moment?

The other group that is organized from this Plenary session is the Finance and Administration Committee. This is formed by nominations or requests by the Chairman. I have listed for this year the following countries who I would like to see serving on this Committee. I should like to mention that we have a very serious financial problem in the Commission and this Committee will be very hard-working this week. It is important that they start work fairly early. I am inviting the following delegations to be represented: our hosts, the United Kingdom, Japan, United States, Soviet Union, and Australia. I am conscripting those five countries; does anyone object? I see no objections. I would ask the Japanese to convene the initial meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee.

I will now try to explain the procedures that I will follow for the remainder of this day to make as much progress in our work as possible. We have a very long agenda. One half day of our time has already gone. We have more and more work coming ahead in the Finance and Administration Committee and in the Infractions Committee. The Scientific Committee have been meeting all the morning while we have been here. I should like to see them continue their work for the remainder of the day. This means that the Technical Committee could not effectively get to work soon after lunch. The Technical Committee does need the Scientific Committee's report and the Chairman of the Scientific Committee present. But I do suggest, Mr. Asgeirsson, that right after lunch you convene the Technical Committee group, form up the Chairman and the Infractions Committee. You might need Dr. Allen with you in the initial stages of that meeting. I would like to see you organise the Infractions Committee and set them to work immediately so that you will have material coming from them and from the Scientific Committee tomorrow morning. Your first main meeting should be first thing tomorrow morning. We will decide the time in a moment. Is that all right by you, Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Also, it will be possible, under that arrangement, for the Finance and Administration Committee to meet this afternoon and make progress in the heavy programme of work which they have. And they will no doubt be meeting at odd times through the week. But I would like to

hold the next Plenary session on Thursday morning in the hope that I shall have a lot of the work done by the Finance and Administration Committee, and also the Technical Committee.

I should also like to say again what I have said at these meetings before, that I would hope that in the Technical Committee all the technical issues and the scientific issues are well and truly heard and thrashed out, so that when you come back to the Plenary session we do not involve ourselves in explanations from the scientists or from the Chairman of the scientific group. I would hope that all this can be done at the technical level so that we can be fairly straightforward in our work in the Plenary sessions.

Another point I would like to see from the Technical Committee is that when you are dealing with quotas, classification of stocks and so forth, you work from the centre page of the existing schedule and replace - or whatever may happen to the numbers that are already in there - whether sustained management or protection and so forth. I think it will be easier for us in our work in the later Plenary sessions if this table is completely re-organised, with new figures and new information, rather than go through a process of taking stock by stock all over that table with no sequence. This no doubt will depend upon the way in which the Scientific Committee have passed on their recommendations.

I have nothing further to add at this point in time. I suggest that at 2.30 the Finance and Administration group get together to convene their first meeting and elect a Chairman, and at 2.30 or so the Technical Committee, if possible, form their Infractions Committee, and that the

Scientific Committee continue their work this afternoon, and the Technical Committee start work tomorrow morning. Would nine o'clock be too early? I see no objections. So the Technical Committee meets in this room at nine o'clock tomorrow morning. As far as venues are concerned, there is another room here for the Finance and Administration, is there not?

THE SECRETARY: The Finance and Administration Committee this afternoon can meet in the middle room in the block of three between what is now the Scientific Committee room and the Secretariat.

THE CHAIRMAN: This concludes the first Plenary session of this meeting. According to the decisions of the Commissioners I will ask the members of the Press to retire until the final Plenary session when they can reassemble with us.

USA (Dr. Aron): Mr. Chairman, a point of question in terms of the schedule for this afternoon. I gather that the real intent of assembling the Technical Committee is to appoint the small Infractions Committee and their meeting should be a very short one indeed, to allow the Infractions Committee to commence its work. I wonder if it would be possible to assemble the Technical Committee first, and then allow the Finance and Administration Committee to meet perhaps 15 minutes afterwards so that Commissioners could attend both sessions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you see some overlap there, Dr. Aron?

USA (Dr. Aron): Yes, Sir, I think there is.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Would the Finance and Administration Committee stand by until Mr. Asgeirsson has formed up his Infractions Committee. I declare this session closed.

(End of first Plenary Session)



INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

THIRTIETH ANNUAL MEETING

London

26-30 June 1978

SECOND PLENARY SESSION

29th June 1978

Transcribed from tape by:

Palantype Organisation Limited

North Mews

Abchurch Lane

London WC1N 2JP

Telephone 01-405 9162



THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen, I declare this second session of the plenary meeting open and before I commence I would like to remind you that we are one day late in commencing the work of the plenary session and I seek your co-operation in speeding up the procedures as we go on for the rest of this day. I plead with you to avoid repetition of issues that we have covered in the technical committee and I remind you this is a plenary session and I hope that you can keep your interventions to an absolute minimum.

As well as that, I appeal to the chairmen of the respective sub-committees to ensure that any manuscripts which they have outstanding are placed with the secretariat. I know the secretariat is heavily overworked but it is to their advantage to have as much work in as possible so that the material can be completed and printed and available to you for clearance and use during our meetings later today and tomorrow. As I said yesterday, for people working in a foreign language it is most important that they have the resolutions and recommendations in front of them as we discuss them and vote upon them.

I have been requested by the observers for Chile and Peru to make statements concerning their future intentions of joining the International Whaling Commission and I call on the observer for Peru - rather, Chile first - to make his statement now at the standing microphone. Thank you.

CHILE (Mr. Berguno): Mr. Chairman, distinguished Commissioners, ladies and gentlemen. I thank you for this opportunity to speak on behalf of my government and I warmly congratulate both the secretariat and Her Majesty's Government for the excellent organisation of this important meeting.

Chile has decided to adhere to the International Convention

for the regulation of whaling and is also prepared to take an active part in the process of revision of this Convention with a view to strengthen the present Commission whose need to face the challenge of conservation is further qualified by major questions raised by the new law of the sea and an emerging new international economic order.

In the late forties, with Ecuador and Peru, Chile pioneered the concept of a 200-mile zone of coastal jurisdiction, thus endeavouring to preserve our patrimonial rights on the living and non-living resources of the sea.

Although the small-scale whaling by Chilean fishermen is conducted off its coast at a distance not exceeding the 200-mile zone, such activities have been carried in compliance with the regulations enacted by the South Pacific Permanent Commission, which differ only slightly from those of the International Whaling Commission. However, being a fishing nation and a country that quite naturally takes an active interest in all maritime affairs, does not modify the basic tenets of our position which is strongly in favour of effective conservation. In this context, I would like to mention the efforts of the consultative parties of the Antarctic Treaty to draft a new regime for conservation of the marine living resources and also support the proposals made by the United States and the United Kingdom on a liaison between the International Whaling Commission and the proposed mechanism of the draft treaty.

We are approaching a time when only genuine international co-operation, improved technical and scientific knowledge and a strong political will can ensure the conservation and rational management of whales and other marine living resources. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, and on behalf of my fellow Commissioners, we would like you to convey to your government our extreme pleasure and satisfaction in knowing that your government will become a signatory to the Convention for the Regulation of Whaling and we would like to make sure that other countries who are whaling and still non-members of this Commission would follow your example and, once again, thank you very much.

Could we please hear from the observer for Peru, please.

PERU (Dr. A. San Martin): Mr. Chairman, distinguished Commissioners, ladies and gentlemen. I find this a favourable opportunity to thank on behalf of my government the invitation to attend this singular event, which poses such altruistic objectives and to which we should all dedicate our greatest efforts. It is a pleasure for myself to announce that the measures of control offered by my delegation in Canberra, and as specified at a special meeting in Tokyo, have already been executed with the greatest results for they are the consequence of our renewed conviction of the rational use of all marine resources.

To date the appropriate authorities in my country are controlling or attaining at an imaginative level a reduction of 30% on licence to hunt Bryde and sperm whales, in comparison to the average of the last ten years, and this was sanctioned by means of a government resolution on 29th November 1977. If the technical, scientific evaluations that are almost concluded recommend an even greater reduction for next year, my government - that is to say, the Ministry of Fisheries - is prepared to put into practice the said recommendation since it would be a natural consequence of our supreme conviction that our natural resources should be exploited only to the extent where it does not affect their conservation and reproduction.

The convergence between on the one hand the measures inspired in the conservation criteria of the I.W.C. and the other, those being put into practice by Peru, is becoming more and more evident: in this beneficial practice of rapprochement my country trusts that this assembly will recognise our efforts and our sincerity, understanding and reciprocity, our need to exploit rationally our marine mammals which serve as a source of work and as an integral part of the food of our people.

For these reasons, for the time being in an immediate way the whaling industry cannot be abolished, thus we are unable to abide by the present quota sanctioned by the I.W.C. for Area 9 and which, due to lack of time, the Scientific Committee has not been able to revise such as had been approved by this great assembly and such as we hoped since we have sent scientists to the meeting in Cambridge with this aim.

We trust, Mr. Chairman, that our economic, social situation will be taken into account and, above all, the fact that a quota for the sperm whales in Area 9 has not been revised. With this aim, we have compiled technical and scientific data that may substantiate the acceleration in the amendment of quotas for sperm whales in Area 9.

Our country is a member, along with Chile and Ecuador, of the permanent Commission of the Southern Pacific, of which one of the rules - that is to say, for hunting of whales in the waters of the southern Pacific - is inspired by the same principles and aims for identical objectives as those of the International Whaling Commission, varying only in certain formal and procedural aspects. My country shares the decision with the government of Chile - as we said, we belong to the same permanent Commission in the South Pacific - to request formally the addition as prospective members of the Inter-

national Whaling Commission, that in the case of Peru it will take place in June next year. We hope that in the meantime the several moratorium for the hunting of sperm whales in Area 9 will revise  $\frac{7}{3}$  the scientific and technical criteria for the Scientific Committee, and we request, moreover that if we are granted a quota less than hunted by our country at present, this reduction be applied in the future in a progressive and ..... way.

Mr. Chairman, we are convinced that if we officially formalise our addition to the International Whaling Commission, we will be able to contribute real suggestions, statistics and new ideas to strengthen this Commission where the greater part of its members cannot further this moratoria simply because they do not have a whaling industry and, consequently, they do not have the problems faced by countries such as ourselves that do have this industry with an already proved rational and technical criteria, as we have explained, with many renewed opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank your kindness in allowing us to speak and all the attendants of this meeting for their attention to myself and the hope that our situation be understood and our petition accepted, bearing in mind all the various reasons that I have presented for your consideration. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, again, on behalf of my fellow Commissioners. I am sure you will understand that we understand your existing problems and I would like you to convey to your government that we look forward to the day when your government can become a signatory to the Convention and we hope that this may be quicker than you really anticipate. Meanwhile, we hope that you continue to be an observer at our meetings. Thank you very much.

We now pass on to Agenda Item 7 on your main agenda, and I will

ask the Chairman of the Technical Committee, Denmark.

DENMARK(Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, sorry to interrupt you, but before you proceed I would like to raise a small point of order.

We were forced, in Canberra, to make rules of conduct for observers. In those rules it said, in the first paragraph: "comments to the media on discussions in committee meetings and in plenary sessions are prohibited until the Commission meeting has been completed". I have here before me the issue of 'Echo' No. 2 where there is a comment on something which happened in our first plenary meeting. The comment reads - I have only to quote one line of it -

"Japan's denial is something of a non-denial".

Furthermore, we have in the rules, Point 3, following the conclusion of the Commission meeting, observers may speak freely to the media, subject to the following conditions: attributions to individuals or countries of statements made at committee meetings is prohibited.

I have before me the 'Echo' No. 4 where there are quoted by countries comments made on the bowhead issue in yesterday's Technical Committee meetings. Mr. Chairman, in my view this is a break of the rules we set up and I will leave it up to the Commission which action to be taken. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lemche. You are quite correct. I have in front of me the rules which we have agreed upon and it does say that it is only after the conclusion of the Commission meetings observers may speak freely to the media and subject to the following conditions, which I repeat: "attributions to individuals or countries of statements made at committee meetings is prohibited and quotations from, or

use of, draft documents is also prohibited. Statements by Commissioners in plenary sessions may be quoted and attributed".

At this stage, I think it is sufficient for me to issue a warning to observers who are not observing these rules that I think the action that can be taken is that they are asked to withdraw or their accreditation is withdrawn. So, rather than enter into a discussion at this stage, I think that I should issue this warning and if we have a continuation of this, we will have to consider what further action we take.

Any further comment? I trust that those observers who are present will convey these views to those who may not be in the room at the moment. Thank you.

We will continue then with Agenda Item 7, Review of Technical Committee Mandate and Functions. Mr. Asgeirsson, Chairman of the Technical Committee, would you report on the conclusions which you have reached with your committee.

Might I say that in view of your long document, we might suggest to the secretary rather than you reading it all, that you quote the section and ask him to have the text incorporated in the verbatim minutes of the plenary session. Mr. Asgeirsson.

ICELAND (Mr. T. Asgeirsson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Agenda Item 7 is an item that we have dealt with in the Technical Committee and one which we can report to you now. You have in your hands, and I am sure all the Commissioners have in their hands, the first section of the written report of the Technical Committee. It is on a yellow piece of paper and I see it all around. This section, and our report, the pages are not numbered but I think they are easily identifiable by the reference to the plenary agenda item appearing on the left top of each page.

The first three pages of our report refer to this Agenda Item

7 and I should suggest, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary to read through them. You will find the recommendations of the Technical Committee, there are quite a few recommendations that the Technical Committee wishes to be considered by the Commission with regard to the mandate and functions of the future Technical Committee, both with regard to the participation, organisation, meetings, reports and so on, and, finally, the Technical Committee also endorsed the recommendations of the working group that the Committee meet for a maximum of one week prior to the Commission meeting and, estimating an attendance of 100 people including observers, it was felt that it might be necessary for the Committee to meet in London and if the Technical Committee overlaps the meeting of the Scientific Committee additional staff would be required and the Technical Committee finally considered that these factors could involve an additional cost of not more than £10,000.

Is this sufficient reporting?

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Asgeirsson. What I propose to do is take it section by section and inquire whether any Commissioner wishes to comment. I will start with the first section, "The Review of Technical Committee Mandate and Functions", that first section before we come to rules of procedure. Does anyone wish to comment, or can we accept this recommendation from the Technical Committee? It appears that we are completely satisfied with that section, so I will move on to the rules of procedure of the Committee and, dealing first of all, with participation, that section covering participation. Are we happy with that section? It appears that we are. So, we will move on with organisation: any comments on this section? Any comments on the section on meetings? Reports? And the final paragraph on the third page?

On that final paragraph, does the Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee wish to make a comment in regard to the additional financing of the Technical Committee?

UNITED STATES (Dr. W. Aron (?)): Mr. Chairman, I was about to leave the room to pick up our draft copy of the Finance and Administration Report for distribution to the Committee members. It is clear, however, even in draft the numbers do not change. The Commission is faced with a very difficult problem of very significant increase in its annual expenditures if we maintain a business-as-usual procedure. This increase amounts to, I believe, 93% over last year's proposed budget. The increase does not include any special meetings; it does not include any special requests by the Scientific Committee or the new increase recommended by that Committee for the whale marking programme.

The exact numbers should be available to the full members of the Commission, I would trust, late this afternoon after our Committee has reviewed them and approved them, I hope, or early tomorrow morning when any typing may have to be done. I think it is clear that the Commission, however, must seriously consider their willingness to make additional contributions or, indeed, to have host governments pick up the expenses of any additional meetings. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Aron. Is it the wish of the Commissioners that we accept this recommendation from the Technical Committee, subject to a further hearing from the Finance and Administration Committee in regard to the overall funding of the Commission? I see no objections so we will accept this report from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Asgeirsson, I think we move now, do we not, to the next item that you have on your report?

ICELAND (Mr. T. Asgeirsson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The next item we have in our report, the Technical Committee's report, is Agenda Item 12, Whale Stocks and Catch Limits. Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that we have, in the Technical Committee, dealt with most of the stocks appearing in the schedule. There are still a few remaining however that we have not dealt with yet. These will be the sei, minke and Bryde's whales in the southern hemisphere and the sperm whales in the northern hemisphere. But, unfortunately, in our report there is not reported all that we have achieved in the Technical Committee. It is still being typed what we did last night and this morning, so I cannot report on everything that we have achieved in the Technical Committee.

In the report you have in front of you, however, there are several recommendations. They were all achieved by a consensus and I wonder if I have to go through them stock by stock, or if I can mention them all the same and we can deal with them all at the same time.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are two ways of dealing with this. One is to go through your report stock by stock, or to refer to the middle page of the schedule, existing schedule, and note changes that may appear from what was the situation of 1978. Has anyone a particular preference? Or, perhaps, do I first of all ask, do you all have a copy of the schedule in front of you? If you do, I strongly suggest that you open to the centrefold. Mr. Asgeirsson, did you want to make a comment?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you: just to point out that the stocks listed on the two pages we have on Agenda Item 12 are all classified in the protection category and we are not proposing any changes from the present situation, so I think it is sufficient that I just mention the stocks. I think it is a good

idea that everyone has the schedule table in front of them and they can mark them if they so wish, but we are not proposing any changes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, subject to the views of the Commissioners, it would be satisfactory if you name the area, the stock, the classification and, if necessary, the quota, but these are all protection stocks. Is that right? Would you like to see how we go in this procedure?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): O.K. Thank you. There are a few recommendations attached to some of the stocks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, they will have to be mentioned.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The Technical Committee recommends to the plenary that the southern hemisphere right whales, blue whales and humpback whales all be put in a protected category where they are now. If I go on to the North Pacific, then the Technical Committee recommends that right whales, blue whales and humpback whales remain in the protected category and the same with regard to the sei whales. If we move then to the North Atlantic, the Technical Committee recommends the classification of the right whales, blue whales and humpback whales as protected species and, finally, in the Arctic the Technical Committee recommends the bowhead right whale to be put in the protected category.

There are, as I said, a few recommendations attached to some of the stocks and I can go on and report them to you, or do you wish to stop here and deal with the classifications?

THE CHAIRMAN: I have a question: where does the bowhead appear in the schedule?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The arctic bowhead does not appear in the schedule and it was agreed that the Secretary be charged with finding the right place where to put it.

THE CHAIRMAN: At that point, are we all agreed that

these stocks, detailed by the Chairman of the Technical Committee, should remain as protection stocks? I see no dissenters. They will continue as protection stocks. Would you proceed please, Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. Turning to the southern hemisphere right whales, then I should report to you that Argentina indicated that they are developing their studies on right whales in their waters and will present the data and research to the Scientific Committee. The Argentinian Commissioner may have something to add to this; I do not know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the Argentinian Commissioner wish to make a comment?

ARGENTINA (Mr. E.H. Iglesias): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it is not necessary at this moment. I can say that this kind of study is going on and in the future we will be informing the Scientific Committee, or the Commissioners directly, on all the matters. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Taking that particular point on right whales: is it agreed that we accept this recommendation from the Technical Committee? All agreed. Blue whales, Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes. The Technical Committee recommends that all member countries - we are talking about the blue whales of the southern hemisphere?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): That all member countries having material that might help to clarify the taxonomic and population status of the pygmy blue whale to analyse it and publish the results. Also, that systematic sighting programmes should precede any exploitation of these stocks. I suggest that the

plenary adopts this too.

CHAIRMAN: Is that accepted? We can move and second these and have a vote, but I think by the attitude of the Commissioners that this is not necessary, but if anyone feels at any stage they wish to accept these more formally, please do not hesitate to call my attention. It is agreed that the recommendation on blue whales is accepted. Proceed please, Mr. Asgeirsson.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. There was a consensus in the Technical Committee on all those issues. With regard to the humpback whales of the southern hemisphere, the Technical Committee recommends that the Tonga government and F.A.O. provides statistics on the kill of these species.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that accepted? Thank you. Next one, please?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): It also recommends, with regard to the same stock, that countries make systematic sightings and provide data from the coastal migration paths of these species and, if possible, the fraction of the migrating group included.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? That is accepted. Where do we go now, Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): We should go to the humpback whales in the North Pacific, where the Technical Committee say that systematic sightings always should also be recommended by the plenary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Agreed? That is agreed. Thank you.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): We then move to the North Atlantic right whales. The Technical Committee recommends that non-member countries join the Commission in protecting these species completely.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the recommendation: are we all agreed? We agree.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. And finally, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the humpback whales of the North Atlantic, the Technical Committee recommends that Spain takes steps to prohibit catches from the very depleted Eastern Atlantic stock.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did we hear from the observer from Spain in regard to this particular point at the technical session level? I do not think we did, did we? Is the observer from Spain in attendance, and, if so, would he wish to comment on this point? It appears that he would rather not. Denmark?

DENMARK (Mr. E. Lemche): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wonder what the Commission is going to do now we have agreed to adopt recommendations of the Technical Committee on humpback whales in the North Atlantic. My question goes as well to the proceedings on right whales in the North Atlantic. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Asgeirsson, can you help me on this point?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): I am not quite sure I got it. Was the question with regard to the right whales of the North Atlantic?

THE CHAIRMAN: Could we have it again, Mr. Lemche?

DENMARK (Mr. E. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, maybe I did not make myself clear. I think where we are now, the plenary has adopted recommendations from the Technical Committee that in the North Atlantic right whales, non-member countries join the Commission in protecting this species and for the North Atlantic humpback that Spain takes steps, so-and-so. My question is, what is the

Commission going to do now, or afterwards, after the meeting, to implement what we just have agreed upon? Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am referring this to the Secretary because it is too difficult for me. I think in these cases the Secretary communicates with each country. Is that so? The United States, could you help me out, please?

UNITED STATES (Ms. R. Frank): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that we have proposed, and I showed it to the Secretary and we can distribute it at any time, a resolution to be considered under Agenda Item 26, which would attempt to cover all the whaling operations of non-member whaling nations all at one time, so that we do not have to consider each one by itself. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lemche, would you be happy if we defer this particular point of yours until Item 26 and, meanwhile, I guess that this piece of paper will be distributed and you will have plenty of time to examine it. It is a resolution set out in the usual style by the United States delegation and it lists the countries, the species, the areas and the IWC regulations or actions, so I think we will have no problem with this when we reach that part of the agenda.

Mr. Asgeirsson, does this complete? You have Arctic bowhead whales, that has been dealt with, is that right?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have dealt with Arctic bowhead whales, with the Bering Sea stock of bowheads.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, the Arctic bowhead right whales. I think that covers this section of your report, does it not?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Secretary, that does not complete the

whole section of that agenda item, does it? No, there is still some outstanding. We still have some sections to complete in that part of the agenda.

Can we move then to Agenda Item 14, Stocks of Small Cetaceans. Mr. Asgeirsson, what is the report of the Technical Committee please?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The Technical Committee received the report of the Scientific Committee concerning small cetaceans and endorsed their recommendations which appeared on the one page that has the reference to the plenary agenda item 14. I do not know if you wish me to read them word by word. They have six recommendations - a, b, c, d, e and f - and I draw your attention to one amendment that we made to this page in handwriting - I trust that everybody did so. We deleted the last words of the paragraph between (c) and (d); we deleted the last two words, "small cetaceans" and inserted the words, "tuna fishing in the eastern tropical Pacific".

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is it the wish of the Commissioners for this text on this page to be included in the verbatim minutes of this meeting, and also are the recommendations acceptable? Anyone wish to comment? I take it that the recommendation of the Technical Committee is acceptable and will be incorporated into the record of the meeting. Thank you, Mr. Asgeirsson.

Can we move on to your next item, which is Review of Scientific Permits.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Scientific Committee reported on the 114 Bryde's whales taken by Japan in the southern hemisphere and the permit received in advance by the Scientific Committee. The USSR had also taken five Bryde's whales in the southern hemisphere without prior

Scientific Committee review of their proposal through a misunderstanding of the new procedure before they cancelled the permit. The USA suggested that the requirement for prior review should be written into the schedule, but the Technical Committee agreed that this subject should be reconsidered again next year when the Secretary has obtained legal advice on such a requirement.

The Committee noted that Japan has put forward proposals for a final programme on southern Bryde's whales which were considered by the Scientific Committee. All the results of the Japanese studies will be reviewed before any further programme is developed and, finally, Mr. Chairman, the minimum data requirements for special permit catches developed by the Scientific Committee were endorsed by the Technical Committee. These data requirements appear in the page of the Scientific Committee report, numbered 5.6, and they are in the form - a special kind of form.

It is a bit difficult for me, with the language difficulties I have, to describe this form. I trust that everybody has got it: the reference is 5.6 in the Scientific Committee's report. Are you satisfied with that?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary can identify it and he will make sure it is included in the text of the record of this meeting. You have heard the recommendation from the Technical Committee: do we all agree? We agree.

Can we move on to Item 17, Mr. Asgeirsson please?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. The Scientific Committee reported to the Technical Committee that some members of the Scientific Committee felt that they were no more qualified than any other body to comment on the general ethics of killing animals, but a sub-committee was set up by the Scientific Committee to consider the subject in relation to management.

Their work was limited by constraints of time, the limited behavioural expertise and reference material available. A minority report expressed disappointment at the failure to give full consideration to the subject. Panama explained in the Technical Committee why they believe that whaling is unethical on grounds of, firstly, its opposition by many people and, secondly, the risk it holds for bringing about the extinction of certain populations; thirdly, the distress caused to the whales not killed in a social group and, finally, the presumed intelligence of whales based on neuro-anatomical and behavioural studies.

The Technical Committee endorsed the recommendation of the Scientific Committee that the Secretariat continues to seek information on this subject, inquiries into possibilities of a co-sponsored meeting and encourages outside specialists to provide documents for discussion at the next annual meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we accept this recommendation from Australia?

AUSTRALIA (Mr. PURNELL-WEBB): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just looking at that last paragraph, at the bottom of the Technical Committee report, Agenda Item 17:

"The Technical Committee endorse the recommendation of the Scientific Committee that the Secretariat continues to seek information on this subject". Presumably, Mr. Chairman, that is the consideration of the ethics of killing cetaceans. I think that probably was not what was intended if we look at the last page of Agenda Item 20.2 on the Scientific Committee report. That was in the second distribution, Mr. Chairman, IWC/30/4, Agenda Item 20.2, the last paragraph of that section, and it reads:

"The Committee noted the relevance for future investigations of items mentioned in the report, especially the importance of certain behavioural studies (and I underline the words 'behavioural studies') to assessment and management techniques. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat continues to seek information on this subject ..."

I think, Mr. Chairman, that was what we intended. We accepted the Scientific Committee's recommendation, that is what we intended to seek further studies on, not on the whole subject of the ethics of killing cetaceans. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you all able to follow the suggested amendment by Mr. Purnell-Webb? Would you wish that he reads it again? The Secretary has located this suggested amendment from his papers and I take it it is your wish that we amend our record accordingly. This is an amendment, in effect, to a recommendation by the Technical Committee which is incorporated in the verbatim minutes.

I have been told it is a wrong draft in the Technical Committee report, but we are now in plenary session and we received this report, so it makes little difference really, as long as we get the right words in the final version. So, that will be so done. Does that clear up that point, Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes, I think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: And is it the wish of the Commissioners that we accept this recommendation with that amendment in the last paragraph? South Africa?

SOUTH AFRICA (Mr. D.G. NEWMAN): Mr. Chairman, could the Australian delegate just repeat the proposed amendment, please?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure he could, but what say we get

the Secretary to read what he has written in the record here?

Thank you, Mr. Furnell-Webb.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this is a drafting slip on my part. I have lifted out not all of the sentence and it should read:

"The Technical Committee endorse the recommendation of the Scientific Committee that the Secretariat continues to seek information on behavioural studies in relation to assessment and management, enquires into the possibilities of a con-sponsored meeting ... and so on. That is the wording in the Scientific Committee report which did not get transferred over.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you satisfied now, Doctor? We are all in agreement. Thank you.

That completes then our consideration of Agenda Item 17, the consideration of the ethics of killing cetaceans. The next item, Mr. Asgeirsson, in your Technical Committee report is the Bering Sea stocks of bowheads and I suggest that you read your recommendation from your report please.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. In the Technical Committee the United States of America reviewed the management and scientific programmes implemented in accordance with a commitment undertaken at the December 1977 special meeting of the Commission. They put forward specific proposals for future action, including a catch limit at the aboriginal subsistence needs and not more than 2% of the stocks coupled with continued research.

These were embodied in a proposed schedule amendment and resolution. After extensive discussion in the Technical Committee, the Technical Committee agreed to recommend a resolution which is

appended and you will see the appendix on the bottom of this same page where the Technical Committee recommends that the Commission requests a working group, or the Technical Committee examine the entire aboriginal whaling problem and develop proposals for a regime for the aboriginal bowhead hunt in Alaska and, if appropriate, a regime or regimes for other aboriginal hunts will be submitted to the Commission for consideration at the next Annual Meeting.

Then, Mr. Chairman, Denmark proposed, and Argentine seconded, that the schedule paragraph 11, section A, should be amended to read as follows:

"In 1979 hunting shall cease when either 26 have been struck or 24 landed".

The Committee agreed to vote on the landed figure separately and it was adopted by seven votes to six, with four abstentions, as the recommendation to the Commission. Then the USSR proposed, seconded by the USA, that the struck figure in the schedule should be amended to 37. This amendment was defeated by eight votes to three, with six abstentions, as was the original figure by seven to two, with eight abstentions. The Committee makes no recommendations therefore on this element, so what the Technical Committee is recommending is that the schedule be amended only with regard to their figure landed; we have no recommendation for the struck figure.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the phrase in your statement which reads:

"In 1979 hunting shall cease when either 26 have been struck or 24 landed."

No, I am sorry. Is that correct?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The recommendation is to amend

the schedule by changing - this is part of 11 of the schedule -  
by changing the year 1978 to 1979 and to insert the figure 24  
instead of figure 12 that we have in the present schedule and  
delete the mentioning of the figure 18.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right, yes. Could I have a  
second for that recommendation please? United States, you  
second?

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded. Any  
discussion? I had a query before that I thought that in the  
Technical Committee we agreed that 24 should be landed in '79,  
but we did not come to any conclusion on how many should be  
struck. Am I right or wrong? Mr. Asgeirsson.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): This is correct, Mr.  
Chairman, and as a result in the new schedule that would be  
issued after this meeting there would be no mentioning of  
the struck figure, as I was explaining.

THE CHAIRMAN: The schedule has <sup>a</sup>figure being  
struck now and your recommendation says that the section should  
be amended to read:

"In 1979 hunting shall cease when either 26 have  
been struck of 24 landed".

I think it should read that hunting shall cease when 24 have been  
landed. Am I right?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): You are right, Mr. Chairman.  
I am sorry that this is not accurately enough reported, but if  
you read further then you see that the Committee agreed to vote  
on the landed figure separately and the landed figure was adopted  
and the landed figure is the one that we are recommending to the  
plenary and we are not recommendi g any figure for the struck

number and, as a result, as I see it, since the struck figure appearing in the schedule at present is for the year 1978, then the Secretary should delete the words referring to the struck figure when he issues the new schedule, if the recommendation of the Technical Committee is adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the recommendation of the Technical Committee. Soviet Union?

SOVIET UNION (Mr. I.V. Nikonorov): We have agreed on the landed figure to be 24 and there does not seem to be any doubt about that. Now we have to think of the other figure. I quite understand that for the United States it would be better not to have the second figure. In that case, we would never know how many whales would be struck.

Last year, as we heard from the American delegation, the fact that they did have the second figure contributed to the number of lost whales - to the reduction of the number of lost whales: that is, that we heard that the United States have implemented a number of organisational measures which enabled them to increase, if I may call it so, the catchability co-efficient.

We are talking now about the native people, the people who use the whale products only for subsistence and, taking into account the reports and other documents submitted by the United States delegation and taking into account their intent to go on increasing the efficiency of their gear and taking into account that we here have to do only with the native people for whom the whale meat is the main product, main food, and considering the cultural needs of these people, the Soviet delegation moves that the second figure, that is the figure for struck whales, should be 30. I think we have to do something

to somehow solve this problem for the Americans.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The situation before us at the moment is that we have a recommendation from the Technical Committee that the schedule be changed so that the 18 figure becomes 24 - 12 becomes 24, and I have not got a seconder for that. I am sorry, USA has seconded that figure. Now I have an amendment to that from the Soviet Union that we include a struck figure of 30: do I get a seconder for the Soviet Union? Denmark.

Would it be acceptable to you if we voted on the basis of 30 struck and 24 landed; I am more or less combining the two. It is quite irregular. Any discussion? This means then that the schedule will read:

"In 1979 hunting shall cease when either 30 have been struck or 24 landed".

I think we should call a vote so I can test the meeting on those two figures. You agree? Mr. Secretary, let us proceed and perhaps you had better read the resolution again.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the resolution is that in the schedule paragraph 11, subsection (a);

"In 1979 hunting shall cease when either 30 have been struck or 24 landed".

This is a vote in plenary session to amend the schedule and requires a three-quarters majority. The voting, I think, starts at New Zealand. So, can I just say again, the proposal is, 1979 30 struck, 24 landed, needing a three-quarters majority to amend the schedule.

New Zealand: (No) Norway: (Abstain) Panama: (Abstain)  
South Africa: (No) USSR: (Yes) UK: (No) USA: (Yes)  
Argentina: (Yes) Australia: (Abstain) Brazil: (Yes)  
Canada: (No) Denmark: (Yes) France: (Abstain)

Iceland: (Abstain) Japan: (Yes) Mexico: (Yes)  
Netherlands: (No)

The result of the vote, Mr. Chairman, was seven votes cast in favour and five against, so it does not get the three-quarters majority.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to point out that the schedule in its present form will be out of date for 1979 and, according to that vote, we have no quota for this particular stock and if no quota is established by this Commission at this meeting the alternative is to leave it to a special meeting, I suppose, or not have a quota at all. There are the situations in which you find yourselves. I am open for another try to get a set of figures that will be acceptable to three quarters of the voting Commissioners. Norway?

NORWAY (Mr. I. Rindal): Ladies and Gentlemen: as you will recall, last year the Commission allowed the quota of 12 landed and 18 struck from a stock that was then assumed to be in the vicinity of 1,300 animals. This represented a catch of a little more than 1% of the believed stock. We now know, with a very high degree of certainty, that the stock consists of at least 2,260 animals. I think this situation should be taken into consideration when we are to discuss and decide on the quota for the next year.

I believe that the recruitment rate is a little around about 1% of the stock, and the allowance to take a quota of that size should not reduce the present whale population and should be readjusted next year in the light of the future information which the United States has promised to give us in the coming year.

In the last meeting we gave 12 and 18, which means two and

three units to be allowed to be taken. I think we should try to retain this in ratio, especially on the information given by the United States delegation about the ability of the Eskimos to utilise their equipment in the proper way.

From what we have heard so far, 24 and 30 is well above the percentage. I would, therefore, suggest that the number of whales taken should be fixed at 18 animals, which is well below the recuperation rate and that the number of animals allowed to be struck should be 27. We have no reason to believe absolutely that this would mean that all the extra nine animals would be killed, so that by fixing a figure of this size we would keep within almost exactly 1% of the recruitment rate and, therefore, not, as far as I can see, fix a quota which would in any way reduce the number of whales we have.

I think we should remember in this case that we are operating with fairly secure figures. We are talking about 30 and 27, 26 animals; we should also remember that in many other of our assessments we are working, as we heard this morning, on very faulty and incomplete data and we are still giving out hundreds, not to say thousands, of animals on more or less assumptions. In this case we are almost sure what kind of animals we are operating with and I would, therefore, recommend that the schedule 11 be changed in such a way that we insert 1979 instead of 1978 and that hunting shall cease when either 27 are struck or 18 are landed. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could I have a seconder? Iceland, thank you. It has been moved and seconded. The schedule at 11(a) be changed to read:

"In 1979 hunting shall cease when either 27 have been struck or 18 land".

Any comment? Canada.

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Mr. Chairman, I think that at this point in our proceedings it would not be productive to return to arguments on calculating subsistence need, whether based on historical or other considerations. I would merely note that the USA report calculates subsistence need at 24 whales to satisfy substantially all - and I quote - "protein needs of the coastal Eskimos". However, we have not been presented with hard data on the proportion of the diet which is from bowheads.

While we might argue over the statistics, we are very close on fundamentals. A key element that must affect our thinking this afternoon is that we cannot afford to leave this meeting without fixing regulations for 1979. Failure to reach agreement, as you have pointed out, would mean that there would be no quotas in effect for 1979 in the schedule.

We must hold the kill of bowheads to a minimum, which means holding the number of whales struck to a minimum. We should then try to maximise the number of whales landed within this constraint. In my intervention in the Technical Committee I suggested that the present level of permitted kill should be an acceptable international quota. I interpret 'permitted kill' to be close to the struck figure of 18.

Another approach which we might consider is to hold the struck figure within a conservative estimate of the current net recruitment, which may approximate 18 or 23 whales. This would allow some possibility of stock recovery. Allowing for the possibility of further improvement in the struck/lost ratio, I would thus recommend that the Commission adopt a figure of 23 struck or 18 landed, whichever is achieved first, with the clear

understanding, as we have, that the regulation will be in effect for 1979 only, pending assessment of further scientific results.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could I have a seconder for that, of 23 struck and 18 landed in 1979? South Africa, you are seconding the amendment to the Norwegian/Iceland proposal of 27 struck and 18 landed. We now have another proposal from Canada, seconded by South Africa, of 23 struck and 18 landed. Let us test the Commission meeting on this. The United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, this is a subject of deep concern to my government and I feel compelled to speak about it at this point, even though I have spoken about it before.

I wish to explain why my government will be forced to vote against the last proposal, a proposal which I believe is unreasonable. The Scientific Committee of this organisation has indicated that we have a depleted stock and that the safest course of action naturally would be for a zero quota. The Scientific Committee has told this Commission one other thing and that is that the Commission may wish to consider subsistence needs.

The Commission has an issue to face. Will it, or will it not, consider subsistence needs? I believe the Technical Committee has decided to do so and that is reflected in its vote and I ask this Commission to do so.

The United States has done a good deal of work to calculate subsistence needs. We have engaged in calculations relating to medical needs, health needs: we have conducted household surveys: we have not used historical calculations, but we are prepared to rely on them because, in fact, they show a need for figures higher than we are asking for. We have found that there is a minimum

nutritional need for 24 whales for only the nine whaling villages, and 29 whales if we include inland Eskimos.

During this last year, in response to the concern of the IWC, my government has undertaken a substantial programme and the reports of that programme have been presented to this Commission in what I think is a very special document, entitled "Bowhead Whales". It includes a research report, a management report, the work we have done on efficiency and statistics to which I have referred relating to subsistence. We are proud of that report and we ask that you take into account what we have done over this last year in making your decision today.

One element of this report indicates that in connection with management the Eskimo population has complied with a very low figure established by the IWC for 1978. It will comply with the 12 and 18 figure referred to by you, Mr. Chairman; thus far the Eskimos have taken in the spring hunt ten whales and have struck 18 and they are reserving two whales for the autumn hunt. In other words, the system has worked. The IWC has made a decision, the United States has implemented it and the Eskimos have complied with it.

One element that has been discussed here is whether there are not alternatives to the bowhead whale hunt. We have pointed out why we think there are not. It has been suggested that the grey whale ought to be considered and my government is prepared in some fashion to see whether that is a viable alternative. We cannot do that within the next year.

We are not asking here for a long-term solution; indeed, we came to this Commission with a long-term solution. The Commission felt that that needed more study and has reserved that decision for next year. So, we are now focussing on a short-term

solution for one year and the issue is for that one year what we will be doing to this stock, what we will be doing to this stock if a couple more whales are taken or if a couple more whales are struck.

It has been mentioned by the distinguished Commissioner from Norway that the population figures are up, and indeed they are. We will have somewhere around 2,300 bowhead whales, although we may have more depending on the results of the complete census count. From the Eskimo point of view, they concluded that the IWC reached a figure of 12 and 18 when we had 1,200 whales and they wonder, and so do I, why we would not have a commensurate figure now that we have 2,300 whales. 2,300 whales as a result of perhaps the grandest research programme for any whale stock.

We are calculating here human needs versus whale needs and it is my view that those needs can be accommodated. If this Commission were to grant a figure such as 18 and 23, such as has been suggested by the government of Canada, this Commission would be saying that the Eskimos are to go hungry. It would be saying, in effect, that they cannot take 18 whales but must take something less.

We have, remarkably I believe, reduced the ratio of strikes and losses. Four times as many whales were struck as taken before. Now, one half as many whales are struck and lost as are taken. I do not think we can reduce that substantially, at least in the short time, although we will try and we will try very hard. The figure of 18 and 23 is, in reality, not a figure of 18 and 23, but more a figure of 15 and 23 and it is a figure my government cannot accept.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me mention one matter. My delegation is smaller than it was yesterday. Now, normally as a

head of delegation, I consider that to be rather a benefit. In this case, however, I must report to this conference that the Eskimo advisers to this delegation have left the delegation and, I believe, have left London, or are in the process of leaving London. They have indicated to me that in light of the vote yesterday, and what they assumed would happen today, they would not comply with what the IWC has done. I mention that because that means that we may have compliance problems of a significant nature. We may have a confrontation in the United States with native peoples.

If a figure close to the 24 landed that was recommended by the Technical Committee is accepted, it is my view that there will be compliance. If a figure in the twenties, other than the 24 figure, is accepted by this Commission then I think that there is a reasonably good chance of compliance and if the figure of 18 and 23 is accepted, I foresee non-compliance and blood on all of our hands and it may not only be the blood of Eskimos but the blood of more whales than we are talking about here today if the Eskimos do not comply. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. E. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, speaking on a point of procedure. I recognise that all delegations in this room are ready to give some consideration to the subsistence needs of the Alaskan Eskimo; only our different views go to the point where the balance should be. I would, therefore, suggest that procedurally in this particular case we go from up to down - that means that even Canada and South Africa have made an amendment to the Norway/Iceland proposal. We should start with the Norway/Iceland proposal, if not further proposals are tabled and if so we should start with the highest one and go down. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: ... which one we take. I know it is

procedurally correct to take the amendment first, but, in effect, it is two different bids in this case. Would you accept the action that Mr. Lemche suggests? I am prepared to do almost anything to get this off the agenda. Well, Mr. Secretary, I do not see any objections to this change in our procedure, so if it is your wish that we take the Norway/Iceland motion first, which says that in 1979 they will allow for 27 bowhead whales to be struck and 18 landed. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): If we are agreed to have that procedure, I would like to propose that we have a figure saying 27 struck 20 landed. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have just changed the rules to accommodate the Commissioner for Denmark by taking the first one before the amendment. Now we have another amendment which, I suppose, he wants to take first; I am not sure. Canada.

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Mr. Chairman, I think it would be most appropriate to handle these amendments in the order according to our rules and if Commissioners wish to enter further amendments, this could be accommodated and we vote in sequence of amendments as they are further removed from the initial proposal. This is in accordance with our normal procedure and will allow Commissioners to accommodate the objective, if they wish, by proposing amendments to do this.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one objection to changing our rules, so I must respect that. I have now a second amendment proposed by Denmark that the figures be 27 struck and 20 landed. Do I have a seconder? Mexico.

I do not want this to build up. I propose to proceed with the vote on a regular basis, commencing with the Denmark/Mexico motion. Would you read it out please, Mr. Secretary, and call

the roll.

THE SECRETARY: The amendment to be voted on first is the last one proposed by Denmark, seconded by Mexico, that the schedule paragraph 11(a) should read:

"In 1979 hunting shall cease when either 27 have been struck or 20 landed".

27 and 20 are the figures; a three-quarters majority is required.

The voting starts at Norway:

Norway: (Yes) Panama (Yes) South Africa: (Abstain)  
USSR: (Yes) UK: (No) USA: (Yes) Argentina: (Yes)  
Australia: (Abstain) Brazil: (Yes) Canada: (No)  
Denmark: (Yes) France: (Abstain) Iceland: (Yes)  
Japan: (Yes) Mexico: (Yes) Netherlands: (No)  
New Zealand: (No)

Mr. Chairman, ten votes were cast for, four votes against: we did not reach the three-quarters majority, and so we go to the first amendment to the proposal, which was proposed by Canada, seconded by South Africa, that the 1979 limit should be 23 struck and 18 landed. I start the roll at Panama:

Panama: (Abstain) South Africa: (Yes) USSR: (No)  
UK: (Abstain) USA: (No) Argentina: (Abstain)  
Australia: (Abstain) Brazil: (Abstain) Canada: (Yes)  
Denmark: (Abstain) France: (Abstain) Iceland: (Abstain)  
Japan: (Abstain) Mexico: (No) Netherlands: (Abstain)  
New Zealand: (Abstain) Norway: (No)

Mr. Chairman, there were two votes cast for and four votes cast against, so that amendment is also lost.

We now come back to the original proposal by Norway, seconded by Iceland, that the 1979 limit should be 27 struck and 18 landed - 27 struck and 18 landed. The vote starts at South Africa:

South Africa: (Abstain) USSR: (Yes) UK: (Abstain)  
USA: (Yes) Argentina: (Yes) Australia: (Abstain)  
Brazil: (Yes) Canada: (Abstain) Denmark: (Yes)  
France: (Abstain) Iceland: (Yes) Japan: (Yes)  
Mexico: (Yes) Netherlands: (No) New Zealand: (Abstain)  
Norway: (Yes) Panama: (Abstain)

Mr. Chairman, there were nine votes cast in favour, with one vote against, so it gets the necessary three-quarters majority and is the effective change to the schedule.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Asgeirsson, it is time for tea.

We have one item on your report of 18. I do not think it is worthwhile reconvening the plenary session for one item. Do you have enough material to continue your work in the Technical Committee? Mr. Asgeirsson, Iceland.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Would you agree, fellow Commissioners, that rather than reconvene for one or two small items, it is more important at this stage for the Technical Committee to complete its work and have it recorded on paper and distributed as well as our opportunity to read the report of the Finance and Administration Committee, that we adjourn this plenary session until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. Is that agreed? Iceland.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Maybe I was a little too hasty when I said that we had the material. I think I will have to ask the Secretary how the typing and the producing of the papers is going.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is some doubt whether you will have enough material printed to continue. Dr. Aron, how are you placed with the report of the Finance and Administration

Committee? Is it in a condition that can be brought to this meeting if we do continue after tea?

UNITED STATES (Dr. W.A. Aron): Mr. Chairman, the draft report of the Finance and Administration Committee has been completed as a draft. I had hoped that during the tea break our committee would assemble, review the draft and trust that we could reach agreement fairly quickly on the contents, but depending on questions which may come up in the review, I am not certain that we will be ready after this session.

THE CHAIRMAN: All I can suggest is that we reconvene in a plenary session and I will deal with some of these items that have been allocated to the plenary to handle. We will carry on as long as we can in the hope that, in the meantime, the paper will be ready for the Technical Committee to continue. I know a lot of people have engagements tonight at 6 o'clock, so I think we will need to finish our work at 5.30 this afternoon. Dr. Aron.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I would ask members of the Finance and Administration Committee to assemble as quickly as possible, with coffee or tea cups in hand, in room 2 to finish work on our draft document please.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will break for afternoon tea and I would hope to reconvene this meeting at 4 o'clock sharp. Thank you.

(The Commission adjourned)

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Asgeirsson, we will continue with this plenary session and I understand that there is still one item, one recommendation from the Technical Committee, which we have to

deal with in the report that we have from you so far. Is that correct?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Mr. Chairman, I think you are referring to Agenda Item 18?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): I am afraid that we have had some difficulties in reporting this to you because our report is a one and a half page report; we did not quite agree on the wording in the Technical Committee on the last half page and it has still not been approved by the Technical Committee, so I think we will have to defer discussion here and reporting to the plenary on this item.

THE CHAIRMAN: You wish to hold over this item 18, humane killing, to next session. Would that be right?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That completes the items you have here for consideration. Am I correct?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): We have one small item which is part of the plenary Agenda Item 25; that is the last page of the Technical Committee's report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed with this one please?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. This regards amendments to the schedule for the revision of the interpretation section. The Scientific Committee have proposed a number of revisions to the wording of the interpretation section of this schedule, paragraph 1: substantive changes were the separate identification of bowhead, right and pygmy right whales and the recognition of the pygmy blue whale.

A general change was the substitution of "any whale known as" for "any whale known by the name of". The taxonomic name of

the sperm whale is also updated.

The full, amended format of paragraph 1 of the schedule is shown in IWC paper 30/4, Annex M; this is the Scientific Committee report I am referring to, and the Technical Committee recommends its adoption and the Technical Committee further recommends that the Secretary should be instructed to carry out any editorial changes required to bring Table 1 of the schedule into line with the geographical distribution of the various whales now defined.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I would like a seconder for that recommendation, seeing it is involving some changes to the schedule. Will someone second? Canada. Any discussion? We accept the recommendation from the Technical Committee on the Agenda Item 25.2. Have you any further items, Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): I am afraid not, Mr. Chairman, not in the written form at least.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will wait until that appears. I understand that under Item 29, there were some comments by the Scientific Committee which, it has been suggested, should come direct to the plenary session. Is that true, Dr. Allen?

AUSTRALIA (Dr. K. Radway Allen): Yes, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed, please?

AUSTRALIA (Dr. K. Radway Allen): Yes, Sir. These are items referred to in Section 7 of the report of the Scientific Committee. They deal with two activities by international organisations which are of particular concern scientifically to the Commission. The first one, item 7.1, deals with the FAO, ACMRR working party on marine mammals, which, as the Commission knows, culminated about two years ago in the Bergen consultation, the results of which are still coming out.

We received a report from Dr. Holt, as the representative

of FAO at our meeting regarding their programmes and he drew attention there to two particular studies which ACMRR is developing and which they propose to seek for representation from the IWC.

The first of these, which is referred to in the second paragraph under 7.1, scientific aspects of management in multi-species fisheries situations, particularly with respect to the exploitation of the food supply of target species as well as the competition with man by predators such as marine mammals for sources of common food, a working group has been set up by FAO ACMRR on this and Dr. Holt indicated that the IWC Scientific Committee would be invited to send a representative to those meetings.

ACMRR has also engaged in another activity of interest, that is described in the third paragraph. It is co-operating with SCAR and with SCOR - that is the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research and the Scientific Committee on Ocean Research - in sponsoring the so-called Bio-mass programme of research and evaluation of southern ocean living resources. A joint working group has been formed to examine the scientific basis of southern ocean management and the Scientific Committee will again be invited by FAO to send a representative to those meetings.

I felt that this should be brought to the attention of the Commission, Sir. I think it is a very useful forward step that the Commission should have an opportunity in co-operating at a scientific level in these studies which are/very directly concern to the International Whaling Commission. You may wish to discuss them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I make the offer as to

whether Dr. Holt would like to speak on this point?

FAO (Dr. S.J. Holt): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Very briefly, I would like to say that FAO has a procedure of seeking advice from either non-governmental organisations or from groups of scientists who serve in their personal capacities and that is the case with respect to these two working groups, one of which is a group of our own advisory committee and the other one a joint one with SCAR and SCOR.

The feeling expressed by the FAO Advisory Committee was that they would like to make sure that scientists connected with other relevant organisations, of which obviously the Whaling Commission is one - perhaps the most important in this field, should be available to take part. I, therefore, would like perhaps to correct slightly an impression that Dr. Allen might have given in terms of the precise wording. I do not have the resolution of ACMRR with me, but the intent is to invite the nomination of scientists rather than the representation of an organisation at these meetings. That is, the ACMRR saw the need to have one or more scientists connected with the IWC Scientific Committee participating, both to contribute their expertise and to make a slightly less formal link with the IWC than would be created - less formal but perhaps more substantive than would be created simply by inviting representation.

As a matter of fact, in principle they have decided not to invite representatives of international organisations as such because the problem then is that you have a widely expanding working group, with many organisations wanting to send representatives who are not necessarily scientists, and so on. So, what we had hoped was that the formula would be found which permitted ACMRR to ask the IWC to ensure that one or more

scientists connected with the IWC are available to participate in the working groups. I hope that spirit of the intent is made clear, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: While you are there, Dr. Holt. When you ask the IWC to make one or two scientists available, would you be nominating the particular individuals that you want?

FAO (Dr. Holt): No, Sir. We would expect the Commission to do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is much better. I think the Commission requires that freedom.

FAO (Dr. Holt): Yes, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any other discussion on this particular point of the Scientific Committee's report?

What do you want us to do with it, Dr. Allen? We receive your report: would that be satisfactory?

AUSTRALIA (Dr. Allen): I think so, Sir, and then I should go on to the second half of this, which, I think, is purely for information that the Commission could, again, just note. This is concerned with the IUCN Interim Committee on marine mammals. Again, we have the benefit of a report from Dr. Holt, and I think this is a matter also of very considerable interest to the Commission because this is a very major activity, developing studies of marine mammals which are of considerable concern to the Commission.

The Interim Committee has established two working groups: one is an inter-disciplinary group examining the proposals involved in revising the Whaling Convention, particularly in its relation to the southern ocean, and the other is discussing multi-species modelling and problems concerned with management objectives.

As you have already heard on number of occasions, questions

of multi-species modelling is a matter of very direct concern to this Commission. I think this again is a matter purely for the Commission to note, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Anyone wish to comment?

Thank you, Dr. Allen. While we are on Agenda Item 29, Dr. Gambell, is it possible for us to clean up the other sections of this? We might be calling on the observers to report on their contacts with different organisations which are set out in your agenda. We will give the floor to Dr. Gambell.

DR. GAMBELL: Mr. Chairman, the IWC has arrangements where we are invited in an observer capacity to a number of organisational meetings, in the same way that we invite observers to our meetings, and I compiled in document IWC/30/14 the reports from four of these meetings which are of particular interest to the Commission: the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea: the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission: the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, and the International Commission for Southeast Atlantic Fisheries.

The observers' reports are all in this document and I think it is probably sufficient that they are presented to you so that you know that you have them available amongst all your papers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Coming on to 29.5, report of the meeting to renegotiate the International North Pacific Fisheries Convention: has the United States anything to report on this? It is in the annotations section of our agenda, I understand.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, thank you. The United States has provided both the reports mentioned in 29.5 and 29.6, the North Pacific Fisheries Commission report and the Antarctic Marine Living Resources report.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand these reports have been circulated. Mr. Secretary, does that conclude the work on Agenda Item 29?

THE SECRETARY: I believe so, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will receive the reports. While we are on this particular page of our agenda, can we deal with No. 30, the 29th Annual Report. I am sorry: Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the annotated agenda I think there was some indication that the United Kingdom would have some suggestions as to co-operation between this organisation and the coming organisation on Antarctic marine management. I wonder whether you have such suggestions, otherwise I would suggest that we should consider where we could make some interchange of scientific views in order to make further progress towards a co-existing (?) management.

I read through the draft convention and they had in their draft convention some provision for co-operation exactly with this organisation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurdy (?), can you answer Mr. Lemche, please?

UNITED KINGDOM (Mr. Gurdy ?): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the annotation was not only from the United Kingdom but also from the United States of America and I think we were both saying the same thing really. We wanted to ensure close co-operation between the proposed Antarctic Treaty and International Whaling Commission. We would like to hear from the Secretary what precisely the relationship is at the moment between the two - well, one is a proposed body and the IWC itself. I should be interested to hear the arrangements which are presently operating. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will see if Dr. Gambell can help us.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the IWC as a body has no contact and no communication with these other two groups.

THE CHAIRMAN: Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, certainly the United Kingdom and the United States know more about this item than I do. I will only bring to the attention of the Commission that there is such a draft convention and I have the impression that it was the intention to try to let it come into force later this year and just to mention that if so, and when this rule will be in the convention, not only the draft convention, that it is the intention of that Commission to co-operate with us, we should be prepared to have some response to that.

As I understand it, the chairman of that drafting group is from the United Kingdom, maybe it would be most practical to let these things go through the Secretary and the government of the United Kingdom. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Should we leave it to Mr. Gurd and the Secretary of the IWC to explore these possibilities? United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM (Mr. Gurd): Mr. Chairman, I think that would be a very good idea and I will make contact with Dr. Gambell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Any other sections of this 29 that you want to deal with? If not, Mr. Secretary, can we deal with Agenda Item 30.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the 29th Annual Report of the Commission has been circulated in draft, as paper IWC/30/15. It is incomplete in that the catch tables, or tables of catch data, are not appended. This was because we have to make them up when we receive the statistics from the bureau in Norway. They came

in only a week ago and in the general rush of things I have compiled the tables but they have not got out for distribution. If we do have a chance tomorrow, I will try and arrange that these are circulated, but we thought there were more important pieces of paper and it merely reassembles information provided by the bureau. So, the most important thing is to know if there are any amendments to the draft text and we assume that we get the figures right from the bureau statistics.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can we adopt the draft as the 29th Annual Report? Would anyone move that we adopt the draft report as the 29th Report of the Commission? Norway moves. United Kingdom seconds. Thank you.

Moving back through the agenda, I want to have Item 28 for a few minutes and then on 27, the revision of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling. We hope to hear from the Secretary on the action taken and I guess we would like to hear from Mr. Lemche on the lavish preparations he is making in Copenhagen for our arrival. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The preparations are going excellently, I think, because those who prepare them is my neighbour to the right hand and myself and we are over here. We will be able to start the meeting as outlined and we have invited the whaling nations which are not members of the Commission which we agreed upon in Tokyo and out of that group we have got response from some; some of the responses were negative, a couple were positive and we were glad to hear that.

I am not quite sure whether you want me - what you want me to say about this. I will be happy to see you all in Copenhagen next week.

THE CHAIRMAN: How many people do you expect there, Mr. Lemche? How many people do you expect to be at the meeting?

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, as we went round the table in Tokyo, the total sum was something like 40, but this interesting subject has drawn a lot of attention and even there has come less delegation than we wanted and certainly the numbers of those who are coming has increased extremely. So, we will be around 70, 75, something like that of delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can somebody help me? Who will be actually chairing this meeting?

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): I hope, Mr. Chairman, to find a chairman who will be able to chair that meeting such an effective manner like you are chairing our meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: You did not say how many countries, did you, you said roughly the number of people?

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, about 20 countries are participating and five international organisations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Twenty, when there are 17 members of the IWC and three or four observers with us today. It does not appear to be many people outside the Commission unless, of course, there are a lot of countries within the Commission that will not be attending.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, starting from one end - Argentina is coming, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, the Secretariat of the CITES, FAO, France, Netherlands, Iceland and the Danish Government certainly also invited IWC, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom, UNEP, USA, USSR, the EEC and then certainly a lot of Danes, roughly the number you were indicating in Tokyo, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Would anyone like to ask Mr. Lemche a question in regard to the preparations being made in Copenhagen? It appears, Mr. Lemche, that everyone has every confidence in you in organising this, that they have no questions to ask, but I was wondering whether the Secretary had any points he would like to make.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I should just report formally that the Secretariat carried out all the actions which it was instructed to perform in terms of drawing up the revised draft text and distributing it to the countries selected by the Commission together with a covering letter explaining the whole arrangement so far as the IWC was concerned with them. The text of the convention has now been given to the Danish government and since they are responsible for all the arrangements for the meeting I hope that further demands for such a text will be directed to them rather than to us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I would mention that we are taking so many copies of that text as there will be delegates and they will be available at the opening of the conference. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We do have a few spare copies in the Secretariat here at the hotel, should anyone wish to have one to read over the weekend before we actually meet in Copenhagen.

Mr. Lemche, on behalf of the other Commissioners, I should like to thank you most sincerely for the work that you have done in preparing for us - perhaps I should thank even more your colleagues because I understand you are very good at delegating work - and we look forward to being in Copenhagen and we trust that the weather will be adequate for our requirements. Any other comments on

this particular item? Thank you: we will move on then.

We have Mr. Sand of the CITES sitting here and this means that we could deal with Item 28. Mr. Secretary, how do you think we should proceed on this?

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I should just report that the secretariats of CITES and of the IWC exchanged letters formalising the resolutions of the two organisations to exchange observers at their meetings and, on this basis, we are very pleased to welcome the representatives of CITES to our meeting here. I think perhaps the best thing would be to ask him to explain what the next actions are in which the IWC might be involved.

CITES (Mr. P.H. Sand): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me first express my gratitude for having been invited as observer on behalf of the secretariat of CITES to your meeting and to speak on this particular point of the agenda.

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, sometimes referred to as the Washington Convention, has now been in existence and force for three years. As you know, the secretariat functions for this convention have been entrusted to IUCN by the executive director of the United National Environment Programme. The membership of CITES has grown to 46 States, including ten of your own members - Australia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Norway, South Africa, the USSR, United Kingdom and the United States.

The CITES Secretariat welcomes the establishment of working relations with the IWC and the mutual granting of observer status. We shall attend the forthcoming Copenhagen meeting on the revision of the Convention and I hope you will find it possible in turn to be represented at the second meeting of our conference of contracting

parties, scheduled to be held in San Jose, Costa Rica, from 19th to 30th March 1979. I also wish to acknowledge the assistance received from your Commission in the current review of the status of cetaceans which the United Kingdom has agreed to undertake with a view to updating the appendices of the Washington Convention.

There are several consequences which this growing co-operation between our Conventions will have. First, it will progressively eliminate the need for the provisional reservations expressed by some governments, vis-a-vis certain cetaceans listed on the appendices of CITES. These reservations were made before your Canberra meeting last year by four governments, Australia, Canada, South Africa and the USSR. The reservations were limited to stocks of sei whales and fin whales and the reasons given in the case of Australia, for example, were precisely to preserve that country's position at the Canberra meeting of the International Whaling Commission.

I think you will all agree that we have come a long way from Canberra and I would appeal to the governments concerned now to withdraw their provisional reservations in the light of the co-operative relationship established with the IWC. At the same time, and essentially for the same reason, let me make an urgent appeal to those governments which have not yet ratified the Washington Convention: Argentina, Iceland, Japan, Mexico, The Netherlands, New Zealand and Panama.

I know that one of the reasons for the delay in some of these cases has been a wait-and-see attitude until clarification of the relationship with the International Whaling Commission. This obstacle, if it can be called that, has now been removed and I hope we can soon welcome the e countries among our members at

the next meeting of the conference of contracting parties in Costa Rica.

Finally, I wish to refer to the future exchange of information regarding the implementation of our two conventions. As you know, member states of CITES are under an obligation to submit annual reports on trade in species included in the appendices of the Convention. Reports are required from all member states of CITES, including some whaling nations who presently are not members of the IWC. Besides information on export and import permits, these reports cover the granting of certificates for introduction from the sea which, under the terms of the Convention, means transportation into a state of specimens of any species which were taken in the marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any state. This information on permits from governments both inside and outside the IWC could, of course, be of considerable interest to other states.

As the inflow of national reports grows, we plan to develop a standard procedure and format for these reports. For national data relating to whaling we shall, of course, maintain close liaison with your Commission. As mentioned before, implementation of the Washington Convention has only just begun. We hope to make good use of the experience already acquired by older international organisations, such as yours, the International Whaling Commission. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Sand. On behalf of my fellow Commissioners here today, I would like to thank you, first of all, Mr. Sand, for being able to attend our meeting. I would like to thank you for your invitation for us to attend your next meeting. I certainly hope that it will be possible to have a representative of the International Whaling Commission at your

meeting and, thirdly, I would like to thank you for your explanation of the activities of your organisation and how it affiliates with the IWC and similar organisations. And, on behalf of my Commissioners, would you please convey to your organisation our heartiest compliments for the attendance you have given here. Thank you.

Gentlemen, you heard the offer, or the invitation, for us to attend the next meeting of CITES. You may recall at the last meeting of a working group in Geneva, the Secretary and myself attended. The cost to the IWC was the fares and per diem of the Secretary and myself; the costs were borne by the Australian government. Have you any particular ideas on representation of the IWC at the CITES meeting? When is it to be, Mr. Sand?

CITES (Mr. Sand): 19th to 30th March, 1979.

THE CHAIRMAN: 19th to 30th March, 1979. Mr. Mercer, would you be attending that meeting in your own capacity as a delegate from Canada?

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Mr. Chairman, it is as yet indefinite as to whether I would be. I would certainly be willing to report to the IWC on the meeting if I do, in fact, attend, but my commitments are not yet resolved for March. That is not very helpful, I realise, today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone else in the room, or any Commissioner with any of their advisers who knows of anyone present that is closely connected with the IWC that is likely to be at this meeting? I am trying to avoid the cost of travel involved.

Well, it is sufficiently far enough away for us to hold this in abeyance and I would trust that my successor would take this

matter-up with the Secretary and explore the possibilities between the member countries as to whether any people on the delegations here today will be attending. I can assure you that if Canada sends Mr. Mercer, you can have every confidence in him because it was through the hard work of Mr. Mercer in Geneva that we managed to establish such a fine working relationship with CITES. So, my advice to the incoming Chairman would be to contact Mr. Mercer to see whether he is going for a start. I think we have to leave it at that point.

Now can we move on to Agenda Item 26, Mr. Secretary. I see in 26.1. there is a report by the Chairman of the action taken. You have an annotated agenda here: I find it is rather interesting reading what I have done. Has anyone any points they wish to make or any action taken by member countries unilaterally?

Well, moving on to 26.2, I will read this section:

"At its 29th Annual Meeting the Commission adopted a resolution (Japan abstaining) to encourage whaling nations outside the IWC to join the Commission by preventing their whale products from being imported by IWC members. This included the requirement that Commissioners shall report to the 30th Annual Meeting of the Commission on measures they have taken to implement this resolution."

Are there any reports that we can receive from member countries on this point? Japan.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): With respect to the prohibition of importing, importation of whale products from non-member countries, the government of Japan issued a directive to all trading companies and fishing companies concerned to refrain from importing whale products from non-member countries. We are expecting that importation of whale products from non-member countries would cease

shortly. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any other reports, or does anyone wish to ask any questions? South Africa.

SOUTH AFRICA (Mr. D.G. Newman): Mr. Chairman, I would like to report that the importation of commodities which are derived from whales into South Africa requires permits and we have arranged that requests for these permits be scrutinised so as to ensure that no products are imported from non-member nations. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Canada.

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Mr. Chairman, while the administration of the regulations for giving effect to the provisions of the IWC, as well as any regulations and recommendations of the International Whaling Commission, falls under authority of the Ministry of Fisheries and Environment pursuant to our Whaling Convention Act, the import and export of goods under Canada laws administered by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, under authority of the Export and Import Permits Act, officials of my department have undertaken consultations with the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in order to take the necessary steps to implement the resolutions on the prevention of importation of whale products from, and the transfer of whaling vessels to non-member countries.

Under this Act, it is possible to include appropriate items on an import control list and on an export control list as appropriate for the purpose of implementing an inter-governmental arrangement to which Canada is committed. Action is being taken to place on these lists the items included in the two resolutions. Also, any requests for expertise or for financial aid with respect to the conduct of whaling operations will all be referred to the Department of Fisheries and Environment for approval, even if the

original request should happen to be directed to another department of the Canadian government. Hence, we will have full control over these matters as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM (Mr. R.C. Gurd): Mr. Chairman, may I follow the lead of the Canadian delegation by dealing, I think, with both resolutions, although we are at the moment formally only on the resolution relating to imports, but, if I may deal with both resolutions.

First of all, we have the following observations on the resolution relating to the transfer of vessels and expertise. The UK ceased to be a whaling nation in 1963: whaling vessels or factory ships have not been built in the United Kingdom for some time. Since the resolution was passed by the Commission in June 1977, there have been no recorded transfers of such vessels to foreign enterprise and the UK government believes that no craft or equipment has been produced or services provided which have been specifically involved in or relevant to whaling activities.

On the resolution relating to the importation of whale products from non-member states of the IWC, under UK legislation stemming from the Endangered Species Convention, the importation from any source of all whale products, except sperm whale oils, spermaceti wax, ambergris products incorporated abroad into manufactured goods and certain minor whale products is prohibited. Sperm whale oil may be imported into the UK since it is derived from species of whale which are not considered to be endangered and because the oil is used in certain industrial applications where acceptable substitutes are not yet available.

None of the major sperm whale importers has used sperm whale

oil from non-member nations of the IWC for over ten years and  
importers of the oil in the UK are aware of the terms of the IWC  
resolution.

However, as the United Kingdom Commissioner pointed out last  
year at our Annual Meeting in Canberra, there might be problems  
of implementation of these resolutions in UK law, because of our  
commitments under a number of international trading agreements.  
However, since we are only marginally affected by the terms of  
the resolutions, we think it unlikely that any difficulties will  
arise in practice. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any further reports I  
will take in regard to 26.3, which includes the transfer of  
whaling vessels, equipment and other assistance. Brazil.

BRAZIL (Mr. S. De Moura): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
I would like to report to this Commission that the Brazil  
government are taking steps toward the implementation of these  
two resolutions. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any further reports?  
The Secretary has just pointed out that we have this resolution  
that the member countries shall report at our Annual Meetings.  
I suppose if you have nothing to report, it can be in the form  
of a nil return, that nothing has happened, but according to our  
resolution you "shall" report. Yes, Netherlands.

NETHERLANDS (Mr. F.H.J. von der Assen): I think  
indeed, Mr. Chairman, that we are obliged to report and that  
is why I would like to say that as far as we know, and we  
realise that there are similar problems in the Netherlands,  
as were just pointed out by the Commissioner for the United  
Kingdom, there has been no transfer of whaling vessels -

this we feel certain about - but the equipment and other types of assistance; as far as we know there has been no transfer of that either.

On the prohibition of importation of whale products, I can tell you this, that in July last year a law came into effect on the protection of exotic animals and while it is now only concerning live animals, an administrative order on parts and products of endangered exotic animals, including whales, is being prepared at this time and it is expected that it will come into effect within a few months from now. I will leave it at that. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Just to mention, Mr. Chairman, that we have only a couple of weeks ago sent a small report to the Secretary and when he digs himself out of the masses of paper we are confronted with here, and in the Copenhagen meeting next week, probably this will be distributed or put in some collated report by the Secretary. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I would like, I think, to take this opportunity to urge all Commissioners to ensure that in their brief for the 1979 meeting, the 31st meeting, that they do have some comment in regard to these two particular resolutions that we have on our books and even if it means that nothing has happened, I think it would be desirable to be able to go round the table and hear from everybody. I do urge you to ensure that this happens next year.

You should have, I understand, a piece of paper marked Agenda Item 26, resolution on non-member whaling countries, that has been distributed by the Commissioner for the United States. Is that correct? United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, are you referring to the resolution on non-member whaling countries? That is what it is entitled.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, it has been customary for the Commission to pass such a resolution. I am not sure now quite how it fits in with some other statements that have been made, and other resolutions that we have. This resolution has been passed out to delegations and I would like to propose its adoption.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this the actual point in time when we should do this? Is there anything else likely to come up in the agenda that could affect this, or will be discussed before we get to here? I am looking particularly at the attached list that you have.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): I would be happy to have this introduced at a later time. The quotas established on the stocks in the attached list could be inserted when they are established by the Commission just automatically; we could ask the Secretary to do that. It seems to me, as long as it is raised now, we could pass on it now. On the other hand, if you would prefer to raise it at a different time, I would be happy to have it raised then.

THE CHAIRMAN: Frankly, excuse the pun, but I would like to deal with it now if it is convenient.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I am happy to deal with it now. It is self-explanatory and it has been handed out to all members.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you all the piece of paper? The Secretary has suggested that we adopt this as a general format, and

he can fill out the details in the table attached as the need arises, and this could be a continuing, ongoing thing. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): This seems to be a very useful procedure. In that case, I only would suggest that we add one further point on the first page which we think we had in similar resolutions from, I think it was, the 1976 meeting, where, at the same time we mentioned this to the countries, urged member countries as well as non-member countries who did take whales out of the same stock to co-operate in a way that the quota was not exceeded. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Do you, more or less, second the adoption of this piece of paper?

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Yes, I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have an observer who wishes to speak. Is it your wish we have him heard?

? KOREA (Mr. C. Byun): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank you very much for giving me the floor again. We are very much concerned with the draft resolution on non-member whaling countries as submitted by the member state.

As the Korean government has already expressed its readiness to enter the Commission as soon as possible, probably by the end of this year, we do think that the name Republic of Korea should be deleted in this resolution, if you adopt this resolution. We hope that those countries participating as observers in this 30th session of the International Whaling Commission cannot be referred in this resolution if you adamantly stick to the adoption of this resolution. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, as I understand the concern of the representative of the Republic of

Korea, it is that the name of Korea should not be mentioned in the list on page 2 of this, because the Republic of Korea has indicated a willingness to join the IWC by the end of the year. It seems to me that there is some logic in that position and I would be happy to have that name removed from the list and added, perhaps, down at the bottom with an asterisk, or as a footnote, including some indication that the Republic of Korea has agreed to join the IWC, has indicated its intention to join the IWC, by the end of the year. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We will hear from the observer from Spain, seeing that his country is involved.

SPAIN (M. E. de Salas): Thank you, Sir. We, Spain and the Peruvian observer as well, are exactly in the same position as the observer from Korea. The Secretary-General in Spain's case has an official request to join the Commission. But, from Spain's position the paper is even more serious. I mean, here I see Las Palmas, which is apparently under the denomination 'country'. I am afraid this is unacceptable to us. Las Palmas is one of the capitals of one of the two provinces of one of Spain's regions, the Canaries. Las Palmas must come under Spain. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The observer from Peru: would you like to speak?

PERU (Mr. A. San Martin): The Peruvian delegation are seeking the same as the Republic of Korea and Spain, that the name of Peru does not be in this resolution. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: And I imagine the observer from Chile would have the same sentiments. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, with regard to the issue of Las Palmas, it was not my intention to

declare independence on behalf of Las Palmas. With respect to the statement by the representative from Spain, now that Spain has indicated the intention of joining the Commission, I see no difficulty with, again, doing the same thing with Spain that we do with Korea - perhaps put them in a separate notation in the footnote here, indicating the species of whale involved, the area and the IWC regulations or action, with an indication that they have indicated their intent to join.

With respect to the government of Peru, I am somewhat concerned because as I understand it, the government of Peru did not indicate a specific intent to join the Commission. If that is wrong, if there is a specific intent, and we have some indication when that would take place then I should think that the designation of Peru also should be differentiated. However, if Peru is not indicating a specific intent to join within a specific period of time, I question whether they should not remain in the list. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Japan.

JAPAN (Mr. K. Yonezawa): I have a small suggestion on this point. I wonder if we incorporate what has been described by the observers from those countries in our resolution, saying that the IWC welcomes the intention of such-and-such countries to join the Commission, so that we can make it specific in our resolution that those countries indicated at the 30th meeting their willingness to join the Commission and we indicate a welcome to those countries.

Might it not be possible for somebody who has the language to amend the resolution, to reflect what I stated, so that we can do away with the list?

THE CHAIRMAN: I take your point, Mr. Yonezawa.

It would be most undiplomatic of us to offend our friends who are considering joining us and I do not want to reach a situation where we do upset their feelings in this regard for the sake of a piece of paper that we have in front of us. I am just wondering whether the United States Commissioner could re-draft this second page so that it would be acceptable and inoffensive to our potential members. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to try to do that. I must admit I am not sure why the page is offensive. It is simply a listing of countries and an indication of the species which they catch, the areas and the regulations or actions which the IWC has applied to those stocks. But I would be happy to try to redraft it in a way which would be inoffensive.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure you would have no trouble in redrafting that in your most diplomatic way, Mr. Frank. Does that complete the discussion on this piece of paper? I would hope that the Commissioner for the United States will let us have it back tomorrow at our final plenary session. We will not finalise that agenda item at this moment in time.

United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, thank you. I just briefly wish to report, as have other countries, that the United States, of course, does not allow the importation of whale meat from countries not members. We also are pleased to hear of the actions of the government of Japan to stop the importation of whale meat from countries that are not members. It is our understanding that they have issued a directive to that effect and we hope that that directive is an effective document and we further understand that the government of Japan has indicated

a willingness to issue a regulation with punitive provisions if this should not be effective. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I am proceeding backwards on this agenda, which brings me to 25.3. Mr. Asgeirsson, have we dealt with this particular item? "Review of Information Required".

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): No, Mr. Chairman, but the Technical Committee has not reported yet to the plenary on this particular point and we do not have it in a written form yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I think we have to come right back now to Agenda Item 4. For the benefit of the other people on the delegations, there was a meeting of Commissioners on Tuesday and we discussed this item, amongst other things, and we considered two aspects. One was the admission of the press to our meetings and the other the change of the rules of procedure in respect to observers attending our meetings.

The Secretary might correct me if I am wrong, but in regard to the press, it was agreed that a limited number of representatives of the press could attend all plenary sessions, all open plenary sessions, of the 31st meeting.

Perhaps I had better read the draft because I was paraphrasing what I had in mind:

"The Commission agreed that at the 31st Annual Meeting all plenary sessions will be open to the press unless the Commissioners decide, by a simple majority, to close a particular session. The results of this arrangement will be reviewed before the 32nd Annual Meeting of the Commission. Because of the constraints on space there may have to be a limit on the number of press admitted. Any selection required will be by arrangement between the Secretary and press representatives".

I think it should be formally accepted by the Commissioners and is it your wish that this rule be adopted? Will this appear in the rules of procedure? I do not think so. It will appear as one of the rules, like the rules we have for observers at the present time. We will write it into the Chairman's Report of this meeting.

We do have the other section of this item, which refers to observers and there was a small drafting committee formed and they prepared some wording. I am just wondering now whether that is ready. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I believe you were referring to sub-paragraph (b) of Item 4.1, is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): That sub-paragraph has also been submitted to the Secretary. I would be happy to read it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am just wondering whether we should have this copied and circulated to Commissioners. I think we should so they can see it. I am worried about a language problem. So, this also will be re-submitted to the final plenary session.

That has taken me through the Agenda and what is left requires reports from the Finance and Administration Committee and the Technical Committee. I understand that several people have commitments at 6 o'clock tonight and others have dinner engagements which makes it rather impossible to continue in a Technical Committee or Finance and Administration Committee for very long.

I would like to hear from the respective Chairmen as to whether they would wish to reconvene at 8 o'clock tonight or, as they did last night at 11 o'clock. Dr. Aron, could I hear

your position. Let me ask the question: when we reconvene the plenary session at the conclusion of the Technical Committee meeting tomorrow, will you be ready with a complete report of your committee and the papers circulated in good time so that people have a chance to examine them?

UNITED STATES (Dr. W. Aron): Mr. Chairman, the Finance and Administration Committee met during our tea break and I think we resolved the basic draft document which has been submitted to the Secretariat for retyping. We would trust the Secretariat will have these papers available first thing in the morning. There are two areas that we still must cover. I anticipate these can be covered shortly and be available also early in the morning, if we can have a Finance and Administration Committee meeting either immediately following this meeting or, preferably, first thing tomorrow morning.

One item deals with the rules of debate, which I do not believe is a contentious item. The other item - and I think it is reasonable revenge for the Chairman of the Scientific Committee - is to respond to the burdens the Scientific Committee has placed on the Finance and Administration Committee to determine definitions of observers and the role of IUCN in the Scientific Committee. I think both of those issues can be resolved in a fairly short meeting of Finance and Administration. I would propose that we hold it first thing in the morning and append that document to the report which will be available to you, I trust, first thing in the morning.

I think the bulk of the document can be reported on by me quite early tomorrow morning. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Aron. Dr. Gambell, have you any advice on the situation of the typing on this?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): We were making a few minor editorial changes with Mr. Harvey. I do not think there is substantial retyping.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I can only say that I hope that we can get it out overnight. We have machinery problems at the moment, but we will do our best.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Asgeirsson, what are your wishes in regard to the Technical Committee?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Mr. Chairman, while we have been sitting in this plenary session, some material has been made available to delegations on the remaining items on the Technical Committee's agenda. I know that delegations would like to have a time to study these papers as they are of a substantive nature and if everybody does his homework and we be well prepared tomorrow morning, 9 o'clock for example, I think that that would be sufficient. We would not need a late session tonight, but I am in your hands. If delegations feel we should indeed meet tonight, then I am quite prepared to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you feel, Mr. Asgeirsson, that you could complete your work by lunchtime tomorrow?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): It is very difficult to say, Mr. Chairman, but assuming that everybody will be acting in a good spirit tomorrow morning, then I think we should be able to complete.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have your Infractions Committee (?) report?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): I am afraid we do not have that yet. It is probably just about to be distributed.

THE CHAIRMAN: And can I ask Dr. Allen whether his report is complete from his committee?

AUSTRALIA (Dr. Allen): Mr. Chairman, I think the last

documents from us to the Technical Committee are now in the hands of Commissioners. The Scientific Committee does have a few more things to do, but I think these are of a housekeeping nature which will not require a report to the Technical Committee.

I was proposing to have a meeting of the Scientific Committee immediately you adjourn now, Sir, and I would hope that in about an hour we would be able to clean up the work of the Scientific Committee. I believe we have nothing more that we have to report on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. As I see the situation, the Technical Committee should meet here tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock and immediately their work is finished there will be a plenary session which can deal with the Finance and Administration work and then carry on to the other items regarding the Technical Committee in the hope that by the time we finish dealing with the available papers, the remainder will be available.

So, therefore, I cannot set a time for the commencement of the plenary session. Dr. Aron.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): Mr. Chairman, I would request, with your permission, that the Finance and Administration Committee meet tomorrow morning at 8.30 to resolve our issues prior to the Technical session and I think, for sure then, that the full documentation will be available for the afternoon plenary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you do that in half an hour before 9 o'clock?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I believe so, Sir. I think our committee has gotten along very well. We are fortunate in having excellent diplomats in the group.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who are they? Is that clear, ladies and gentlemen, that the Finance and Administration Committee meets



INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

THIRTIETH ANNUAL MEETING

London

26 - 30 June 1978

THIRD PLENARY SESSION

30th June 1978

Transcribed from tape by:

**Palantype Organisation Limited**

North Mews

Charington Street

London WC1N 2JP

Telephone 01-405 9162



THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I declare open this session, this plenary session of the International Whaling Commission. I would like to get a feeling from the Commissioners on our time schedule. I suggest that we work on until, say, 7.30 and have a tea break for about an hour and try to finalise our work, although it may be rather late tonight. There are several people who have hotel bookings they cannot change, or transport arrangements that it would be difficult to alter. Is it the wish of the Commissioners that we try and complete our work tonight, rather than re-assemble tomorrow morning? I see no dissenters, so we will attempt to do our work that way.

I give the floor to Dr. Rosenthal of the Mexico delegation.

MEXICO (Dr. Rosenthal): Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I wanted to make a very brief statement on behalf of my government with regard to the incidents that have just occurred in this hall.

Both myself, Mr. Chairman, as some of you who have been here in the last years, as well as the Mexican government, have been working in the IWC for some years now trying to achieve within the Commission the goals which many of those who participated this afternoon in what I would call a rather unfortunate and immature presentation to the Commission are also trying to achieve, and that is saving whales.

I am afraid that after having witnessed personally myself, and the Commissioners having witnessed, what went on here this afternoon none of us can feel anything but being repelled at the type of actions that were taken by some individuals here this afternoon. I do not think that those individuals represented any of the organisations that have been working with the IWC and have been attending the IWC. I know that many of them

have dissociated themselves from these events this afternoon. I feel very badly for the Japanese delegation and I would like, on behalf of my government, to express regrets and I would only hope that the Commission look upon this as not a reason to restrict access to its meetings, not as a reason to restrict the press from coming to the meetings, nor as a reason to change its procedures regarding the way meetings are conducted, but rather as a way of passing judgment on the maturity, on the emotional maturity of some of the people who were present this afternoon in this hall. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. On your point, when I hear acclamation coming from people supporting what happened, and the people have been with us all the week, I wonder whether your statement is absolutely correct.

Dr. Yonezawa.

JAPAN (Dr. Yonezawa): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am really concerned about what happened this afternoon. I have to say I take it that those things should not happen again and I think we have to take some disciplinary action if some irregularities are involved in association with any of the observers' organisations present here. But I do not wish to introduce any - I am not proposing to introduce any drastic changes in the present rules of procedure because most of the - at least, I hope all of the observers' organisations would take lessons from what happened this afternoon.

We are here; although we may not be thinking in the same way, and this is quite natural in this world that people do not think, or do not value, do not share the same value system, we are here to talk and to find out a reasonable compromise so that on my government we would like to continue this exercise

in co-operation with other countries and we like also to have reasonable understanding from organisations which do not agree with my government in their basic way of thinking or philosophy in the management of whale resources.

I think we need to communicate. We do not need to make unnecessary confrontations. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Gurd.

UNITED KINGDOM (Mr. R.C. Gurd): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to say a very few words on behalf of the UK government. Whilst we are not formally your hosts for the meeting today, I should like to express regrets on behalf of my government to all delegates who have been here that such events should have happened. All I can say is that I hope it will<sup>not</sup> put you off from coming back to London on future occasions. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Well, that is all gone and forgotten, I guess, now and we get on with our work. I have been reassured by Mr. San Martin, the Minister of the Embassy of Peru here in London, that it is the intention of the Peruvian government to join the International Whaling Commission before our 31st meeting. This was not quite clear at the time that the statement was made. I now have a request from Mr. San Martin to speak in this regard on behalf of Chile, Korea and Peru. Would you please speak, Dr. Martin, but you understand our time limit and would you please be brief. Thank you.

PERU (Dr. A. San Martin): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As Peruvian observer, on behalf of Chile, of the Republic of Korea and of Peru itself, I have the honour to read the following statement.

Chile, Peru and the Republic of Korea participated as observers in the 30th Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission, held in London from 26th to 30th June 1978, conscious of the need to protect whale resources declare as follows.

First, the above whaling states fully share the common interest in safeguarding whale stocks and recognise the necessity to further increase the concerted efforts for their effective conservation and rationalisation within the framework of the International Whaling Commission. To this end, they are ready to enter the Commission as soon as possible before its next meeting with a view to promoting international co-operation in this field.

Second, expressing their common concern over the reasonable management of whale stocks based on objective, scientific data and evidence, they take the common view that it is necessary to exchange research activities on whale species and harmonise efforts to establish a global scale of whaling, taking into particular consideration the special interest and needs of the developing coastal whaling countries.

Third, the aforesaid states consider it essential that their membership to the Commission does not cause any serious economic dislocation to their whalers whose livelihood hangs on a subsistence level. For this purpose, the above states affirmed that existing catch levels by their whalers should be recognised as their basic catch limit and maintained at least for a period of two years after the next meeting of the Commission in 1979 in order that they can adjust themselves in an orderly way.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did the observer from Spain wish to speak, or are you satisfied? Thank you. Please be brief.

SPAIN (Mr. E. de Salas): I will be brief, Sir.

In the first place, as we stated yesterday, our government has already informed the Secretary General officially of the IWC that Spain wishes to join the Commission as soon as it is able to. It is in this context that we have taken careful note of those recommendations of this 30th Annual Meeting of the Commission which refer to the fin and sperm whale stocks of the North Atlantic.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that I have listened with great interest and sympathy to the joint declaration just made by the representatives of Chile, Korea and Peru. Undoubtedly, we are all interested in the increase in research on whales and whale stocks. Spain too considers that only by increased research and the systematic collection of scientific data can we establish a firm basis for the effective conservation and utilisation of these stocks. We also believe that a sustained increase in the rationality and effectivity of national whaling management cannot be achieved without this basis, just as it cannot be achieved without a very careful consideration of all the factors involved in whaling activity. Thank you, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We are very pleased to hear the progress your governments are making in relation to joining our organisation, and, again, I repeat, would you please convey our gratitude to your respective governments.

There is no need for me, ladies and gentlemen, to say that we must be brief from hereon tonight and we will not be able to involve ourselves in the discussions, or repetitions of the discussions, that we had in the technical session. I seek your

co-operation to ensure we finish this meeting at a reasonable time.

We will start on Agenda Item 4, "Admission of the Press and Accredited Observers to Plenary and Technical Committee". You should have, circulated in your boxes today, a single sheet of paper with that heading, marked Plenary Agenda Item 4. As you would expect, there has been a slight amendment to this document and I will ask the Secretary to give you that amendment.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the document is headed, "Admission of Press and Accredited Observers to Plenary and Technical Committee" and it has a '4' in the top left-hand corner. I think it is a single sheet of pink paper.

The Commissioners met and approved this document, but under item 4.1, the general arrangements for having observers, and so on, in the meeting, the intent of paragraph (a) was to clarify the situation so that non-member governments and inter-governmental organisations are more warmly welcomed than the existing rules allowed for, but there is an amendment to paragraph 4.2, where, in the second line after the last but one word, the word 'press', there is the insertion of the following words:

"without audio or visual recording equipment"

so that that opening sentence now reads:

"The Commission agreed that at the 31st Annual Meeting all plenary sessions will be open to the press without audio or visual recording equipment, unless the Commissioners decide by a simple majority to close a particular session."

I should add, Mr. Chairman, that all of the observer organisations attending our meetings comply with the revised form of words, so there is no intention of making it more exclusive, quite the opposite in fact. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are these amendments acceptable to the Commissioners? Any comments? I see no signs of anyone wishing to speak so we will adopt that recommendation from the Commissioners' meeting and have it incorporated in the Annual Report.

I wish to consider the Finance and Administration Report first because certain items in that report may influence some of the decisions we may make in respect to the remainder of the items which are coming forward from the Technical Committee and I ask you to turn to the Agenda Item 23. I think that is right, Dr. Aron, and if it is, as Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee, would you proceed with reporting on your work.

UNITED STATES (Dr. W. Aron): Mr. Chairman, I would, at the beginning, like to acknowledge the very fine help that we received from Mr. John Saleeba of the Australian delegation and Miss Janice Barnes of my own delegation, who provided professional assistance that permitted this report and it is a complex and, I am not sure, very pleasant report for you and the Commission to read.

The greatest difficulty is imposed by the fact that the budget proposed for the coming year, as you will note, is nearly twice the budget of last year. As a first step, the Finance and Administration Committee reviewed the budget very carefully in an effort to see what we could do to actually reduce the costs. I point out to all of you that the proposed budget is what we refer to as a 'bare bones' budget. It is business as usual; it does not include the holding of any special meetings; it does not include the addition of any staff. We will come to those additions later, if you think it is appropriate.

Not very many years ago, many of you will remember that the budget of the International Whaling Commission was less than £10,000 annually. We are in a new era. The first recommendation of our committee in response to this new era is found on page 2, that the Secretary obtain additional professional advice on budgeting procedures and the financial regulations as soon as possible.

I would like to go through these recommendations as quickly as I can: I trust you will have them before you. We did, and do, recommend the approval of the estimated budget for 1978/79 which is contained in Appendix 1. We will develop and present to you a series of recommendations on techniques for financing this, but there must be a clear understanding that where those techniques fail, and where there is a shortfall, it will be necessary to pick up the expenses through the normal contributions to the Commission following the formula which we have agreed to.

There are three areas of major cost to the Commission - staff, publications, including documents, and the Annual Meeting. The first recommendations refer to techniques to reduce costs. One, we suggest that member nations might consider seconding a computer expert to the staff of the Secretariat for a period of two to three years. This recommendation is based in part on comments received from the Scientific Committee, in part from the Secretariat. It is designed to put the data in a position that will permit the Scientific Committee to work more effectively and, hence, permit the Commission to operate more efficiently during Commission meetings.

We indicate that £10,000 should be added to the budget if the Technical Committee will meet for one additional week. We indicate that another £10,000 should be added to the budget if a

special Scientific Committee meeting is approved. To help cover costs, we suggest that member nations continue to host mid-year meetings of the Scientific Committee and scientific workshops.

We do have a major expense in terms of publications and documents. There is also a major expense in terms of the Annual Report. Regarding the annual report, we recommend that each member nation receive two copies of the annual report free, that each member of the Scientific Committee receive an annual report free; all other copies should be sold at cost. We suggest that member nations consider buying additional copies of the annual report at cost for their own use or distribution, or consider ways of increasing sales of the report in their countries. We suggest that the subsidy of the cost of the report should be eliminated.

In regard to the Scientific Committee meeting, which imposes an extraordinary burden on the Secretariat in particular, we recommend that all member nations provide the Secretariat with sufficient copies of scientific and other papers prepared by that government for distribution to the Scientific Committee and the Commission as appropriate. In this regard we urge the Secretariat to provide guidelines regarding format, page size, times of submission and numbers of papers required in each instance.

Part of the cost of publications is tied to very heavy distributional costs by the Secretariat. We urge that member nations make arrangements with the Secretary wherever practicable to distribute all correspondence from the Commission through their embassies or High Commissions in London, thereby reducing the cost of postage to the Commission.

A major cost is the annual meeting and we suggest that rule of procedure 2 be revised to provide that the Commission shall hold

a regular annual meeting in such a place as the Commission may decide.

The significant increase in the budget between last year and this year is due to the fact largely that the government of Australia and the government of Japan hosted Commission meetings at their own expense. This year, really for the first time, the Commission is bearing the full costs of hosting this meeting and the costs are substantial indeed, which you may tell when you review the budget document which is attached.

One of the serious problems that we saw in the budget is that the Finance and Administration Committee were asked to review and approve a budget from which a significant amount of money had already been committed. We were presented with a fait accompli. This is a carry-over from past years and we suggest that the Commission change its fiscal year to 31 August from 1 September so that costs of one annual meeting would be met from funding approved by the Commission at the preceding annual meeting. If we do this, the Commission must approve a budget for a transition quarter, 1 June to 1 September, in the year during which the fiscal year is changed.

We looked at the possibility of new funding sources. These include member nations themselves making voluntary contributions to the Commission's resources through the working capital fund. There also were a series of items discussed within our committee. I think you all should be clear that these items were not necessarily in fact agreed to by all members. However, we felt, in view of the very serious financial condition of the Commission that the Commission should have before them possible considerations.

One consideration is the establishment of a seat fee: for example, £200 per seat. If the 25 participants at this meeting

paid that cost, the annual sum - the annual costs of this meeting - of approximately £25,000 would be covered. It was also suggested that a surtax on whale quotas for the previous season - for example, £1 or £2 per whale, could be a source of additional revenue.

Finally, a possible source could be member nations agreeing to contribute to the IWC research fund, funds equal to the amount of the fines imposed for infractions. As part of our business we recommended that the Secretary's contract be approved on a tentative basis, pending review by the government of the United Kingdom; this review is to assure the legal propriety of such a contract.

We examined the suitability of a meeting place and costs and you will note in item 23.4.1 the comment that the Secretary, the Committee reviewed with the Secretary and came to the conclusion that only a very significant reduction - approximately 50% in the number of people attending the annual meeting - would reduce the cost of renting meeting rooms. We recommended that the Secretary be authorised to make appropriate arrangements at the lowest cost and using any effective room layout for each annual meeting.

The committee approved the rules of debate, with one change which is reflected in the second part of the attachment dealing with the procedures of amendment. This is found on page 2 of Appendix 2, that change simply reflects the existence of the present method of voting on amendments and does not present, in my view, any difficulty for the Commission.

We urge that for short-term legal advice the Commission continue to obtain this from legal firms in the United Kingdom on an 'as necessary' basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Aron, I am not sure whether we have Appendix 2?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I think it has been distributed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have we got it? O.K. Fine. Sorry.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): When you see a document in blue dealing with the date and place of the next meeting on the cover page.

An important cost of the meeting dealt with the verbatim records. The taking of verbatim records is expensive, but more expensive than this is the transcription of such records and correction of such records. It was agreed, again as a technique of cost saving, that those governments that required verbatim records would be given at cost the tapes that are made here.

The Secretariat referred for our consideration a request for expanding the publicity functions of the Secretariat and while we think this is a very good idea, it is our considered view that the present precarious financial state of the Commission does not permit this added expenditure. We do, however, urge that member nations do everything they can to inform interested parties of the work of the Commission.

We discussed the possibility of a date and place of next meeting. You remember we have recommended to the Commission that Rules of Procedure 2 be changed to permit, as a cost saving technique, member governments to host meetings more frequently than the present opportunity of once in every three years. It is possible that a member nation at this meeting may, at very short notice, provided here, be willing to host the IWC at the 31st meeting. Hence, our recommendation of date and place is a bit uncertain. We do anticipate that the meeting would be

held during the week of June 25th. However, even that pending discussions here regarding the actions which may be taken by the new Technical Committee and it is possible that the Annual Meeting of the Commission could be postponed until the week of 9 July. This question is put forward to the Commission for discussion.

It has been recommended during the year that the schedule be revised to make it a more legally effective document. This will be an expensive task, requiring the presence of distinguished attorneys and we recommend that the Technical Committee, as part of its new mandate, convene a working group of lawyers from member nations to rewrite the IWC Schedule. Member nations should cover the cost of this group's work.

The budget that we have proposed, that the Secretary has proposed and which we recommend approving, is on the order of £132,436 bare bones. If all that has been proposed to the Commission by the Scientific Committee, by the Technical Committee is implemented, the cost to the Commission will be on the order of £188,756.

We have examined the budget, I think, with great care. We do not see, unless the Commission is willing to substantially alter their lifestyle, any way to reduce the bare bone budget. We have provided for your information some sense of the cost to member nations based upon member nation contributions of the bare bones budget which must be on the order of £118,000 what your additional costs will be in the event none of the costs transferring, rather than cost saving, systems are put into effect. If we do everything which has been recommended to the Commission, and the costs are borne by the Commission, you will have to make contributions totalling in excess of £165,000.

We had one other item that was proposed to us, referred to

us by the Scientific Committee, dealing with admission of observers, raising questions about the role of IUCN.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Aron, could that be left separately seeing it is a different subject and we deal with that after we have dealt with the financial side?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): It is very short, but we would certainly be happy to postpone it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if it is very short, O.K.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): We just simply say Rule A.2. International Organisations, should be interpreted to include the IUCN; that if organisations which have both governmental and non-governmental representation are intended to be excluded from providing advisers to the Scientific Committee that Rule A.2 should be revised to read "inter-governmental organisations".

We also suggest that all international organisations which send advisers to the Scientific Committee should be reminded that the rules of procedure of that committee require that such advisers have appropriate scientific expertise.

Sir, I think that finishes my report. I, or other members of the Finance and Administration Committee, will be pleased to answer any questions you may put before us. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Aron. In what way do you suggest we deal with this? Take the recommendations one at a time, or can we take them in bulk? Do we take it page by page?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I think it is your pleasure, Sir. Some of the recommendations, I am sure, will require instructions from local governments, but I think I would be very pleased to go through them page by page. It is your pleasure.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suggest that you just identify, without necessarily reading them again, the recommendations. You go

through and I will try and get the concensus of opinion as we go along because there are quite a number of recommendations in your report and, no doubt, some people will want to discuss them, but some we may get through without discussion. Mexico.

MEXICO (Mr. A.D. Rojo): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Could I ask Dr. Aron one question and then make one clarification. The question, Mr. Chairman, is looking at Appendix 3 of document 13, the one that is entitled Plenary 4 Agenda, Report of the finance, date and place of the next meeting: it has two appendices and Appendix 3 is the list of the countries and the possible assessments under two alternative budgets, as I see it: £118 plus and £165 plus. My question to Dr. Aron, which perhaps I did not gather from his explanation is, why those two figures and where does the budget that is within the other document fall; in other words, which of these two is the Finance and Administration Committee recommending to the Commission?

That is the question. The clarification, Mr. Chairman, is that in both of those budgets on that page there is an error. Mexico has been assessed two areas of interest, while it only has one. While New Zealand has been assessed only one when it has two. So, I assume there is a cross error there and that the figures should be revised accordingly. I am sorry for the New Zealand delegation. I wish I could have taken on their quota.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): If I may respond to the second question first, according to our new rules of debate. The chances are that there is an error. These tables have not been proofed very carefully. I would urge each of you to review your contributions to determine if other errors exist. I apologise for that error.

Budget documentation may be in part confusing. We are indeed

recommending approval of a budget of £132,436. Some of the budget comes from sources other than contributions by the members. Appendix 3 deals only with those costs which are charged directly to member nations, or which may be charged directly to member nations, assuming that none of the techniques, such as hosting an annual meeting by a member nation, work out.

£118,000 budget is the bare bones budget. It assumes that none of our cost savings or cost sharing techniques work. It also assumes that we have no special meetings, no particular expansions of any function. The £165,000 budget to the right makes the assumption that we will do everything. We are recommending to the Commission that they accept the budget which leads to member contributions of £118,000. It will be up to the plenary, however, to discuss at this session, one, do they wish to approve that and, two, if they do what additional costs they are willing to incur.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Now, Dr. Aron, which is the first recommendation? Is that the one at the top of page 2?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): Yes, Sir; we are now at the top of page 2. We recommend that the Secretary obtain additional professional advice on budgeting procedures and the financial regulations as soon as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? Any discussion? That is agreed, Dr. Aron. Will you please proceed?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): We do urge that the Commission approve the estimated budget as contained in Appendix 1.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? Do we approve this estimated budget for 78/79 contained in Appendix 1? -Australia.

AUSTRALIA (Mr. Furnell-Webb): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It might be advisable to leave that one because a great deal will

depend on what Commissioners think of other recommendations we have made in there and that could alter the bare bones estimated budget and so it might be advisable to come back to that one last of all when we know how we have modified it, if we have modified it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I take your point and will you remind me in case I overlook it at the end. Dr. Aron, the next one is half-way down the page.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): Yes. If I may, I would go perhaps one step further than my Australian colleague and suggest that final decision on the budget pend discussion by appropriate committees of their recommendations. We are not in a position to advocate all of the funding required by the different other committees of the Commission and I think they should have the opportunity to present their case on each issue as it arises. So, I have a feeling, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps the final approval of the budget must wait until later in this meeting. I am sorry for that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I take your point.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): The recommendations which follow, I think, can be handled - several can be handled very quickly. It is something we commend to the consideration of each member nation. Perhaps Dr. Allen or Dr. Gambell would like to speak to this further, but it appeared very clear to the members of the Finance and Administration Committee that the Secretariat and the Scientific Committee both - and the Commission as a result - would be substantially helped by the full-time availability of a computer expert, someone who could work closely with the Scientific Committee during their meetings, someone who could assist in the preparation of data throughout the year, to assure that these data are available in the most effective form to improve the efficiency of both the

Scientific Committee and the Secretariat.

The additional costs of that staff member are substantial, if they have to come from the Commission and we hope that member nations would find it possible, and we think it would provide a very worthwhile professional experience for experts to come to Cambridge to work for the Commission, but it would also provide a fine way to keep Commission costs down. I turn this to Dr. Allen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could I ask a question, Dr. Aron? You say that £10,000 be added to the budget if it is decided that the Technical Committee will meet for an additional week. Does that not depend on where it meets? If it is hosted by a government, does it still mean £10,000?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): That is one of the uncertainties and we wish to point out to the Commission that unless host governments are willing to pay costs £10,000 per week is a reasonable estimate if the Commission is to host the meeting. It was placed here to allow Commissioners to reflect on the costs of recommending meetings that they are unwilling to host. Someone will have to pick up the tab if we want these meetings to occur.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any discussion on those recommendations, as outlined by the Chairman of the Finance Committee? Dr. Allen, do you want to say something?

AUSTRALIA (Dr. Allen): Mr. Chairman, I understood that the Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee referred this question of the availability of a computer expert to me. I would go so far as to say that it is essential, if the Scientific Committee is to continue to operate and develop along the lines in which it is moving at the present time and it's probably still more

essential if the Committee is to have any hope of avoiding the sort of delays that have arisen in this and the last few meetings. If we are to have the information available to us more or less on the call during the meeting and get our computing done quickly, I believe this service is absolutely essential.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any further discussion on these recommendations? Canada.

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we could return to two of these recommendations relating to the meeting of the Technical Committee for one week, for an additional week, and the following one regarding a special scientific meeting, we should come back to these after we have discussed the work plan for the forthcoming year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Will you remind me to make sure that I get those recommendations through later. Thank you. We will hold those recommendations.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): Mr. Chairman, as we suggested before, I think the chairman of each of these respective committees must speak to these items when the time comes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Now, on page 3, half way down the page, I think we can accept those, can we not? We can decide on most of these? Australia.

AUSTRALIA (Mr. Purnell-Webb): I would like to propose a small addition, Mr. Chairman. I apologise to the Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee for not doing it in committee. I had intended to, but something went wrong somewhere. That is the second last sub-paragraph on that page under 'Recommendations'. It says that member nations provide the Secretariat and I propose to add after 'member nations', and I quote:

"member nations, individual members and representatives  
of international bodies"  
and then carry on with it, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will accept that addition. Did you  
get my point, Dr. Aron?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): Yes, Sir. I think that  
is a helpful correction. It is what the committee meant to  
do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can we take these five recommendations  
together? Are there any points any Commissioner wishes to raise?  
If you do not, I will assume that these five recommendations are  
acceptable. I establish the fact that they are acceptable.  
Dr. Aron, there are three over the page, on page 4, is that  
right?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): Yes, and they are quite  
different and I would urge that you treat them separately. The  
first recommendation, I think, is simple. It just asks each  
member nation to please make arrangements with the Secretary  
whenever it is practicable to distribute correspondence from  
the Commission through their embassies or High Commissions.  
This will represent a significant cost saving to the Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure that is acceptable. It  
must be acceptable. Will you move on to the next one please?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): The next one is a  
fundamental change and you must consider this carefully. It  
will change Rule of Procedure 2 so that regular annual meetings  
may be held in such places as the Commission may decide. At  
the present time two out of every three meetings must be held  
in London. Those costs are no longer borne by the United  
Kingdom, they are borne by the Commission. As a technique

of reducing costs to the Commission, it will become very desirable for member nations to assume the burden of hosting meetings. We are 17 nations and if every one were able to hold such sessions, it would mean once in every 17 years. There is a proviso here which the Chairman of the Scientific Committee pointed out to us that when we consider this it is critical, in view of the kinds of work done by the Scientific Committee, that there must be appropriate computer facilities available to the Scientific Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You are suggesting a change of Rule 2. We do not have the actual wording of the change, do we? Dr. Gambell is working on this, but I must draw attention to Rule 22.

"These rules of procedure may be amended from time to time by a simple majority of the Commissioners voting but notice of any proposed amendments shall be despatched by airmail to the Commissioners by the Secretary to the Commission not less than 60 days in advance of the meeting at which the matter is to be discussed."

Now, you all know I am a rules man, but we are all responsible Commissioners and if we can reach agreement on this, I see no reason why we do not accept this recommendation without having to wait until the next regular meeting of the Commission.

I would like to hear whether the Secretary is going to be critical of me for saying that.

THE SECRETARY: There is good precedent in that we have already taken changes to the rules of procedure and financial arrangements. Formerly they were presented to the next Annual Meeting to give sufficient notice, but we have acted in the spirit

of the change in the year before, so there is precedent in the last two years to do this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Japan.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): I would like to ask the Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee on this point if there is any urgency for us to introduce this amendment to the rules of procedure because we are going to decide, I am quite sure, or at least you are recommending for us to meet next year in London, is it not? Thank you.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): In response to the Commissioner of Japan, the degree of urgency is really only a function of budget. If indeed the Commissioners find it possible to accommodate the increased costs of the Commission by continuing to meet at Commission expense in the U.K. there is no urgency. On the other hand, one of the techniques for reducing budget costs are to have a member nation agree to host the meeting next year, thereby saving approximately £25,000. I really have to leave it to the Commission to decide urgency, but certainly I think even now the notice for hosting a meeting in another country may very well be short. Some Commissioners here, however, may have instructions to permit them to invite either at this meeting or in the near future the next meeting of the Commission. But that is the sense of urgency.

THE CHAIRMAN: United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, in connection with this issue, I would like to state two things. First, it may be that the government of the United Kingdom would be able, although it would not want to sponsor the entire meeting, to lend some facilities to these meetings - for example, a government building might be available for the meeting itself.

and in that way we could cut down the expense of renting this hall, for example. That does not mean that some of the other expenses should not be picked up by the IWC, but I wonder whether the Commissioner from the United Kingdom could consider that subject.

Secondly, my government would be able seriously to consider hosting an IWC meeting within the next couple of years, should the IWC so decide. Obviously, that is a consideration which - there are a variety of considerations in deciding where to be: I am simply expressing the willingness of my government to entertain such a request. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. United Kingdom, do you know the views of your Treasury in this situation?

UNITED KINGDOM (Mr. R.C. Gurd): No, Mr. Chairman, I do not know the views of my Treasury, but I can make a pretty shrewd guess. I would have to take instructions on this subject. I have a very small fig leaf only, but I will go so far as saying I am prepared to look into it certainly - look into the possibility of some way in which the United Kingdom government can lend more support than it does at the moment, but I must stress that I am without instructions at the moment and I might be rapped over my knuckles for so saying.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are all very conscious of the many years that the United Kingdom did host this Commission and the question is, of course, do we try and amend this rule which will allow us to meet in London as frequently as we like, I suppose; it just overcomes this problem of having to meet twice in London before we can go to another country. The way to overcome it is to more or less waive Rule 22 and make the change today and, as far as my Secretary is concerned, it means in Rule 2 of the Rules

of Procedure, if you have them, on the first line of that rule  
cross out 'London' and the words following;

"Commission may decide that once in three years the  
annual meeting may be held at ..."  
leave in 'such', delete 'other', and the rest remains.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the words that are then  
left are:

"The Commission shall hold a regular annual meeting  
in such place as the Commission may determine".

THE CHAIRMAN: I would expect a comment from the  
lawyers on this point, but it seems that we are prepared to  
accept this change at such short notice. All agreed?  
Thank you. Dr. Aron, please.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I have been reminded  
of a point I think you should all recognise in your future  
thinking, that in the event a country hosts one of the special  
meetings that we suggest will cost about £10,000, there would  
still be costs to the Commission in view of travel requirements  
by the Secretariat. So, hosting will not reduce the £10,000  
cost to zero, but probably will eliminate, depending on where  
the meeting is held, a very substantial burden to the Commission.

There is another fundamental change on page 4, towards the  
bottom, where we suggest that the fiscal year which currently  
runs from June 1 to May 31st be changed to cover the period  
from 1 September to 31 August.

I found it perplexing in my first experience as Chairman  
of this Committee to be approving a budget from which a substantial  
expenditure had already occurred and I am sure the Commission would  
like to be in a position of approving budgets prior to the  
expenditure of money.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any comment on that point? It looks as though we are going to break Rule 22 again. The Secretary says we can formalise it next year. Thank you, Dr. Aron, it appears that the Commissioners will accept that recommendation.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): You realise that when we do that we will have to provide some budget for the transition quarter? It is really only a shifting of money; it does not change the cost burden imposed on any country.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now you ask us to approve a budget for a transition quarter; that is requiring approval from the Commissioners?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): Yes, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I get that approval? I have that approval. Thank you. On to the next page, Dr. Aron, please. I am sorry: Australia.

AUSTRALIA (Mr. Purnell-Webb): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest that there probably is not time to approve such a transition quarter budget this year and I would simply suggest for the Commission's consideration that we add a rider to this that the Secretariat prepare next year's budget in two parts - a transition budget from 1 June to 1 September '79 and then the next annual budget from 1 September to 31 August '80.

THE CHAIRMAN: With my limited knowledge of finance, I think you are right. Will the Commissioners agree to that? Are you prepared to accept that, Dr. Aron?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): We are at the Commission's disposal, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was this in the report? No, it was not. Well, we accept that and will have that included in our recommendations.

Dr. Aron, can we then go on to, is it the top of page 5?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): We are at the top of page 5. The next recommendation is put forward for the consideration of member nations and that is the simple plea to increase voluntary contributions to the Commission to the extent that you can do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mexico.

MEXICO (Mr. A.D. Rojo): Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with that recommendation. I would like to make two points regarding that general chapter which is entitled, 'Possible New Funding Sources'. One is to say that it would seem to me that whoever presented idea No. 1 - and I am not aware of who presented it - would probably be ensuring that the International Whaling Commission would be attended by standees only. I know my government would not give me <sup>a</sup> £200 seat to come and sit here. I am not worth that much.

The second point, Mr. Chairman, is that it would seem to me that it might be useful for the Commission, and specifically for the Committee on Finance and Administration, to look once again, in the period between now and our next Annual Meeting, at the question of the way assessments are made on member nations. We do have a distribution that was approved at the 29th Meeting, but it does continue to seem to my government in any case, Mr. Chairman, that that distribution is not a rational one and that it might be useful to look into this question once again to see whether a better distribution system can be found whereby those nations that, unfortunately, are still obtaining an economic interest from the activity which is being undertaken and sanctioned by the IWC, be willing to increase their contributions to the Commission, whether that be through the assessments or through the

voluntary contributions would remain to be seen, but I would strongly urge that this issue be reviewed again.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. These points, (1), (2) and (3) are ideas and people are entitled to comment on them. Argentina.

ARGENTINA (Mr. E.H. Iglesias): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like also to share the point of view of the distinguished delegate from Mexico. I think really we have to reflect a little bit more about the proportion - the part of the budget each is permitted. I have to say never in my mind could say that it is some kind of ..... I mean, you know in this case it is absolutely true that some country is taking some kind of profit of this activity, then there are other countries who are really sharing this floor in order to accommodate and to put forward some idea in order to make really an arrangement concerning the whaling activity. It would be perhaps a little more rational to accept that this country which is positioned here is really to try to accommodate all the situations. I mean, the facts in one way really have to support a so increasing rate in his budget. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Iceland.

ICELAND (Mr. T. Asgeirsson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Contrary to the views we have heard just expressed, I rather favour the idea of having a special seat fee, especially since it includes the observers and I think it is quite appropriate that the observers they pay quarter facilities the gesture. So, I think maybe £200 per seat is too much, but I think it might be worth trying to find out how much Mr. Rosenthal is worth.

(Laughter)

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, on the second idea, I have completely

different views. I wish to remind the Commission of the fact that when we agreed on allocation of the contributions in Canberra last year, Iceland was the only member that voted against that, if I remember correctly and I think I do. And the reasons are, of course, our fear that the budget would increase so drastically as we have now seen.

I need not say, Mr. Chairman, that the Icelandic taxpayers they pay probably about 80 U.S. dollars when some other taxpayers from other member countries pay probably about ten cents and this is quite a difference. Of course, we will go along with this system that we have, but we are indeed at the mercy of our Finance Ministry and I cannot promise beforehand that we will find the money, but, of course, we will do all that we can in order to find the money to pay our contribution. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. E. Lemche): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder whether it would overcome the difficulties of the distinguished delegate from Mexico if we would establish a badge fee instead of a seat fee.

Secondly, I would suggest for your consideration if you look for further ideas of funding, to make a fee according to how much you are speaking. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that the establishment of a seat fee would be wrong and I might say that that is not just my personal view, it is shared by all 25 members of my delegation. It is a unique idea, never before done by any international organisation, and I think people would rightly frown at this organisation, unlike international

organisations but like theatres, started to charge by the seat. I would have no difficulty with the surtax mentioned in paragraph 2. It is interesting to note that the kind of surtax is very low in comparison to the value of whales: whales are worth many tens of thousands of dollars and we are talking about a couple of pounds here per whale. I am not sure what the implications of No. 3 are, that is in terms of infractions. There may be some problems because of an inclination not to report infractions if No. 3 were adopted.

I have the impression that we are not going to resolve this issue today. I wonder whether, in light of the hour, it would not be useful to ask member governments to focus on this issue so that we can resolve it when we next meet. If it does need to be resolved today, I withdraw that comment: if it does not need to be resolved today, I suggest we not debate it. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: To answer your question, I think I would have to call on Dr. Aron; whether you need the money that badly that you must have this seat fee, registration fee.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): Sir, it is not I who need the money, it is the Whaling Commission and the real question is, how the Commission decides to pay the expenses laid out, or if they cannot pay such expenses, what they are willing to give up. This is a question for the Commission; it is not a question for the Finance and Administration Committee or its chairman, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Soviet Union.

SOVIET UNION (Dr. V.G. Lafitsky): Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the discussion which is held now is very interesting: the discussion which we are having on the report submitted by the Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee, Mr. Aron. Maybe if we deviate for a little while from the alternatives which

have been discussed now and which created such a friendly and merry atmosphere in the hall, we will certainly find that this report contains a very deep analysis of the situation we are in now and the situation we may find ourselves in if we do not take any measures to improve the financial situation of the Commission, and I think that in finding the ways - we have to thank Mr. Aron for trying to find the ways of improving this situation.

Mr. Chairman, at the same time I would like to say that it seems to me that we could stop discussing this situation or this report, at this stage - the details of this situation at this stage because many countries, including our country, have no instructions, have not been authorised to either agree or disagree with the position or with the statements, with the proposals made in this report.

What I mean to say is that we all have to have time to consider these proposals and to make ourselves more prepared to discuss this question in future. Therefore, we propose that at the next meeting, that is at the 31st meeting of the IWC, and on the basis of these proposals, and on the basis of the home tasks which each delegation will have to decide to prepare, to come to some conclusion at the next meeting. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. These were only put down as ideas by the Finance Committee. How far should we pursue these, Dr. Aron?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I think it might be appropriate to address some of that question to the Secretary. I believe that one of the grave concerns we face is the current budget, at least the budget of last year, and I am not sure what instructions member nations have vis-a-vis their ability to meet the new budget, but unless there is an expression of willingness

to meet the new budget, I grow concerned that the Secretariat may very well find it impossible to meet salaries and continuing business and I would like a comment perhaps from Dr. Gambell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Gambell?

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the present situation is, indeed, serious in that we do not have enough money in the bank to pay the costs of the present meeting. We have spent, or committed, incurred debts for which we have no funds and, as you know, we have no reserves. So, the situation is very serious. I am not quite sure how we get out of it. We just need money to pay for what you have already had in the last week here and the scientists for two weeks in Cambridge. I would have thought though that there is little possibility of raising money in the coming year on any of the kinds of ideas which have been brought up and so I would think that we will struggle along as we seem to have to and come back with fresh ideas next year for the future.

The most immediate concern is that we do have enough money this year from whatever sources are available. I half feel inclined to go into the tee-shirt market, but this is much more serious and it would obviously help a very great deal if member governments who have their contributions sitting in Treasury departments at home could pay them to the IWC immediately, without waiting to get the formal notification or waiting until the end of the formal payment time. If a payment in advance could be made, recognising the fact that the Commission is very nearly bankrupt, this would help very considerably in the short-term and this is what we need.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, I would propose that we would be prepared at the next Annual Meeting to consider

the seat fee of £200. If we request that now there will be sufficient time for governments to reflect upon that and consult with their Ministers of Treasury. In the meantime, I am sorry to go one paragraph back where the committee recommends that the member nations consider voluntary contributions to the Commission's resources. I would suggest that this be expanded to also cover the observer organisations who, apparently, have a hell of a lot of money. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I tend to agree with Dr. Lafitsky that we will not reach any conclusion here at this point of time, but I do recommend to the Commissioners that they take these views back to their governments and be prepared to consider this in some detail at the next meeting. I presume there will be sufficient money coming elsewhere to hold the next meeting.

I, myself, see nothing wrong with people paying something to attend these meetings. I do not think it is fair that a small country with a delegation of two should subsidise the facilities that we have here - morning and afternoon tea, and so forth - subsidise this for delegations up to 20 or 25 strong, and also for the observers as well, and also for the Eskimos as well, also for the demonstrators drinking afternoon tea today. I think we have to be rational about this and that if people want to bring large delegations, they must be prepared to pay their share of the cost of running the operation.

As for the argument that those people who catch whales pay, there is also the argument, of course, that it suits some countries politically to attend these meetings to pursue their own political attitudes on other aspects of whaling. So, I think there is a two-fold benefit here for both sides of the question. Having said that, I am prepared to carry on with the

next item on here, the contract, and I do not want to prolong a discussion on these ideas. You have spoken once, the Commissioner for Mexico, I will give you the floor once more on this subject.

MEXICO (Dr. Rosenthal): Thank you very much, Dr. Bollen. Since your last comment seems to be addressed, at least among others, to myself I feel I have not only the right, but the duty to respond to you.

The Commission adopted at the 29th session, precisely because it was recognised that there were countries who were members of the IWC who were not engaged in whaling, a new way of assessing contributions and that new way of assessing contributions reflects the so-called interest areas, of which my government is one. I feel, however, Dr. Bollen, that your comment was not really called for. I assume that the events of this afternoon are heavily on all of our minds.

THE CHAIRMAN: As a point of clarification, which comment did you think was not called for?

MEXICO (Dr. Rosenthal): The comment that some governments attend these meetings to pursue political interests.

THE CHAIRMAN: In relation to whaling?

MEXICO (Dr. Rosenthal): Yes, in relation to whaling.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I agree with that.

MEXICO (Dr. Rosenthal): You agree with the fact that it was uncalled for?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I agree with what I say.

MEXICO (Dr. Rosenthal): Well, I do not, Dr. Bollen.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are entitled to your own view, Dr. Rosenthal.

MEXICO (Dr. Rosenthal): Thank you. I would like to make the point that I do not agree with that point of view. I

think that all members ...

THE CHAIRMAN (interrupting): We have heard you once on this and I do not want to pursue this discussion here at the expense of the other people and the time is getting very late. I accept the point that you said that you did not agree with me. Is that not sufficient? Iceland.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to express my complete agreement with every word you have said. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Dr. Aron, can we proceed with this? Argentina.

ARGENTINA (Mr. E.H. Iglesias): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry to intervene after your request to stop this matter. Mr. Chairman, really I am worried about some kind of observation we are doing here, but particularly with this one concerning some kind of ticket to pay to attend in this meeting. Really, I was reading again the Convention of the International Whaling Commission. I do not know: in '46 I have been not there, but really there is some kind of wish of the Commission at this moment even to enter in the United Nations body, even to have some - I was reading Article 3, paragraph (c)6 - and really I am afraid if we are taking this kind of measure we are really going far from the idea that the International Whaling Commission was closed as another international organisation.

Really, I am worried about that and I appeal to the Commissioners here to think we are going so far in distinguishing our organisation from the other international organisations. I think even my delegation perhaps it will be useful to have some kind of ticket, I mean for each person attending, but I think it is not really serious - I am sorry for the words I am using -

that to go so far in order that the other international body and to pay some kind of ticket to enter here, I am sorry to say this is my feeling, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Everybody is entitled to their view and I made my intervention for people to go away and think about it and come back at the next meeting when I would hope that decisions would be taken on these ideas that are listed on this page. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, please stop me as soon as you find I am wasting the time of the plenary. I wonder if it were possible if we would adopt the principle of paying a badge fee of £200 and make it subject certainly to some objection, so if we adopt it now and if within three months member governments object, O.K. those member governments do not pay next year and those who do not object, they pay next year. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Can we move on to the confirmation of Secretary's contract because we cannot finalise this question here.

At a meeting of Commissioners on Tuesday, we confirmed the contract for the Secretary and we decided to give tentative approval to the severance pay arrangements proposed by the Secretariat, pending a review by the government of the United Kingdom. This matter was thoroughly discussed by the Commissioners at their meeting and I think it is sufficient here to confirm the decisions that were taken. Any comment?

Dr. Aron, can we move on to 23.4.1, please?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): This item simply would authorise the Secretary to use his best judgment in the selection of room layout and other arrangements for the annual meeting.

I think that the Finance and Administration Committee were well satisfied with the work done by Dr. Gambell and the Secretariat in this regard for this year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are we all agreed? I am sure we are. Where do we go on to now?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): Item 23.4.2. You have to refer back to Appendix 2, and I believe it is the view of the Finance and Administration Committee that we should approve the rules of debate that have been submitted to you, as amended to reflect the current procedures vis-a-vis amending proposals.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Anyone wish to comment? Do we accept the recommendation? I see no dissenters: we accept that, Mr. Secretary. Thank you, Dr. Aron.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): 23.4.3: simply approves the present actions of the Secretariat to seek legal advice on a short-term basis as necessary from local legal firms.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a recommendation, gentlemen. Do you agree? It is agreed.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I think you should pay careful attention to Item 23.4.4. Each of you at the present time receives copies of the verbatim record. These are typed in copies and our attempt to reduce expenses to the Commission was pointed out to us by the Secretariat that this task is an expensive task; it is a task that many members of the Finance and Administration Committee felt was really unnecessary in view of the much less expensive method of providing to each member of the Commission that desired it copies of the tapes. This avoids transcription costs; it avoids substantial secretarial costs and also the time of the Secretariat. You should look at this carefully because it does present a change and it may be

particularly difficult for those nations who use the verbatim record for their own work in preparation for future meetings. It will save the Commission substantial monies.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any comment? Denmark

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): I so move, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We are going to move this one, are we? Do we all agree? Apparently, Dr. Aron, this is quite acceptable to us.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I think there may very well be - my delegation points this out - I think what is written here is not what we actually agreed to. I am sorry because we were talking here and we say that each member nation should receive one free copy of the verbatim record. I assume that all of you recognise the verbatim record here means the tape transcript as opposed to a typed manuscript.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is the recommendation. I am sure they all accept this. It is accepted. Publicity.

The Secretary says to me that the recommendation should say that the Secretariat continue to produce the verbatim recording in the first sentence. Thank you. Can you move on, please, Dr. Aron?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): The Secretariat had proposed an expanded publicity programme: in light of our present precarious financial state, the Finance and Administration Committee recommends that while we feel this task is important, it can be deferred. It urges member nations to take every action possible to inform interested parties of the work of the Commission. It does not recommend any new expenditures for publicity by the Secretariat.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure we will all agree with that. No dissenters? That is agreed. Next one please, Dr. Aron?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): We had recommended that the next annual meeting take place during the week of 25 June. I think at the present time the venue of that meeting is perhaps uncertain. I think it pends further discussion by Commissioners in light of possible invitations in light of the financial status of the Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are saying that we cannot decide on this now. Can we decide on this at a later stage in the meeting or not at all?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I think the only decision that can be made at this meeting would be, indeed, to (1) approve the budget that we have recommended with inclusion of funding for the meeting in London. It makes the assumption, however, that all Commissioners - and I think there was perhaps a mistake or, perhaps, I put it poorly; the sense of urgency that I feel about the budget did not mean to reflect on the three seemingly contentious considerations. It reflects on the fact that many member nations here may have instructions which limit the extent of increase in their contribution. If they cannot meet the current budget demands we will have to think seriously about changing our lifestyle.

I have the feeling, Sir, that our Secretary, unless he knows something more than we in the Finance and Administration Committee know, or have been made privy to, may be in much worse financial shape than he thinks.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is fairly important if we could establish as soon as possible where we are meeting next year but it is not reasonable to ask Commissioners here and now can their governments host the meeting next year because, obviously, they would not be briefed on that point because the rules have said that the

next meeting will be in London. Do we have to assume that it will be in London on that date, subject to change if some other country offers to host it? Dr. Aron.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): Even this is difficult. If you examine the attached document to our report you will note an addendum to Item 24, Date and Place of Next Meeting. The problem is complicated by difficulties of scheduling in Cambridge and in London of special meetings of the Technical Committee or an expanded meeting of the Scientific Committee and when you examine this it may very well be, Sir, that you will wish to change the date of a UK meeting to the week of 9 July.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am in somewhat of a dilemma here because I thought we had to decide at this meeting the date and place of the next meeting.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I think that you may wish to come back to this after the discussions of the Technical Committee and Scientific Committee to see what meetings the Commission is willing to agree to, and then, perhaps as a late agenda item, make the date of selection.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does this budget cover the next annual meeting?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): This budget covers the next meeting.

THE SECRETARY: No, you are paying for this meeting now. We are in the same mess on 1st June next year.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): This budget only goes to 1 June, that is correct; I am sorry. This budget does not cover the next meeting, that is correct.

THE SECRETARY: We are bankrupt again on 1st June.

THE CHAIRMAN: Frankly, I think it is most important that

we get a country to host the 31st meeting. I think there is little alternative financially, but I cannot see Commissioners being able to commit their governments to the increases at this stage. There is impasse. I think we should try and decide here and now that the Secretary communicates with member governments in the hope of finding one who is prepared to host the 31st meeting and this will partially solve some of our financial problems. Canada does not agree?

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Mr. Chairman, this annual meeting will be in one fiscal year, the next year's meeting will be not in the year for which we are budgeting now. So, we are not going to solve the problem we are facing today with this budget by arranging the hosting of next year's meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: But we cannot take the assumption that before the next meeting we will have solved all our financial problems, can we? Argentina.

ARGENTINA (Mr. E.H. Iglesias): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to emphasise that we are changing a custom during a quarter of a century. I mean, this is a very important decision. We have always had this here in London. Even the international treaty at the first moment it was saying that the UK will be concerned with this matter. I am afraid I have no instruction to change and move up to the rule of the <sup>seat</sup> siege in the future concerning the meeting.

Even if the <sup>seat</sup> siege would be established here to go on in the future but we are really changing a rule during a quarter of a century we are doing. I mean, all meeting except one of each three years. It would really be very difficult for me to change that. I prefer really the risk of some kind of bankruptcy as has already been said, but I am afraid it will be not possible that

because anyway this meeting is paying with the next budget. But really we have to realise, I mean, the next meeting will be here and afterwards in the next meeting we can decide that with more time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I thought we had agreed to change the Rule 2, but it does not change what will happen. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that there are two issues here. One is which budget to approve and the other is how to get the incremental amount of money. I get the impression that we will not be able to decide here how to get the incremental amount of money. I do think, however, that <sup>we</sup> ought to decide on a budget and approve it. Before December, either through some other mechanism or at the meeting that could take place in December of the Commission, we would then decide how the allocations should be made and governments could consult with the Commission ahead of time.

I do not know whether a motion is appropriate at this point. If it is, I would move to accept the budget of £118,854. Everyone should recognise that that would mean somehow getting the additional funds. If it is not appropriate to make such a motion now, I recommend that we, nonetheless, somehow accept this budget and go on to our other business. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We were coming back to this budget after all, depending on what the commitments were as a result of the Technical Committee report, so I cannot see us approving the budget at this point of time in our meeting.

Australia.

AUSTRALIA (Mr. Purnell-Webb): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think when we get to talking about the date and

place of the next meeting, we could possibly resolve that at this time we see the next meeting being in London, held in the week during the 25th June, but in the light of what happens between now and December in relation to taking into account the sorts of adjustments which will naturally follow some of the things we have agreed, the Secretariat could present then a revamped budget and, during that time, the possibility of a meeting - somebody being able to host the meeting elsewhere - might well arise and a decision could be taken then to change it. That might be the most appropriate way of doing it.

That would save us having to adopt a particular figure in the budget. We would agree to it in principle, but subject to adjustment by the Secretariat in the light of the variations which will flow from those things we have agreed to here at this meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can we hear from the Secretary on the feasibility of that?

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, it is slightly difficult in a practical sense that immediately after the approval of the budget at this meeting the Secretariat has to calculate the national contributions due to whatever formula is currently employed and to bill the member governments for their contribution, to be paid by a certain deadline, so that we need to have a starting figure in order to send out the invoices.

AUSTRALIA (Mr. Furnell-Webb): In that case, Mr. Chairman, we could approve the bare bones budget, as Dr. Aronson described it, at this meeting and do as I suggested between now and December; the Commission could have another look at it then.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean possibly have a supplementary budget?

AUSTRALIA (Mr. Purnell-Webb): That is what it boils down to, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who are the financial experts here? Shall we try that? Go over that again fairly quickly, Mr. Purnell-Webb, so that we all know what your proposal is, in English.

AUSTRALIA (Mr. Purnell-Webb): Thank you. I hope I can remember it, Mr. Chairman. I would propose that we approve the bare bones budget, which is the £132, 436 which includes country contributions of £118,858, and that between now and the December meeting the Secretariat take into account the proposals to which we have agreed at this meeting in the Finance and Administration Committee's report and adjust the budget accordingly and adjust it in the light of any offers to host the 31st meeting and present that as a supplementary budget for approval at the December meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you have convinced me. Whether you have convinced the other 16 Commissioners, I do not know. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, I got the impression that the budget is going from now on until June 1st 1979, is that right?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): That is that budget we have to deal with here, and another question is, how to deal with the expenses of the annual meeting next year. To the last subject, annual expenses next year, I will propose that the Commission urge member governments to consider between now and the special meeting in December if somebody could host that government. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The proposal is to approve of the

bare bones budget and come in with a supplementary budget to cover any additional costs that may occur that we cannot identify at the moment. Dr. Aron, being the head of the Finance and Administration Committee, I am sure you would be au fait with what Mr. Purnell-Webb is talking about?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, that we have any choice. I think there is something which may wish to be considered here and I am reluctant to bring up at this late hour a slightly different idea.

The reason we find ourselves in such difficulty is because we are approving a budget at this point in time from which a substantial sum of money has already been spent. I am reluctant to remind the Commissioners that when we said 'bare bones budget' we really meant it. Built into that budget was no special meeting in December. It is not in that budget.

We did recommend, to get around the problem faced by the odd way the Commission has budgeted itself, by recommending that the budget start in September 1 and be completed in August 31st, so at each annual meeting we would have the opportunity to consider a budget in advance of expenditure. It may very well be, in view of the discussions we have heard from the Commissioner from the United States and the Commissioner from Australia, that we may wish to revise that recommendation and consider a new fiscal year beginning with a calendar year on January 1. This would allow the December meeting to consider (1) new invitations, I trust, from member nations to host the June meeting. It would permit the interim budget to be extended on an annual basis after due consideration by all Commissioners during this six months interlude, so that

we could at this stage perhaps approve the transitional budget: instead of being a quarterly budget perhaps it should be a half-year budget and then begin the new cycle on January 1.

The problem that we are trying to avoid is confronting the Commission with a budget that, in fact, is a fait accompli. It is rather academic as to when that budget cycle starts, but it must start at a time that permits the Commission to plan in advance and commit its money in advance, not in the past.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where are we?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): Mr. Chairman, I have suggested, and I would call if I may through you and through the Commissioner from Australia - Australia has on its delegation John Saleeba who has been very helpful in the preparation of the budget documents. I wonder if he would care to comment at this point?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Saleeba?

AUSTRALIA (Mr. J.W. Saleeba): Mr. Chairman, if the Commission was to approve the bare bones budget and to look to having an interim budget presented to them in December, it would mean that the Commission would have approved a budget for 12 months, £132,000 and so many pounds, but would only be required to operate on that for seven months and then, at the December meeting, the whole matter could be looked at again and any increase necessary to make the adjustments that have been suggested could be built into that interim budget and accepted then and then, perhaps, a further contribution would be required to build up to whatever the total figure was. But certainly, the acceptance of the bare bones budget would provide the Commission with the funds to operate effectively for seven

months, which is the point at which, as I understand it, the whole matter would be open for review again and a further interim budget could be effected at that date.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would this help us to remain solvent through to December and the next meeting?

AUSTRALIA (Mr. Saleeba): So long as at December the matter was reviewed and a further budget was approved, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that we have got ourselves in such a financial position that this matter will have to be discussed at the special meeting that we have been talking about. So, can we have from Australia again what they propose we should do because I want to get the concurrence of the other Commissioners so that we can move on from this subject.

AUSTRALIA (Mr. Purnell-Webb): Mr. Chairman, we would propose adoption of the bare bones budget, or the budget of £132,436, and then we would additionally propose that the Secretary, between now and then, adjust the figures in accordance with the proposals to which we have agreed, which are set out in the Finance and Administration Committee's report, and bring to the December special meeting a supplementary budget which will take into account those things and may be able to take into account any offer to host the 31st meeting.

I had better back-track there a little, Mr. Chairman. That will not come into this budget but he may be able to tell us at that time that there is an offer to host the 31st meeting and that will give the Commission some indication of the forward funding for the interim budget period from June 1 to September 1 next year, to which we have already agreed.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the government of Australia has just proposed

that we adopt the bare bones budget and that we decide in December what to do thereafter. I second the proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Any further discussion? I can see the heads nodding. I am not sure whether you are going to sleep or agreeing. We will assume the latter and we will accept the bare bones budget as outlined by the Australian delegation and seconded by the United States.

That still has not answered my question in regard to the date and place of next meeting. I presume we make the assumption that it will be in London at that particular date, subject to changes and invitations. O.K? So, that deals with that particular point.

25.1, Dr. Aron, refers to revision of the schedule in the light of legal opinion. Do you have a recommendation there?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): We simply recommend that the Technical Committee convene a working group of lawyers from member nations to rewrite IWC Schedule. The member nations should cover the costs of this group's work.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are we all agreed?  
Canada.

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Just a very small change, Mr. Chairman. I would think it appropriate that this be handled by a working group of Finance and Administration rather than the Technical Committee. It is Commission business; managing the Commission, rather than managing whaling.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you are right. I can see my colleague from Argentina nodding his head and he should know. Thank you. Shall we change that to the Finance and Administration

Committee? No other comments? We will do that.

Dr. Aron, you have another piece of paper here: have we dealt with the items on that?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I think there is really only one item on that other piece of paper and that deals with the request by the Scientific Committee on the admission of observers. It is our view that IUCN is an international organisation. It is our view, if the Scientific Committee has concern about its membership, it is up to them to review and revise as necessary their rules of procedure. It also is appropriate for them to remind all organisations that attend Scientific Committee meetings of the rules of procedure of the Scientific Committee requiring that advisers have appropriate scientific expertise.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would propose that Rule A2 of the Scientific Committee's rules should be revised to read, 'intergovernmental organisations', which would exclude the IUCN.

We do not consider IUCN to be of similar scientific standing than, for instance, the FAO. We have concrete arguments for this opinion and we can bring it forward if you so wish. However, as I have indicated earlier, we would be prepared that IUCN be given ad hoc adviser status in the Scientific Committee and I have a proposal for amendment, which would be to put in a new paragraph (3) in the rules - that was a further amendment. My first proposal was to change to 'intergovernmental organisations' in paragraph A2, and then after paragraph A2 to put in a rule saying -

"Further to organisations mentioned in the preceding

paragraph, the IUCN has ad hoc status of adviser" and then renumber the following paragraphs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I have a seconder for that proposal? Japan, did you wish to speak?

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): Just I wanted to second the Danish proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, will we have the views of the Scientific Committee on this before we decide on it? My only concern is that we may not have that and I would prefer to have those views before knowing how to cast my vote. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: You know my views on getting back to the scientific level in the plenary sessions and I think this is one occasion where you may need clarification on this organisation and how it fits into the work of the Whaling Commission. So, under those circumstances, if you wish I will allow Dr. Allen to speak. You are allowed to speak, Dr. Allen.

AUSTRALIA (Dr. Allen): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reason why the Scientific Committee referred this matter to the Commission was that it had on two occasions considered a proposal that the IUCN representative should be given the same status as the FAO and UNEF representatives, that is adviser status, and had found a division of opinion among its members.

The rule that is proposed now would have the effect of clarifying that situation as far as the Scientific Committee is concerned and I believe it would be entirely satisfactory: we would no longer have a matter which was open to doubt and I think the ruling would be in accordance with the views of the majority

of the members of the Scientific Committee.

The only question that I can see is that the proposed new rule would prevent any other non-intergovernmental organisations being given similar status except on a purely individual ad hoc basis. At the moment I cannot think of any other organisation where this question might arise, but then, of course, this could well be a possibility in the future. It certainly would solve our immediate problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Could I just ask the Chairman of the Scientific Committee what the views are of the Scientific Committee members, that is what the vote has been on this subject. He has said that a majority feel one way. Could he give me some indication of the size of that majority.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Allen): The Scientific Committee avoids going to a vote. It has never been to a vote on any item in my experience of the Committee. I think I can say that we have a situation in which there is a definite majority which would favour the admission of IUCN, but I cannot be more precise than that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Does that satisfy you, Mr. Frank?

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a motion before the Chair proposed by Denmark and seconded by Japan. Are you all in agreement with that or do you wish to vote? Mexico wishes to vote, so we will vote.

Let us make it clear what we are voting about. I will ask the Secretary to read out the motion as he sees it.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the proposal is to amend.

the rule A2 as presently before you to delete the word 'international organisation' to 'intergovernmental organisations' and to insert a new rule (3):

"Further to paragraph (2) above the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources shall have ad hoc adviser status in the Scientific Committee".

So there are two changes: one to change 'international' to 'intergovernmental' in the existing paragraph and then a new paragraph all to IUCN.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a change to the schedule and so a simple majority is adequate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mexico.

MEXICO (Mr. A.D. Rojo): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the sponsor of this particular proposal to explain the difference to me between 'international' and 'intergovernmental'?

THE CHAIRMAN: Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the microphone to my colleague from our Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

DENMARK (Mr. ): I will try to be very brief. We have had to deal with this problem in reference to the meeting in Copenhagen and we found that the definition of 'intergovernmental' is that the so-called organisation is established by international treaty between contracting governments, while an international organisation can be any organisation which has more than one national in its membership. I believe even in the Whaling Commission you have a special definition of what is an international organisation,

that you have to have members in more than three countries, I don't believe, so the definition of an international organisation is much, much more wide than the definition of an intergovernmental organisation. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are we ready to vote?

Call the roll please, Mr. Secretary. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, could I just clarify: does the IUCN go to the Scientific Committee meetings under this rule, or does it not go?

THE SECRETARY: It goes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Call the roll please.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the vote now starts at

Argentina (Abstain): Australia (Yes): Brazil (Yes): Canada

(Abstain): Denmark (Yes): France (No): Iceland (Yes):

Japan (Yes): Mexico (No): Netherlands (No): New Zealand

(Abstain): Norway (Abstain): Panama (No): South Africa

(Abstain): USSR (Yes): UK (Yes): USA (Abstain)

Argentina (Abstain)

Mr. Chairman, there were seven votes cast in favour and four against and so that proposal has a majority.

THE CHAIRMAN: And so it is accepted. Thank you.

Dr. Aron, have you any more business from your committee?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I do not have any more business, but I have a point of clarification with you, Mr. Chairman. I understood the advice of the Commissioner from Canada regarding the review of the schedule. We do have one minor problem. Whereas the Chairman of the Technical Committee is, for all intents and purposes, a standing officer of the Commission, the Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee

serves during the course of the meeting and while I think we are quite prepared to do that which the Commissioner from Canada has requested that we do, I think I need a ruling from the Chair, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can we obtain a compromise here by asking the Chairman of the Technical Committee to do this in collaboration with the Chairman - well, I take your point, there is no such Finance and Administration Committee permanent position, is there? I am just wondering then, thinking out aloud, that this be done in collaboration with the Chairman of the Technical Committee in collaboration with the Secretary of the Commission. Canada, how do you feel about that?

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Mr. Chairman, that would be acceptable. The officers of the Commission, the Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: As long as we do the work, that is the main thing. So, we will change our position on that. Dr. Aron, this means that you have dealt with Agenda Item 23 in its entirety and 24 and 25.1 and I think that was all the work that was allocated to your committee. Is that so?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I believe so, Sir.

? AUSTRALIA: We deferred two items.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right. We cannot deal with those two until we have heard from the rest of the Technical Committee so we are not in a position as yet to adopt the report of the Finance and Administration Committee on 23.5. So, Dr. Aron, we will have to come back to that in a moment.

The time is five minutes to eight and I am just wondering whether the Commissioners and their delegations and observers would like to have a break for an hour, or do you wish to go on

now? I am at your pleasure. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I express a preference for continuing on now. I find that one hour for dinner is inadequate and I would prefer to have three hours for dinner at 11 o'clock tonight. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The views of anybody else? You are assuming that we will finish at 11 o'clock tonight? Denmark, do you wish to be excused again?

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): In order to have a sandwich, Mr. Chairman. I had no lunch.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I have one for and one against. Argentina says continue. Canada?

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Canada votes for dinner, Mr. Chairman.

NORWAY (Mr. I. Rindal): I am fully in agreement with my Danish colleague. It would be much better now to have at least a sandwich and rest our brains a little. Perhaps we would be even more fresh and on the ball when we have been mellowed with a beer or, perhaps, a half a bottle of wine. So, I would suggest that we break now and return at 9 o'clock. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other views? United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM (Mr. R.C. Gurd): I would subscribe to that view too, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I am getting a majority now. Netherlands. We are going for a one hour break and please be punctual and be back here at 9 o'clock. Thank you.

(The Commission adjourned)



INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

THIRTIETH ANNUAL MEETING

London

26 - 30 June 1978

THIRD PLENARY SESSION

30th June 1978

9.00 p.m. onwards

Transcribed from tape by:

**The Palantype Organisation Limited**  
North Mews  
Northington Street  
London WC1N 2JP

Telephone 01-405 9162



THE CHAIRMAN: We continue this plenary session of the Commission and, in doing so, I wish to receive a note handed to me by the Japanese delegation. This note reads:

"The Japanese delegation would like to express its regret concerning the grave incident which took place on 30th June, 1978. It is unprecedented for a group of unauthorised persons to gain access to the conference chamber of an intergovernmental meeting. It is even more extraordinary that these persons were given the chance to actually throw red dye at the Japanese delegates. It seems evident that it is impossible to conduct a calm and rational discussion when such violent behaviour can occur. In view of the grave consequences, the Japanese delegation wishes to be informed of the parties responsible for the security of the arrangements, including control of the access points into the conference chamber. It is further requested that steps be taken to prevent the reoccurrence of similar incidents and a solemn assurance in this regard be given to the Japanese delegation."

Now, the question asked, of course, is who was responsible for the security arrangements, including the control of the access points in the conference chamber. I can only reply to the Japanese delegation to the effect that the security officers of this hotel were warned, the police were alerted, the police were told and it was completely beyond the control of the International Whaling Commission's Secretariat.

In regard to the reoccurrence of such an incident, I think that we will have to think very seriously about future security in regard to any of our future meetings and I hope we can reassure

the Japanese delegation that this will not occur again unless we can possibly help it. Thank you.

The Chairman of the Technical Committee, if we can go through the agenda, commencing from the beginning, it would be easier for the Commissioners to follow, but it may be more difficult for you to report. If you<sup>have</sup> the facility and the notes, I would like to start on this procedure, commencing with Agenda Item 8, the Terms of Reference for Infractions Sub-Committee. Mr. Asgeirsson.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not think it could be possibly more difficult for me to report to the Commission and this time I am in a very unhappy position that all my notes have been destroyed, so I propose that we this time make this a report from the Chairman of the Technical Committee - a joint report from the Chairman of the Technical Committee and the Secretary - and I appeal to the Commissioners to help in reporting accurately what happened - that is to say, the recommendations from the Technical Committee - I do not think we can be expected in this hour and in the light of what has happened to give you a very accurate report of all the discussions and I do not think that is necessary either because it should be pressing the minds of delegates around the table.

If we turn our attention to the item you referred us to, Item 8 on our Agenda, then, as usual, the Technical Committee established a sub-committee on infractions and that sub-committee viewed this agenda item and you will note in page 5 of the sub-committee's report - you all have it in your hands, I hope - it is paragraph (t) that relates to Agenda Item 8, there is no action needed and no recommendation but we propose that the

plenary take note of what is contained in this paragraph.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So, I take it there is no action to be taken by the plenary session.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Well, you appreciate that the contents of this paragraph is really towards giving a mandate to the sub-committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: In this document we seem to have a conclusion by the sub-committee that it should appropriately consider matters and documents related to the observer scheme and infractions insofar as they involve monitoring of compliance with the schedule and penalties for infractions thereof. Now, I guess this is the mandate that they consider they require to carry out their work. It is fairly general, but I think it covers what they do and I think, in view of our situation in which we find ourselves, we have to accept this at this meeting and maybe it will receive further consideration the next time we meet. Do you all agree? We accept that, Mr. Secretary.

The next item, Mr. Asgeirsson, would become the new management procedure and I am not sure whether you dealt with this Agenda 10 and Agenda 11 together. Can you give us a reference and give us any proposals which may be coming from your committee.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We did indeed deal with these agenda items together and we have, in fact, a written report from the Technical Committee on these agenda items. This report appears in the second part of the Technical Committee's report and it is identified by the agenda items on the left top side.

The Technical Committee made the recommendation with regard

to the review of the present management procedure, namely that a special group of scientists consider these matters under the agenda item by correspondence during the coming year with, perhaps, a short meeting before the next Annual Meeting. The following membership was proposed: Mermoz from Argentina, Allen from Australia who was proposed to convene the group, Doubleday from Canada, Fukuda from Japan, Garrod or Horwood from U.K., Chapman from U.S.A. and Holt from the FAO. It is also possible that the U.S.S.R. may participate and I propose that we adopt this recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I have a seconder? Denmark. You have heard the recommendation and the seconding of this proposal, are you all in agreement? It is accepted.

That deals then with Agenda Item 10 and 11 and we pass on to Agenda Item 12. Can you find that amongst your papers? Will you please proceed?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have dealt with a number of the stocks under Agenda Item 12. I was going to refer you to the written report of the Technical Committee, the latter part of it, and I refer you to the third page, identified Plenary Agenda Item 12.2, southern hemisphere sperm whales.

There was an intensive discussion in the Technical Committee with regard to the classification and catch limits for the southern hemisphere sperm whales and we had proposals and amendment proposals mentioned in our report and the classifications the Technical Committee recommends to the plenary are as follows:

Division 1, males, sustained management; females, sustained management. Division 2, initial for both. Division 3, sustained management for both. Division 4, initial manage-

ment for males, protection for females. Division 5, sustained for males and initial management for females. Division 6, initial for both. Division 7, sustained for both. Division 8, initial for both and Division 9 protected for both sexes. And I propose that we adopt these classifications.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I have a seconder? Australia.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): If we then move on to our recommendations with regard to catch limits, then do you wish me to read them for all the divisions or just refer you to the paper?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, for the purpose of the records seeing it is being recorded, you should read out the recommended quotas.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. The recommended limits are as follows: Division 1, males - 273, females - 91. Division 2, males - 808, females - 241. Division 3, 847 for males, 281 for females. Division 4, 566 males and 0 females. Division 5, 402 males, 159 females. Division 6, 276 males, 83 females. Division 7, 176 males, 98 females. Division 8, 874 males, 261 females and Division 9, 0 for both stocks, and I propose that we adopt.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mexico, are you seconding it?

MEXICO (Mr. A.D. Rojo): No, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I get a seconder before we have the discussion - Denmark. Mexico?

MEXICO (Mr. A.D. Rojo): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Technical Committee has recommended to the plenary that the catch limits for southern hemisphere sperm whales in Divisions 5 and 7 be set at 75% of their '77/'78 levels, as a compromise solution for opposing points of view which were manifested both in the Scientific and the Technical Committees. It is my under-

standing that the Scientific Committee at the outset was unwilling to make specific recommendations on catch limits for these divisions because of the unavailability of precise data. At the urging of the Technical Committee and after a brief meeting, the Scientific Committee reconsidered the question and came up with the recommendation that is now before us.

On the other hand, this afternoon the Technical Committee decided to recommend that a special meeting of the Scientific Committee and the Commission be held at the end of this year in order to re-examine the data and make a more precise study of the basis for setting catch limits. The Technical Committee also decided in agreeing to the special meetings in December to recommend zero as the catch limits for northern Pacific, Western Division sperm, as an interim measure pending the outcome of those meetings.

It would thus seem to my government that there are sufficient reasons for the Commission to act in a similar way regarding at least Divisions 5 and 7 of the southern hemisphere where a declining birth rate among female sperms seems to indicate the necessity for a zero quota until the Scientific Committee can re-examine the matter. We realise in making the proposals for a zero quota in Divisions 5 and 7 until the special meetings that the whaling fleet will be unable to begin operations as planned in late October. However, we feel that the doubts raised within the Scientific Committee justify a postponement of the start of operations pending the reassessment and I would, therefore, formally propose that in Divisions 5 and 7 the figures read zero.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is an amendment to the proposal being put forward via the Scientific Committee and seconded by Denmark?

MEXICO (Mr. A.D. Rojo): That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I have a seconder for that proposal?  
Panama. Any discussion? We will take the vote on the amendment  
first. I will suggest that the Secretary reads the amendment  
first so you know exactly what you are voting for.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, may I take the liberty  
of asking clarification on the amendment. Is it to take the  
figures for the other divisions, except for 5 and 7 where you  
insert zero, not just 5 and 7 on their own?

MEXICO (Mr. A.D. Rojo): Pardon me?

THE SECRETARY: Do you want to include the figures  
for Divisions 1 to 4, 6, 8 and 9 as they stand? Thank you. I  
am sorry, I had not fully understood your proposal.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal is that the quotas as given by  
the Chairman of the Technical Committee should be adopted,  
except in Divisions 5 and 7 for both males and females, that  
there should be zero quotas inserted. The figures are  
available in the Technical Committee report in the written  
record and the change is to change Divisions 5 and 7 in both  
sexes to zero. This is an amendment to the original proposal.  
This is a schedule change requiring a three-quarters majority of  
those voting. The rule starts at Australia.

Australia (No): Brazil (Abstain): Canada (No):

Denmark (No): France (Yes): Iceland (No):

Japan (No): Mexico (Yes): Netherlands (Yes):

New Zealand (No): Norway (No): Panama (Yes):

South Africa (No): USSR (No): UK (Abstain):

USA (Abstain): Argentina (Yes):

Mr. Chairman, there were five votes cast for and nine against:  
the amendment does not pass.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will proceed then to the original motion, proposed by the Scientific Committee and seconded by Denmark.

THE SECRETARY: We now come to the original proposal from Iceland, from the Technical Committee Chairman, seconded by Denmark, to take the figures as given in the Technical Committee report for all divisions. The voting now will start with Brazil.

Brazil (Yes): Canada (Yes): Denmark (Yes):  
France (Abstain): Iceland (Yes): Japan (Yes):  
Mexico (No): Netherlands (Abstain): New Zealand (Yes):  
Norway (Yes): Panama (No): South Africa (Yes):  
USSR (Yes): UK (Yes): USA (Yes): Argentina (Abstain):  
Australia (Yes).

Mr. Chairman, there were 12 votes cast for, with two against, it therefore has the required three-quarters majority to change the schedule.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let the schedule be amended accordingly.  
Mr. Asgeirsson, you have a caveat to that, I think.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think the Commission should note that it was also agreed in the Technical Committee, on the advice of the Scientific Committee, that there should be no 10% allowance between divisions as in previous years. Japan asked that this matter be reconsidered further by the Scientific Committee at its next meeting and I propose that we take note of this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we take note of this? Note is taken. Thank you.

The next stock involved in Agenda Item 12, Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): If we go by the report of the Technical Committee we have in our hands then the next stock

would be the southern hemisphere fin whales, where the Technical Committee recommends a protection category and, therefore, a zero quota and I propose that we accept this recommendation.

It was also recommended that a reanalysis of the fin whales stocks, especially in Area 6, should be undertaken as soon as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we have a seconder? Denmark seconded. Are we all in agreement? We all agree; that will be written in the schedule. Next please?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. North Pacific fin whales: the Technical Committee recommends that stock be placed in a protected category.

THE CHAIRMAN: A seconder please? Panama, Canada. All in agreement? We agree.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. If we move on to the minke whale stock in the north Pacific, then it is recommended that the Okhotsk Sea/West Pacific stock be classified as sustained management stock with a catch quota of 400 animals. It is also recommend that an examination of the effects of efficiency resulting from the introduction of motor boats be submitted next year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Seconder, please? Japan. All in agreement? No dissenters: accepted.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The Technical Committee recommends further that the Sea of Japan stock be classified as sustained management stock and that the total catching effort is not increased on this stock and the government of the Republic of Korea is urged to take appropriate steps to implement this decision until they join the Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Seconder please? Japan. All in

agreement? Carried. I am sorry, United States? France's first.

FRANCE (Mr. C. Roux): Yesterday, some things were coming very quickly. I had something to say about the minke whales by Republic of Korea in Japan Sea. I should like to propose a small amendment to the motion approving action of the Technical Committee with respect to the Sea of Japan stock of minke whales now being taken by the Republic of Korea.

I move that a quota be established for the coming season of 473 whales, which is average annual harvest of 15 years from 1962 through '76. The reason for my motion is so that a very large number of minke whales, more than 1,000, were taken by the Republic of Korea in 1977. This large catch has caused concern that the stock may become rapidly depleted.

I know that the Republic of Korea has expressed the intention of joining the Commission this year and I should think that it would be appropriate to set a quota for the guidance of that government. In any case, the Whaling Commission has set a precedent for the action I propose by setting a quota for sperm whales in the North Atlantic which are taken mainly by non-IWC nations. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Do I have a seconder for that proposal? United States. Japan?

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): Before going to vote, I would like to mention two things. The Republic of Korea has indicated its willingness to join this Commission and, of course, that means willingness to comply with the regulations of the IWC, subject to their right in the Convention, of course. But, so really I question if this is a time for us to set a quota as indicated, proposed, by the French delegation.

The French delegation proposed that catch limit be set at the average for 15 years. I am not quite sure if my colleague from France is aware of the facts of setting the quota at an average for the certain years. You might assume that if you set the quota at an average what you could catch for the coming 15 years would be just about the same. But this is not true because catch fluctuates up and down of the catch limit so that what you are proposing is actually trying to reduce the catch to about a quota of the total catch achieved in the past 15 years. So, I do not think we can do this without more thorough consideration by the Scientific Committee.

As I mentioned, we do not have - Japan has no interest in this fishery. What we catch is just a few numbers as compared with the hundreds of whales utilised by my neighbour country. I am really saying this from the point of view of justice so that I wonder if France and the United States may review the situation before asking for the vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain why I believe that there should be a quota here. First, the Republic of Korea has indicated that it will join the IWC by the end of this year. We are voting on a quota for next year: in other words, when this quota will take effect Korea will be a party to this Convention and a member of this Commission. It seems to me, under those circumstances, it should not engage in an unregulated fishery.

Secondly, the Republic of Korea in anticipation of its joining the Commission, has asked that it be treated differently than other countries. For example, in the resolution on non-member whaling

countries it has asked to be treated differently and we have accommodated that wish. If it is going to make such a request in anticipation, it seems that we should establish a quota in anticipation.

Thirdly, the question has been whether or not it is prudent to establish a quota based on a 15 year historical average. The Scientific Committee does do that in absence of other evidence. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Japan.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In response to the remarks made by the United States delegate, I would like to remind you that the Scientific Committee does not recommend establishing the quota. So, are we complying with the recommendation of the Scientific Committee or not? This is a serious question and I dearly question the validity of setting the quota at such a low level. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We have a recommendation and a seconder for the Scientific Committee recommendation - Technical, I am sorry - and an amendment. According to the usual procedure we will vote on the amendment first. Mr. Secretary, would you make it absolutely clear to the Commissioners the nature of the amendment.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the amendment is to set a catch limit on the minke whale stock in the Sea of Japan at 473 whales, four seven three, for 1979. That is an amendment to the original proposal which set no figure. The proposal is a schedule amendment and requires a three-quarters majority. The vote starts at ...

THE CHAIRMAN: Panama.

PANAMA (Mr. R. Dec Vega): Mr Chairman, just before.

the vote, I would like to ask a question of the Scientific Committee because I am a bit puzzled about this. I wonder if it is true that last year the Scientific Committee recommended that the catch limit of 473 was recommended not to be increased - just as a matter of curiosity?

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Allen, can you answer that, please?

AUSTRALIA (Dr. Allen): I apologise, I could not quite catch the question, I am sorry.

PANAMA (Mr. R. Decerega): Last year the Scientific Committee recommended that the catch limit of 473 should not be increased.

AUSTRALIA (Dr. Allen): That was the recommendation last year. This year the Scientific Committee considered the matter quite a lot. It was rather puzzled by the circumstances which have created this more or less doubling of the catch which has taken place in 1977 and, although the situation was not all that clear, the recommendation, as you heard, was that the best way of controlling the situation might be a recommendation that the efforts should not be increased.

PANAMA (Mr. R. Decerega): I just wanted to know if the Scientific Committee were a bit worried about the increase of quota. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Can we proceed with the vote.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I would remind you we are voting for a figure of 473 for the Sea of Japan minke whale stock. The voting starts at Canada:

Canada (Abstain): Denmark (Yes): France (Yes):

Iceland (Abstain): Japan (No): Mexico (Yes):

Netherlands (Yes): New Zealand (Abstain): Norway (No):

Panama (Yes): South Africa (Abstain): USSR (No):  
UK (Yes): USA (Yes): Argentina (Yes): Australia (Abstain):  
Brazil (Abstain).

Mr. Chairman, there were eight votes cast for and three against, which is not the necessary three-quarters majority to change the schedule. So, we go back to the original proposal which was for no quota recommendation. Do you require to vote on that one?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, please.

THE SECRETARY: The proposal now was the one from the Technical Committee, given by Iceland and seconded by Japan, that there should be no figure inserted in the schedule for the Sea of Japan minke whale stock and I think it would be appropriate to couple that with the recommendation that the total catching effort is not increased on this stock and the government of the Republic of Korea is urged to take appropriate steps to implement this decision until they join the Commission. The voting now starts at Denmark:

Denmark (Abstain): France (Abstain): Iceland (Yes):  
Japan (Yes): Mexico (Abstain): Netherlands (Abstain):  
New Zealand (Yes): Norway (Yes): Panama (Abstain):  
South Africa (Yes): USSR (Yes): UK (Abstain):  
USA (No): Argentina (Abstain): Australia (Abstain):  
Brazil (Yes): Canada (Yes).

Mr. Chairman, there were eight votes cast for and one against, that received the necessary three-quarters majority for the schedule.

THE CHAIRMAN: Accordingly, the schedule will be amended. Mr. Asgeirsson, your next report from the Technical Committee, please.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. The final

we are still on the North Pacific for the remainder of the stocks, the minke whale stocks there. The Technical Committee recommends no change in the schedule, but that it still be initial management stock with a rider that this is pending a satisfactory estimate of stock size, and zero catch limit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where do we find this?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Immediately after the Sea of Japan stock.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I have a seconder? Denmark.  
Are you all in favour? No dissenters. We accept the necessary amendment to the schedule. Thank you, Mr. Asgeirsson.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): We then move to the North Atlantic minke whales, Mr. Chairman, and the Technical Committee recommends that for the Canadian East Coast stock it be classified as sustained management, with a catch quota of 48. The West Greenland stock be classified as sustained management, with a catch quota of 394, and a rider that it is provisionally listed as sustained management for 1979 pending the accumulation of sufficient information for classification. This is the same rider as is in the present schedule.

If we move on to the East Greenland/Iceland/Jan Mayen stock, then it is recommended that it be classified sustained management with a catch quota of 320 - no change there either. The Svalbard/Norway/British Isles stock be classified as sustained management with a catch quota of 1,790. This is also the same as in the present schedule, so there is no change.

It is also recommended that the proportion of the females in the catches, especially from the West Greenland and Svalbard/Norway/British Isles stocks be reduced. Norway indicated that it recognises the problem and will look into the situation,

including investigation of the effect of the high take of females on the population and I propose that we adopt this.

There was a concensus in the Technical Committee, that is why I read it out all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Canada.

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Just a point of clarification, Mr. Chairman. The number listed for the West Greenland stock does not coincide with the figure currently in the schedule. One number is 394, the Technical Committee report, and the other is 397 in the present schedule. Is there a typographical error in one of these?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a reduction. Could I ask a question: why are there three little crosses against SMS on the West Greenland stock? That is shown in the schedule as a footnote provisionally listed. Should that be changed, 1978 to 1979?

THE SECRETARY: That is how he read it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did he? Thank you. A seconder please? Canada, Norway. Any discussion? All in favour? The schedule be amended accordingly. Thank you, Mr. Asgeirsson.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): If I then move on to the fin whale stocks of the North Atlantic. It was similarly a concensus in the Technical Committee, so I wonder if we can take them all at the same time. Assuming that we can then the recommendation of the Technical Committee is for the Nova Scotia stock, a protected category. The Newfoundland/Labrador stock be classified Initial Management with a catch quota of 90. The West Greenland stock be classified Sustained Management stock, with a catch quota of 15. It is also recommended that the development of a marking scheme is established to determine the stock size.

Finally, the East Greenland/Iceland stock be classified as Sustained Management, with a catch quota of 304 maximum in a six-year block quota of 1,524. This is the same as we have in the present schedule.

It is recommended, with regard to this stock, that log book data from 1974 should be examined for the development of searching effort data.

The North Norway stock of fin whales be classified as Sustained Management, with reference to the schedule that it be provisionally listed as Sustained Management for 1979, pending the accumulation of sufficient information for classification.

West Norway/Faroe Islands stock be classified as Sustained - as Protected stock and, finally, the Spain/Portugal/British Isles stock be classified as Sustained Management stock, with no catch quota but, again, with the same footnote in the schedule as we have in the present schedule that it be provisionally listed as Sustained Management for 1979 and catches not to exceed present catch levels. With regard to this stock, it is recommended that the Commission make renewed efforts to obtain catch and effort data from the catcher/factory vessel, Sierra, based on the Canary Islands.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Do I Have a seconder? Canada. Any discussion? All in favour? Contrary? It is accepted. The amendment will be made in the schedule.

Mr. Asgeirsson, our next stock please?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The next stock would be the Sei whale stocks in the North Atlantic. The Technical Committee recommends that the Nova Scotia stock be classified as Protected stock and that the Iceland/Denmark Strait stock be classified as Sustained Management stock, with a catch quota of

84 and with regard to this stock, it is recommended that a marking programme be carried out as soon as possible. With regard to this stock, Iceland described their successful effort regulation in this fishery for the past 30 years and pointed out that the reduced catch limits now resulting from the averaging procedure on a less preferred and erratically appearing species. They will raise the subject again next year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We will take those first. Do I have a seconder for that proposal from the Technical Committee? Norway. Any discussion? All in favour? Carried. The amendment will be made in the schedule. The next one, Mr. Asgeirsson, please?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The sperm whales of North Atlantic are the next stock appearing in our report and the Technical Committee recommends that they be classified Sustained Management with a catch quota of 685 and it is further recommended that the collection of biological material from catches at Spanish land stations be obtained.

THE CHAIRMAN: A seconder please? Denmark. Any discussion? All in favour? Carried. The next one please?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The bottlenosed whales of the North Atlantic: the Technical Committee recommends a Protected category for this stock.

THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Canada and the Netherlands. Any discussion? All in favour? Carried. Does that conclude Agenda Item 12, Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): No, it does not, far from that. There are still quite many stocks that we have not dealt with. The next would be the Greenland humpback - no, this is

Agenda Item 13, but there are still a few stocks that we have not dealt with.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can they be dealt with?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes. The next stock we can take - I propose that we take the sperm whale stock of the North Pacific.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we are now working from our notes. You will not have the paper in front of you for some of these stocks, so you will have to bear with us and please ask a question if you are not absolutely sure of what is being proposed by the Technical Committee.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. After a thorough discussion in the Technical Committee, it was agreed to recommend to the plenary that the North Pacific sperm whale stocks be classified as follows. For the Western Division, the males be classified Sustained Management and the females Sustained Management. For the Eastern Division, males Initial Management and females Initial Management. And I propose that we accept this recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Seconder please? Japan.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The catch quota recommended

...

THE CHAIRMAN: Are we all in agreement? We agree.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The catch quota recommended by the Technical Committee, or quotas rather, would be as follows: for the Western Division, the males - the catch quota for males would be 0 and the quota for females would be 0 too, and this would have an annotation that the quotas for 1979 to be set later by decision of the Commission before operations start.

If we move to the Eastern Division, then it is proposed that

the quota for the males be 3,014 and the quota for females be 667 and here we would also have a footnote saying that these catch limits may also be reviewed at the special, at the December 1978 special meeting of the Commission. I propose that we adopt this recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Seconder please? Mexico. Any discussion? Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, I indicated this morning the reasons why I do not like this procedure. However, taking in account the late hours I am not going to pursue to make any amendments on catches, but I want really to have noted in the record of the plenary that I think we all are in agreement that these figures are provisionally based on some science which very likely is to be improved so that if revisions in upward direction is going through at the special meeting I think we will all agree that this is not because of any pressure from anybody but because we, at that time, will have acted upon a better and full scientific advice.

I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, if any delegation will contest what I just said. Thank you, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will soon find out, Mr. Lemche. Anyone wish to comment on the Commissioner for Denmark's comment? Well, we have a proposal which has been moved and seconded. Are you all in agreement? I see no dissenters. It is carried. I am sorry, did I overlook you, Canada?

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Would you repeat the proposal please, Mr. Chairman?

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the proposal is that for the North Pacific sperm males - I am sorry, we have lost

something in the way. There are two divisions and we have changed the boundary line slightly between the divisions, I think. That should be taken note of, should it not?

Anyway, there are two divisions. The Western one has a zero quota for both males and females, with a footnote attached in the schedule that quotas for 1979 be set later by decision of the Commission before operations start. And for the Eastern division, the male figure is 3,014 and females 667, with a footnote that these catch limits may also be reviewed at the December 1978 special meeting of the Commission.

There is, inevitably, with a footnote like that a recommendation that there is a special meeting as indicated. I think that must be part of the total recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Japan.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): I just want to appeal to other delegations to vote 'No' to this proposal. It is not necessary to establish quotas when we decided to have the special meeting in December, which is prior to the start of the whaling operations and, secondly, zero quota for male is in contravention with the recommendation of the majority group of the Scientific Committee. There is no basis for proposing zero for males. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Asgeirsson.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that we should first decide in the plenary if we are going to adopt the recommendation of the Technical Committee to have a special meeting in December, then come back to the quotas.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are we all clear on the proposal by the Technical Committee? Did I hear 'no' somewhere? Apparently, we are. All in favour? Japan.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): We are talking about the explanation on asterisks or we are voting on the quota?

THE CHAIRMAN: We are just agreeing to have a special meeting. I think that is acceptable; we have no problem with that. We have to write into the record that we are moving the boundary between those two regions in the North Pacific and I will call on the Secretary to explain where the boundary now is.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the Scientific Committee recommended that the boundary between the Eastern and the Western divisions of the North Pacific should be moved ten degrees to the east, south of forty degrees north from the previous line that had been drawn. It is a matter of moving over ten degrees to the east, just south of forty degrees north - fifty degrees north, I beg your pardon - south of fifty degrees north.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the quotas and you have heard the movement of the boundary. I believe it has been moved and seconded. Are you all in favour? I see no dissension. It is accepted. Thank you, Mr. Asgeirsson.

The Commissioner for Japan, were you quite clear what you were approving of then?

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): Mr. Chairman, yes, the boundary question, but I think this comes also to the question of the object of the examination at the forthcoming Scientific Committee and Commission's meeting, so that should also be provisional. They might recommend some other division.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that would happen automatically, would it not, seeing we are having this investigation?

I want to make it quite clear: have you accepted these quotas for the North Pacific sperm whales?

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): I made a plea that other delegations should vote 'no' on these quotas, so I request voting on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have the Secretary read the proposal and we will have a roll call.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the proposal now is for North Pacific sperm whales on the agreed divisions: for the Western division, zero quota for males and females, with the quotas to be footnoted that they are for 1979 - sorry, quotas for 1979 to be set later by decision of the Commission before operations start. And for the Eastern division, the male catch limit is 3,014 and for females 667, both with a footnote that these catch limits may also be reviewed at the December 1978 special meeting of the Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, did Japan propose an amendment? Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, Japan made a comment and a plea. Japan.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): It is my wish that when this vote is defeated - or it may not be defeated, I do not know - I may propose something else.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Asgeirsson.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you are just about to vote, then I would like to explain my vote and I wonder if you want me to do it before we vote or after.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will hear you before.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. I will vote against this proposal because we have just accepted to have a special meeting to establish quotas for this stock in this

region, so I see no need for quotas to be adopted now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Argentina.

ARGENTINA (Mr. F.H. Iglesias): May we please, Mr. Chairman, have some explanation when some delegation ask for a vote, it must be seconded or not? It has to be seconded or not when some delegation ask for a vote?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, we do not work on that principle. You are working under the Bollen set of rules. I am writing a book, so they tell me. Can we proceed with the vote please?

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, this is why we set up some rules of debate.

The vote for the North Pacific proposal starts at France.

FRANCE (Mr. C. Roux): I am sorry, I have not directly understood the question.

THE SECRETARY: The motion on the table ...

FRANCE (Mr. C. Roux): Is it the same proposal that was made before?

THE SECRETARY: Yes, this is the proposal - the recommendation of the Technical Committee itself. Thank you.

France (Yes): Iceland (No): Japan (No):

Mexico (Yes): Netherlands (Yes): New Zealand (Abstain):

Norway (No): Panama (Yes): South Africa (Abstain):

USSR (No): UK (Abstain): USA (Yes): Argentina (Yes):

Australia (Abstain): Brazil (Abstain): Canada (Abstain):

Denmark (No).

Mr. Chairman, there were six votes cast in favour and five votes against. The schedule change requires a three-quarter majority and so it fails to gain the change.

THE CHAIRMAN: As a result, at this point in time, we do not have a quota for the North Pacific sperm whale stocks.

The situation as I see it is that the meeting will be held - well, I think it is how I see it - the meeting will be held and before the season commences and at the special meeting of the Commission quotas will be established. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): I quite agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that this is the situation, but I think we should fill something in the schedule. Do you agree?

THE CHAIRMAN: I would prefer to see something in the schedule.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): I would propose what I proposed this morning and for the same reason that I explained this morning, that on all form of stocks in the North Pacific, males and females as well in the Eastern as in the Western, there be set a dash with an asterisk and the same footnote which I indicated in the Technical Committee. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Do I have a seconder for that proposal? Seconded by Japan and Norway. We will test the feeling of the meeting by voting on that, if there is no further discussion.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the proposal is that for both Eastern and Western divisions there is for males and females a dash placed on the schedule with an asterisk, or a footnote, to indicate that quotas for 1979 to be set later by decision of the Commission before operations start.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you all clear? I think you can call the roll, Mr. Secretary.

THE SECRETARY: The vote on this proposal, which is again a schedule amendment and so requires a three-quarters majority, begins at Iceland:

Iceland (Yes): Japan (Yes): Mexico (No):  
Netherlands (Abstain): New Zealand (Abstain):  
Norway (Yes): Panama (No): South Africa (Yes):  
USSR (Yes): UK (Yes): USA (Yes): Argentina (Abstain):  
Australia (Yes): Brazil (Yes): Canada (Yes):  
Denmark (Yes): France (No).

There are 11 votes in favour and three votes against, so it achieves the three-quarters majority necessary for the schedule, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. The schedule will be amended accordingly. Mr. Asgeirsson, have you any more difficult ones left.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes, there are a few.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, Argentina.

ARGENTINA (Mr. E.H. Iglesias): We are in some difficulty, I am afraid, if I understood you well. You mean, when I ask concerning the vote, your rule in this matter; I understand well?

THE CHAIRMAN: I ruled that if any person wanted a roll call vote, we call the roll: if no one wants it, we often say that we pass this without bothering to vote. That was the point you made, was it not?

ARGENTINA (Mr. E.H. Iglesias): I am sorry. I am just asking please - answer me slowly - if when some delegation ask for the vote it is necessary to be seconded or not? Why; may I ask why?

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman: the custom of the Commission has been that if there is unanimous agreement it is not always necessary to call the roll, but if any Commissioner requests that a roll call vote is made then we to through the

roll call, but if it will save time and no one objects, then we can do it without the time of going down the list of names. It is a matter of practicality.

ARGENTINA (Mr. E.H. Iglesias): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That means in the future you will check each time or you mean that the custom is to accept one delegation is enough for the vote?

THE CHAIRMAN: You might notice that after it has been moved and seconded, I call, "Is there any discussion: all in favour?" and it is at that point in time that if anyone wants to do a roll call they ask for a vote on the matter.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I hate to return to this vote. I was confused about the footnote; we have had so many footnotes. Could someone read what the footnote was? I understand that in that last vote there were four dashes with asterisks: could you tell me what the footnote is, please?

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the footnote was the original Danish proposal for a footnote, which says that 'quotas for 1979 are to be set later by decision of the Commission before operations start'. It was the same wording that we had on the previous zero.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain my vote. It is my understanding that what that means is that until quotas are set no whaling can take place. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what I meant with my proposal for the footnote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Does that finalise the

I would, therefore, ask the Japanese delegate to tell us whether any catch of this particular species will be taking place before the meeting in December or not. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There is no possibility for such.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you happy now? Thank you very much. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I was prepared to vote for quotas on these issues. I understand the problems of certain delegations in doing so. My problem now is that if the December meeting does not agree on a quota, it is unclear whether or not whaling will be unregulated: in other words, apparently under the interpretation not of the proposer and not of a one-time seconder of this language, but of the government of Japan there could be unregulated whaling after December.

THE CHAIRMAN: My impression was that the footnotes even says that catching will not commence until a quota has been established.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, if that is your interpretation I will accept this vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Japan.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): I think we are discussing a very assumptive and unlikely situation, but I think I have to defend my position. First of all, when we have the December meeting there is a procedure for the proceedings and we receive the recommendation of the Scientific Committee. Right?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): On which the Commissioners are requested to vote. There will be a decision. However,

pretation of the schedule and both delegations - I mean, perhaps, three here - explained some kind of interpretation. It is quite important to realise that both interpretations will be legal if we do not decide that and it will be a precedent for every time we have no quota for some species or for some place.

I mean, everybody agree that when this case happens both interpretations are valid or not? I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that I need to know this kind of problem.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, not to be rude to the Commissioner for Argentina, but I think my amendment was seconded not only by Japan but also by Norway, so even if Japan has some specific interpretation which was not my intention, the amendment was seconded and it was carried. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Secretary, I think the Commissioner for Argentina has a problem here. I am not quite sure: is it the question that whenever we are going to amend the schedule you want to have a vote?

ARGENTINA (Mr. E.H. Iglesias): Mr. Chairman, the only problem I have, and I am sorry to have it, is the following. One delegation, and after another one supported, one proposal but both delegations interpreted the same proposal in different ways. This is my problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether they had different interpretations of the one proposal. Norway.

NORWAY (Mr. I. Rindal): I would like to underline, Mr. Chairman, that in the footnote as suggested by the Danish delegation it is explicitly stated that the quota should be established before catching begins. I do not understand that there can be many different interpretations of such a clear and very elementary text.

North Pacific sperm whale, Mr. Asgeirsson? Have you any caveats?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes, we have a few more difficult stocks - difficult in the sense that we do not have a written report and we still have to go by our notes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you please listen carefully to these verbal recommendations which, unfortunately, you do not have the papers for. Japan.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): I take it that is the understanding of the United States, but it is not necessarily the interpretation of my delegation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): Of course, I have to make it clear, make my position clear. I am not saying that Japan plans to do it, plans to operate its whaling without a quota being established. This is far from my intention, but we are talking about a legal interpretation of what we have agreed and I would like to reserve the right to make interpretation in my way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yonezawa, your explanation is recorded in the verbatim report. The next one, Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. I propose that we move to the sei whale stocks of the southern hemisphere, where the ...

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me a moment: it might help you folk if you are using the centrefold of the schedule. It is not a very interesting centrefold, but you must make the best of it.

ARGENTINA (Mr. E.H. Iglesias): I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, to take the floor again but it does happen. You have already decided that both interpretations are valid. I mean, it is a very difficult matter because we are dealing with inter-

suppose, say, if some delegations boycott the organisation or refuse to comply with the commitment we make that we meet in December, I think in such a situation I have to defend the position of my delegation. But, normally, if we meet in December, and I should say in all circumstances it is the duty and obligation of the Commission to set a quota, even if it is a zero quota. We have to set the quota. Right?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): So, this is what I like to say. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Now, can we proceed to the next item, please? The Chairman of the Technical Committee.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. The next item would be the sei whale stock of the southern hemisphere where the Technical Committee recommends that the classification be as follows: for Area 1, sustained management: for Area 2 - no, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. The recommendation is that all the stocks in all the areas be classified as protected stocks and a zero quota accordingly for all the stocks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Netherlands, second? We have a proposer and seconder and to make it quite clear, seeing you have no paper, I will ask the Secretary to read the recommendation again.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, for the southern hemisphere sei whales the recommendation of the Technical Committee which is now tabled was that for all areas the stocks should be classified as protection stocks with zero quotas.

THE CHAIRMAN: Japan.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): As I mentioned this morning, we are presented with a new analysis at the last moment without full opportunity for our scientists to review the results in a significant way. Nevertheless, our scientists found out lots of inconsistency and shortcomings in the analysis, so we are severely contesting the results or the recommendations of the majority group of the Scientific Committee and we also were advised by the chairman of the Scientific Committee that the Scientific Committee cannot define the MSY in numerical terms so that procedurally I do not think these stocks would qualify for being classified as protection stock.

For these stocks where we cannot define in this way, it is far more fitting for us to set a quota on the basis of a replacement yield. We calculated, on the basis of the calculations by the majority group, which is of course the most conservative, unrealistically conservative, estimation, that Area 1 - replacement yield for Area 1 is 311 and Area 4 611; altogether 898. The last year's quota was 771.

I propose, therefore, that no classification for these two areas and a quota for 140 for Area 1 and 200 for Area 4, altogether combined quota would be 340 for these two areas, which is down by half, less than half of the replacement yield, so that the population is, under the most conservative estimation, to go during the coming year, even if we set the quota as I propose.

There is one small merit for my proposal; that is, if we continue this very small operation in Area 1 and Area 5 we would be able to collect more data so that we will be in

a much better position to discuss the status of the stocks at the next annual station. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yonezawa, so I can get a seconder would you just repeat the figures of your proposal?

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): 140 for Area 1 and 200 for Area 4.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Do I have a seconder? Soviet Union. This is an amendment to the recommendation from the Scientific Committee - the Technical Committee - seconded by the Netherlands. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to remind you what I said this morning about my opinion and the fundamental and general problem on last minute incoming new knowledge. I think it is only fair to explain one moment further than I did this morning which has some relationship to the language problem in this Commission. If those who are getting the last minute good ideas based on what has happened before, it can be very difficult for those who have not English as their mother tongue really to have time to evaluate this and to respond to that.

I think it is a general problem and I would like to underline what I said this morning, that we necessarily have to operate for practical reasons with some deadline. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. If there is no further discussion, I propose to call for a vote on the amendment which the Secretary will repeat.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with southern hemisphere sei whales and the amendment is that there is no classification for the stocks in Areas 1 and 4 and that Area 1 has a catch limit of 140 and Area 4 has a catch limit of

200 for the 1978/79 and 1979 seasons. This is a schedule amendment and requires a three-quarters majority to pass. The vote this time starts at Japan.

Japan (Yes): Mexico (No): Netherlands (No):

New Zealand (No): Norway (Abstain): Panama (No):

South Africa (Abstain): USSR (Yes): UK (No):

USA (No): Argentina (No): Australia (No):

Brazil (Abstain): Canada (No): Denmark (Abstain):

France (No): Iceland (Abstain).

Mr. Chairman, there were two votes in favour and ten votes against so the amendment is lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: We now vote for the motion.

THE SECRETARY: The original motion was the original Technical Committee recommendation, seconded by the Netherlands, that the southern hemisphere sei whale stocks should be classified as protection stocks in all areas, with zero quotas. The roll starts at Mexico.

Mexico (Yes): Netherlands (Yes): New Zealand (Yes):

Norway (Yes): Panama (Yes): South Africa (Yes):

USSR (Abstain): UK (Yes): USA (Yes): Argentina

(Yes): Australia (Yes): Brazil (Yes) Canada (Yes):

Denmark (Abstain): France (Yes): Iceland (Yes):

Japan (No).

There were 14 votes for and 1 vote against, so that is sufficient to change the schedule.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment will be made. Thank you. The Chairman of the Technical Committee, what is our next stock to deal with.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The next stock would be the minke whale stock the southern hemisphere.

THE CHAIRMAN: And what is your recommendation?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The recommendation is no classification, that is no change from what we have in the present schedule, but catch limits are recommended as follows. For Area 1 the catch limit would be 671; for Area 2 1156; for Area 3 2282; for Area 4 1263; Area 5 512; Area 6 337. And I recommend that this be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: A seconder? Denmark. Any discussion? All in favour? There is no need for a vote then and we accept this recommendation from the Technical Committee and the schedule will be amended accordingly. Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): It should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that with regard to this stock we will have the same provision for a 10% allowance as we had before.

The next stock would then be the Bryde's whale stock, I think, in the southern hemisphere and the Technical Committee does not propose any changes to be made to the schedule. The stocks in all the areas still to be classified as initial management with zero quota.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I have a seconder? Denmark, and South Africa. Any discussion? All in favour? The recommendation is accepted and the schedule will be amended accordingly. Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): With regard to this stock, it should also be noted, Mr. Chairman, that the Technical Committee recommends that there be no increase in the catch off Peru.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): I think then that we have

only to deal with one stock, Mr. Chairman, to finalise this agenda item. No, that is not correct, there are two or three others, but we will move to the North Pacific again and to the Bryde's whale stock for the whole region of the North Pacific. When I say the whole region, I am referring you to the schedule, the table. We propose, indeed, a change to be made to the effect that we split the region in two areas. I think I will have to ask the Secretary; I cannot remember which areas or where the boundaries are.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, he means he cannot read my writing. The proposal was that the North Pacific Bryde whales should be managed on the basis of two stocks, separated by the 160° west line of longitude. This is a temporary measure recommended by the Scientific Committee. The stock on the western side of this division is recommended to be classified as an initial management stock with a quota of 455, and the eastern stock is also an initial management stock but with a zero quota pending a satisfactory estimate of stock size. That is with a single asterisk in the current schedule arrangement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I have a seconder? Seconded by Denmark. United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM (Mr. R.C. Gurd): Mr. Chairman, I wondered whether those numbers are correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are doubting the figures?

UNITED KINGDOM (Mr. R.C. Gurd): I think the 455 should be 454.

? AUSTRALIA (Dr. K.R. Allen): Actually, it was 454 in the ..... committee report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I am glad to see people

are still awake.

THE SECRETARY: Please, if you do discover errors in the only record left to the Secretariat of the meeting, it is very important that we do get it right. So, with that amendment: both stocks, initial management classification and 454 for the western stock and zero pending a satisfactory estimate of stock size for the eastern stock.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? Are we all in favour? We appear to be. The amendment will be made to the schedule accordingly. Mr. Asgeirsson.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I remember that there were two more items that we dealt with and recommended, and agreed to recommend in the Technical Committee. I cannot remember which items they were. It was the North Atlantic Bryde's whales, where the Technical Committee recommend that that stock be classified as initial management stock, with a zero quota and with a footnote that this is pending a satisfactory estimate of stock size. There is no reference to the stock, I believe, in the present schedule.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I have a seconder? Thank you, Denmark. Any discussion? All in favour? Carried. The amendment will be made to the schedule. Does that complete our business in regard to Agenda Item 12, the Chairman of the Technical Committee?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): I think it does, Mr. Chairman, but the Chairman of the Scientific Committee might remember still one more point that we dealt with. I am not quite sure.

AUSTRALIA (Dr. Allen): Mr. Chairman, I believe that there were a whole group of protection stocks which were dealt with

in an earlier session which are actually in the first part of the record of the meeting. I do not recall them having been cleared tonight.

THE CHAIRMAN: We dealt with quite a number of protection stocks yesterday morning. My only concern is that we have covered all the stocks on the schedule. Yes, Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Mr. Chairman, I guess it does not really matter if we deal with the grey whale stock under this agenda item or under Agenda Item 13.

THE CHAIRMAN: 13.3.3?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we have finished with Agenda Item 12. Can we deal with 13.3.2 and 13.3.3; the capture of 10 humpback whales in Greenland being the first one. Do we have any paper on that issue?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes, we do, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you point out where it is for the benefit of the Commissioners?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The paper appears in the second part of the Technical Committee's report. It is the last but one page, identified as Plenary Agenda Item 13.3.2, Greenland humpback catch.

The Technical Committee agreed to recommend to the plenary that there be no change in the schedule with regard to this stock and that the catch of 10 humpback whales would still be allowed, although the Scientific Committee, I should report to you, had recommended that this exception be removed from the schedule. But this is linked together with another recommendation that was agreed on in the Technical Committee



that the fin whale catch limit for the West Greenland stock should be increased from 4 to 15, with a footnote that the combined catch limit for fin and humpback whales in the West Greenland waters shall not exceed 15 whales.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I have a seconder for that proposal?

Denmark, thank you. Any discussion? Are we all in favour?

Carried. Canada, do you wish to speak?

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Mr. Chairman, there was also a resolution that accompanied that section which I do not believe has passed the plenary session.

THE CHAIRMAN: What was it?

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): This was a resolution encouraging Denmark to transfer effort from humpback whales to fin whales.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Will Denmark second that?

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Yes, Mr. Chairman. To help you, Mr. Chairman, to get the way out of this, but I certainly want to reiterate what I said that, taking into account the nature of the fishery in Greenland, it might be very difficult but we shall try what we can.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any discussion? We thank Denmark for the efforts they intend to make. All in favour? Carried. What do we have next? The gray whales, 13.3.3.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Technical Committee endorse the Scientific Committee's recommendation to classify the two stocks as eastern stock sustained management with a catch limit of 178, but the western stock as a protected stock. It was further agreed that the Soviet aboriginal fishery should be managed to achieve a more balanced

sex ratio and non-member nations should be urged not to kill any whales from the western stock. And, finally, Mr. Chairman, the Technical Committee noted the joint statement by Mexico and the USA on results and conservation measures which they are developing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I have a seconder for the earlier part of that statement, the actual recommendation? Denmark. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I think it is important, at least as far as the public is concerned, for the public to realise that what we are doing with respect to gray whales: gray whales have recovered to a great extent and, therefore, a change in their status is taking place. However, this does not mean that there will be commercial whaling of gray whales.

First, no quotas have been established and it is my understanding that no one has proposed establishing a quota. Second, the United States for its part will be continuing to protect the gray whale within its 200 mile zone. We hope other countries, past whose coasts the gray whale migrates, will do so and will indicate here that they will do so.

Finally, it is my belief - at least I have been told - that no country has any intention to commercially hunt gray whales. I would appreciate, after this vote - indeed, before this vote - if you would ask whether any country has any present plans in that direction.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to note that the 178 whale limit is a limit for the Soviet Union in connection with its aboriginal hunt. In light of that, I would like to suggest an asterisk next to that number which would refer to a footnote which would read as follows:

"Available to be taken by aborigines or a contracting government on behalf of aborigines pursuant to paragraph 11 but not for commercial purposes."

This would be in the schedule. That footnote is a traditional footnote which has been used by the IWC in the past. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are suggesting an addition to an original motion, which has been seconded. I am sure - I think I can get the seconder to agree, but the original proposal came from the Technical Committee through their Chairman.

Mr. Chairman of the Technical Committee, do you agree to amend your proposal to take the footnote?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Mr. Chairman, I do not think I can do that as the chairman of the Technical Committee. I cannot change the recommendations of the Technical Committee. As Icelandic Commissioner, however, I could support this proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us test the meeting. The Technical Committee, the committee as a whole, are we all in favour of this amendment that has been suggested by the United States?

MEXICO (Mr. A.D. Rojo): Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favour of the amendment suggested by the United States. I wanted to make a statement, so whenever you are ready, I will be happy to do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: If I can get the mover and seconder of this cleaned up, I will call you. USSR, you will second?

USSR (Mr. I.V. Nikonorov): Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Denmark, were you not the original seconder of the motion? Are you happy with this addition proposed

by the United States?

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): I think I am, but I did not really hear it. Would you repeat it?

THE CHAIRMAN: But you are always insisting on footnotes. I would have thought you would be sure to agree with this one.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): That depends, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can we read it out to you, Mr. Lemche?

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Yes please.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): It would read as follows:

"Available to be taken by aborigines or a contracting government on behalf of aborigines pursuant to paragraph 11 but not for commercial purposes".

THE CHAIRMAN: Before I call on Mexico, I was asked a question by the Commissioner for the United States, whether any nation was proposing commercial operations in regard to this particular fishery. I can assure you, Mr. Frank, there is no intention. There were two questions you posed, was there not? United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): The other was a request, or a hope, that other governments would indicate that they will continue to protect this stock on the other coastal areas, as the United States will do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Everyone seems to be ..... Canada, are you speaking directly to the point made?

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): I am speaking to the point which Mr. Frank has raised. We have no intention of commercially exploiting gray whales: indeed, all whales are protected within 200 miles of Canada coasts and there is no intention of changing this provision.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you seek assurances from any other countries? Thank you. Mexico.

MEXICO (Mr. A.D. Rojo): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My statement related precisely to this question, so I will make it now, and that is that the government of Mexico will continue to protect all whales within its 200 miles including the gray whale, and I might add to that for the record that the Mexican government is proposing to - is studying the possibility of establishing two more gray whale refuges off the California coast for breeding purposes: one to be located in Laguna San Ignacio and the other one to be located in Bahia Tortuga (?).

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Does that finalise our work on the gray whale, Mr. Asgeirsson? No, I am sorry. I have heard the discussion, but I have not sought your concurrence in the classifications or this catch limit that has been included. It has been moved and seconded. The caveat was placed on by the United States, agreed by the seconder and also supported by the Soviet Union. Is there any further discussion? We appear to be all in favour, so the schedule will be amended accordingly.

I think that completes Agenda Item 13, Mr. Asgeirsson. What about the definition of terms; have we dealt with that? Mexico, then Netherlands.

MEXICO (Mr. A.D. Rojo): Mr. Chairman, while we are still on item 13, and specifically on the gray whales, I was wondering whether something which we were interested in - would it be possible for the Soviet delegation to inform the Commission what use has been given to the approximately 185 gray whales that have been taken by the Soviets?

THE CHAIRMAN: Could the Soviet Commissioner answer

that question please?

SOVIET UNION (Mr. I.V. Nikonorov): I have already clarified that problem and spoken about that. You may not have been present, Mr. Rosenthal, at that time. I can talk to you and explain it to you in a private conversation.

MEXICO (Mr. Rosenthal): I apologise, Mr. Chairman. I was not present and I will be happy to talk to the Soviet Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Netherlands, did you wish to come on the floor?

NETHERLANDS (Mr. F.H.J. von der Assen): Yes, Mr. Chairman. Before we leave Agenda Item 13, I would like to make a proposal. I will keep it short.

Coming back to the bowhead issue, Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw this meeting's attention to a resolution which was adopted at last year's special meeting where it was resolved that all necessary measures be taken to preserve the habitat of bowhead and beluga whales. This resolution is in the Chairman's report of the Tokyo meeting in Appendix 2, under (e).

Now, in the light of our recent discussions on the bowhead taken in the Bering Sea, and the reaction of the representatives of the Alaskan native people to the decision taken, and also in the light of the resolution which was adopted by the Inuit Circumpolar Conference pertaining to the protection of the bowhead whale habitat, and, furthermore, in view of the fact that there has been no report in the implementation of this resolution, it would seem appropriate to us, Mr. Chairman, that the Commission reaffirms its opinion in this matter and we would, therefore,

like to propose that this meeting adopt a decision to that effect.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I have a seconder for that? United Kingdom, Panama. The Commissioner for the Netherlands, this refers to bowhead particularly?

NETHERLANDS (Mr. von der Assen): Particularly to bowheads, yes, Mr. Chairman, but in last year's resolution the beluga whales were also included.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we all support that proposal? The United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I, too, support the proposal; and, assuming it is past, I just wish to report very briefly on what we have done in implementation of that proposal.

First of all, we are engaging in studies to see the effect of oil on whales. That is important, we believe, because we wish to know whether oil exploitation or exploration will have an impact on whale habitat. Secondly, we are examining the question of whether marine sanctuaries should be established, pursuant to domestic legislation, around Alaska and, in particular, in the Beaufort Sea. Thirdly, there has been contact between the United States and Canada to discuss the same subject with Canada - that is, the question whether or not there should be protection of habitat in the Beaufort Sea off Canadian coasts. The issue, of course, is oil.

We will pursue the issue and will report to the Commission when we have some definitive news. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Canada.

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Mr. Chairman, we would support the motion which we, in fact, I believe, moved last December. We have rigorous requirements pertaining to activities

in the north, particularly in relation to exploratory oil drilling and things of this nature which are of concern, particular concern, in that area. We are taking steps in terms of research programmes; indeed, last year we conducted about \$200,000 of a research programme on beluga whales, involving studies on the detail of distribution in relation to environmental parameters in areas where there is island building for oil exploration activities, in order to get the necessary information to ensure that we are taking effective action to preserve the beluga habitat.

We have a large volume of documentation presently in draft form which I actually did bring to this meeting. In view of the fact that the Secretary had, I believe, 1,438 pages of other material I refrained from giving him 200 pages more, but I will undertake to the Commission to provide copies of the published documents later in the year and to report more fully at next year's meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Are we all in favour of the proposal? No further comment? It is accepted.

There is one small item, I think, on Agenda Item 13, that is 13.1, definition of terms. Who can report on that?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Mr. Chairman, with regard to this point on Agenda Item 13, I think I should refer you to our deliberation on the Bering Sea stock of bowheads, where we passed a resolution that, I believe, is also relevant to this agenda item.

It has been dealt with already in the plenary and the recommendation - do you want me to read it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, please.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): The recommendation was to the effect that the Commission request a working group, or the Technical Committee, to examine the entire aboriginal whaling problem and develop proposals for a regime for the aboriginal bowhead hunt in Alaska and, if appropriate, a regime or regimes for other aboriginal hunts to be submitted to the Commission for consideration at the next Annual Meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I think we can accept that. 13.2 is a report of the Scientific Committee, which we do not adopt until Agenda Item 21. I think that completes our work on Agenda Item 13 and I think we should move on to Agenda Item 15, the International Decade of Cetacean Research. Have you a report on that, Mr. Chairman?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Mr. Chairman, there is no recommendation from the Technical Committee with regard to this item. We just received the Scientific Committee's report and agreed to pass it on for your attention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We will assume this has been received. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, my comment is in reference to what was mentioned by the Chairman of the Technical Committee in relation to the establishment of a regime for the bowhead aboriginal hunt. What we would like to do is to have a working group prepare technical information and also proposals for such a regime and have those distributed to governments before the meeting of the Technical Committee which would take place before the next Annual IWC Meeting.

I have discussed this with other governments, including those who are interested particularly in aboriginal hunts, and they have indicated a desire to do this. We are perfectly

happy to do it informally. We will inform the IWC contracting parties what is occurring and if any party would like to participate, such party could. If, on the other hand, a formal working group should be established, or anyone would prefer that, we would be happy to see the establishment of a formal working group.

The major point, however, is that we, with other countries, will be working so that proposals can be placed before the Technical Committee at its next meeting and that we will be able to establish a regime at the next Commission meeting. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Does that complete our work on the stocks of small cetaceans? I beg your pardon: we are on Agenda Item 15.

The Secretary has reminded me that I should make an appeal for funds, voluntary funds, for cetacean research. He says that all donations will be thankfully received and faithfully applied.

Agenda Item 16, Review of Scientific Permits: we have done that. 18 - we mentioned humane killing on our earlier plenary session, but we were asked to defer it for some reason. Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes, Mr. Chairman. The reason why we asked you to defer the discussion on this agenda item was that the second page of the Technical Committee's report was being revised and we did not have it out at the time. So, we have not been engaged in any discussion on this agenda item in the plenary.

You will find the Technical Committee's report in the written form. The first page is in the first part and the second page is the last page of the second part, identified as Plenary Agenda 18 continued and in the right upper corner, 'Revised IWC/30/6'.

If I may continue Mr. Chairman: the Technical Committee

endorsed several recommendations from the Scientific Committee and I propose that the plenary adopt these recommendations. I do not know if you wish me to read them word by word, or if it is sufficient just to refer you to the paper. I hope everybody has it in their hands.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suggest you refer to the paper and we will ask the Secretary to include the text in the verbatim report. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemcher): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Speaking to the page Mr. Asgeirsson referred to, there is a provision that all whale catchers operating in conjunction with factory ships and land stations shall report the following information on each whale taken: first, number of harpoons used to kill each whale; second, number of whales struck but lost.

Mr. Chairman, since we discussed this in the Technical Committee, we discovered that in fact we dealt with this item last year in a quite different manner. I refer you to the 28th report of the International Whaling Commission, the big blue one, on page 73, left column, last paragraph, where the Scientific Committee last year noted that a proposal to make it statutory to record the number of harpoons used to kill each whale was before the Commission, but the Scientific Committee considered this to be an unsatisfactory measure of humanness because it might encourage gunners to use less harpoons and finish off the animal by other means - for instance, compressed air - so being counterproductive.

Mr. Chairman, I really think that I would like to ask Dr. Allen whether the Scientific Committee has changed its view completely upside down since last year. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: This question should have been asked in the Technical Committee, Mr. Lemche, but on this occasion I will excuse you. Dr. Allen, can you help on this? Mr. Asgeirsson may be able to help you.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes, Mr. Chairman. This specific recommendation did not originate in the Scientific Committee; it was indeed proposed by one of the Commissioners.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I believe we did propose this. If the Scientific Committee believes that this is a counterproductive procedure, we would be happy to second the proposal by the distinguished delegate from Denmark, which I am sure he would have wanted to make, to remove it. I would like to hear from the Chairman of the Scientific Committee.

AUSTRALIA (Dr. Allen): Mr. Chairman, we did have this year a subcommittee of the Scientific Committee looking at humane killing techniques. Its report appears in Annex J. That subcommittee did not refer to this particular question so that the item quoted from last year's report would remain the most recent ruling of professional opinion by the Scientific Committee on this point. I do not think the Scientific Committee can be regarded as having changed its mind on this; it just has not come back to the point again. I would suspect that its views might well be the same. It certainly has not expressed any contrary opinion to that it expressed last year.

THE CHAIRMAN: The situation in our debate is that the Technical Committee has recommended this amendment to the schedule and I still need a seconder - that is from Norway. Is it your wish that this be included in the schedule as set out in this document which was read partially by the Commissioner for Denmark? All in favour? It is acceptable. Thank you. It shall go into

the schedule.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): May I speak as an Icelandic Commissioner? I am not in favour of including this in the schedule and I propose that it be not included in the schedule in light of what we have heard from the Danish Commissioner and the USA Commissioner.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will someone second the recommendation by the Technical Committee? Australia will and the Netherlands. Netherlands, do you want to speak?

NETHERLANDS (Mr. F.H.J. von der Assen): Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering whether it might not be desirable to have some clarification here. I, at least, am not entirely clear on this subject any more. Maybe it is best if the Danish proposal was repeated: I think that that would clarify the matter. Thank you.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the Technical Committee proposal has been seconded; would it now be appropriate to attempt to amend it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, certainly.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): In light of what the Scientific Committee has said - that is, that it would be counter-productive to have such a proposal - I believe that it should not be in and, therefore, I propose to amend it, to delete the words 'report the following information on each whale taken' and then all the words following (1) and (2) and to add the following in its place:

'report information on each whale taken'

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. Let me retract what I have just said.  
to  
I would like just/delete what is under number one - that is, I would like to delete the words 'number of harpoons used to kill

each whale' and replace that with, 'methods used to kill a whale other than a harpoon, and in particular compressed air'.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you wish for (2) to remain as it is?

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Yes, Sir. It is my understanding that that bit of information would not, in the view of the Scientific Committee, be counterproductive.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Could I ask the Commissioner for the United States to repeat it at dictation speed, please?

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the proposal of the United States is that paragraph 24a1 should read:

'Methods used to kill a whale, other than a harpoon, and, in particular, compressed air'.

THE CHAIRMAN: The USA amendment has been seconded by Iceland. Is it your wish that we vote on the amendment, or is the amendment unanimously acceptable? Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Yes, Mr. Chairman. On the condition that we still note here in the plenary that the same difficulties - we will be having the same difficulties with (b) for the reasons which are noted in the Technical Committee's report. That applies also to the amendment, but I second the amendment with that comment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are we all prepared to accept the amendment? I see no dissenters so that will be included in the schedule. Thank you. Does that complete Agenda Item 18?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Mr. Chairman, in addition to the many recommendations, the Technical Committee also recommended adoption of the resolution appearing in the last part. I do not know if we have included that?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, we have been dealing with the amendment to the schedule. The Technical Committee also

recommend the adoption of the following resolutions, which are set out on this piece of paper. Can I have a seconder for those resolutions. Canada, thank you.

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Mr. Chairman, I believe there were a few words lost in this revision.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you point them out to us, please?

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Similar to those incorporated in paragraph 24(b) above. At the bottom of the page, on the third last line where it reads: 'small type whaling operations and native operations' add the words, 'taking species listed in paragraph (1)'.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then it goes on: 'should report', is that right?

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that clear to everybody? Acceptable? We will adopt these resolutions. They will be included in the Chairman's annual report.

Mr. Asgeirsson, on this particular agenda item, does that complete the work?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes, Mr. Chairman, if we have also adopted the resolution I was mentioning.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it has been adopted. Can we move on to Agenda Item 19, the International Observer Scheme. Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Technical Committee found the agenda items 19 and 20 so inter-related that we dealt with them at the same time, and I wonder if we could not do that in the plenary as well?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. We are going to deal with 19

and 20 concurrently.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): I wish to refer you to the report of the Infractions Subcommittee on the green paper we have in our hands. I do not think I have to go through it in detail, but I draw your attention to the recommendations that are included and which were endorsed by the Technical Committee.

The first recommendation is to be found on page 3 in this report where the Technical Committee recommended that the schedule should be reviewed and steps taken to resolve a certain ambiguity that the subcommittee found in the schedule with regard to the words taking, killing and striking. The Technical Committee did not, however, make any specific proposals - yes, we did.

What we did in the Technical Committee was to refer this to a legal group of the Technical Committee and I propose that we so do.

The second recommendation appears on the same page, where the Technical Committee endorsed the recommendations of the sub-group that the Secretary contact the observer at the Icelandic whaling station to obtain additional information about the need for a change in the schedule with regard to the whales taken for local consumption and the need to keep the meat of these specific animals separated from other meat during normal operations. We propose that the Secretary so does.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we can deal with all these together, if you would like to go on.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Yes. The third recommendation appears on the bottom of page 4 in the subcommittee's report, where it is recommended that the contracting governments of the Commission be requested to transmit copies of their laws and regulations to the Secretary with explanations of their systems

of remunerations and penalty pursuant to paragraph 37 of the schedule and we also request that this be in the English language.

We made a fourth recommendation, but I cannot find it. The Secretary might be able to help me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Gambell, can you help us here.

THE SECRETARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There was a recommendation agreed within the Technical Committee that the observer scheme itself should be more comprehensive and expanded in form and the precise wording is that it:

'should develop proposals for an expanded observer scheme to be administered through the Secretariat'.

It is the wording on the last page of the Infractions report, the second to last paragraph. The recommendation is to develop proposals for an expanded observer scheme to be administered through the Secretariat for consideration by the Technical and Finance and Administration Committees at their next meetings.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): I propose that we adopt these four recommendations.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is proposed by the Chairman of the Technical Committee that these four recommendations be adopted. Do I have a seconder? Australia, Netherlands, Norway. All those in favour? I see no dissenters. It has been adopted.

Are there other recommendations in that report or does that conclude the proposals in the observer scheme and the infractions agenda item?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): There is one point that relates to Agenda Item 19.3, reports by member governments about introduction of new observer schemes. I think it is best to ask Canada, or the Secretary has it?

THE CHAIRMAN: We will hear from the Secretary on the point.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, Iceland, Canada, Denmark and Norway have met to discuss the feasibility of implementing an observer programme for the Minke whale fisheries of the North Atlantic. Several practical problems were noted in relation to the large number of small vessels involved, which land whales in scattered communities along an extensive coastline. All nations affirmed, however, their willingness to have observers. It was agreed that Iceland and Norway would explore the possibility of placing an Icelandic observer on some expeditions of larger Norwegian minke whalers operating off East Greenland. It was also agreed that Iceland, Norway and Canada consider extension of the present land station observer programmes at Iceland. The international observer could arrive in Iceland approximately one month earlier than at present so as to observe the minke whale operation in North Iceland before the land station operation begins in late May.

If I may add, Mr. Chairman, we also had a statement from Brazil indicating that negotiations with Australia are still in hand. There are internal difficulties which are delaying the procedure, but this observer scheme is still in the offing.

THE CHAIRMAN: These are statements which we need to accept; is that right? Do I take it that we accept these statements and put them in the record of the meeting? I see no dissenters, so that will be done.

Now, does that complete Agenda Items 19 and 20. Canada.

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Mr. Chairman, could I return to Agenda Item 18. I believe there is one page of the report of the Technical Committee which we did not adopt yet, and that is the

page with reference to the recommendations of the Scientific Committee regarding humane killing, with a proposal for some work to be conducted at Iceland.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, on your instruction that page was read into the record of the meeting without actually saying it.

CANADA (Mr. M.C. Mercer): Of the plenary?

THE SECRETARY: Of the plenary, yes.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, in connection with item 19, observers, and of information from observers, the Technical Committee did discuss access to information provided by observers in connection with the observer system. I would like to propose, before the plenary, something which was discussed by the Technical Committee, as follows: that a new rule 11(f) should be added to the rules of procedure. It would read as follows:

"Provide copies of, or access to, reports of the Commission, including reports of observers under the International Observer Scheme, upon request, after such reports have been considered by the Commission".

The reason I propose this is that, as I understand it, Mr. Gambell has received a number of requests for this information and has found it somewhat embarrassing to have to deny the information. I believe this information should be open to the public so that we can show that most whaling operations in fact do not involve violations. Furthermore, in the United States when we receive this information we have a particular problem because, under our laws, we are obligated to provide it to the public. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Do I have a seconder?  
Canada, Netherlands, United Kingdom. Any comment? Soviet Union.

SOVIET UNION (Mr. I.V. Nikonorov): Could we have a few minutes just to go through this?

THE CHAIRMAN: I will give you one minute. Argentina.

ARGENTINA (Mr. E.H. Iglesias): May I take, Mr. Chairman, advantage of this minute. I would like, if you permit me, to know something concerning the point you just already accepted. It was one of the recommendations of the Infractions Committee, the last one concerning the law that each country has to provide to the Commission. Is this right? You quote afterwards where you say something concerning the language of this kind of documentation that has to be provided, it will be in English.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can the Secretary explain this: I am not familiar with it.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Commissioner for the Argentine has raised a very real problem here that we, in Technical Committee, did agree that the laws should be passed to English because that is the working language of the Commission, but I would think it more likely that national legislation only appears in the national language and I think there is probably a real problem, a real conflict, in that.

ARGENTINA (Mr. E.H. Iglesias): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It was my idea to draw the attention of the committee that it will be quite difficult to accomplish with this suggestion. Each country has its own law and I think all countries perhaps will be unable to translate officially his own domestic law. I think this point will have to be taken with some caution in the future.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Soviet Union.

SOVIET UNION (Mr. I.V. Nikonorov): The Soviet delegation would be in favour of the ideas expressed by the

Argentinian Commissioner. It would seem to us that we should not adopt such resolutions just offhand. Therefore, we would suggest to come back to this question at our next meeting, so that the delegations could consider this question and consult their proper authorities at home. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the Soviet Union make sure it is put forward as an agenda item for the next meeting?

SOVIET UNION (Mr. I.V. Nikonorov): Would you not object to having it on the agenda of the next meeting?

THE CHAIRMAN: We can deal with it now, of course.

SOVIET UNION (Mr. I.V. Nikonorov): I have no instructions to that effect.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see. All I can suggest is that the matter be raised again at our next meeting. Soviet Union, can we go back to this suggestion, or recommendation, by the United States concerning the reports of the international observers. We have a recommendation from the United States. Do we have a seconder for that? Yes, we had the Netherlands. Is there any discussion on this?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Commissioner for the Soviet Union, is it the point you are making that this recommendation by the United States, seconded by the Netherlands, you have no brief and you want to consider this at the next meeting. Is that your position?

SOVIET UNION (Mr. I.V. Nikonorov): Yes, we would be in favour of considering it at the next meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: There might be a lot of people wanting to pass it here and now, so I have a proposer and a seconder to this motion. If it becomes an approved recommendation by this meeting now, there is no reason why you should not raise the

issue again at the next meeting. United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, this item was on the agenda and this is a modification of it. I would like to have a vote on it and if the Soviet Union finds a compliance is difficult, it could certainly raise it at the next meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the position I am trying to follow. Japan.

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): I raise the question that if we can make it available to the public the information which may contain infractions or allegations on the infractions and so on, I really think this should not be made public. The information is made available to the contracting governments, all of the contracting governments, and the Commissioners and delegations members. I do not see any merit to extend the publicity beyond this circle. It may contain the classified information or information leading to prosecution to start the investigation.

I can accept the recommendation with the following modification. I would like to put only two words.

THE CHAIRMAN: What are those two words again, Mr. Yonezawa? Where do they fit in?

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): 'Where it is appropriate' after 'provide'.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Frank, can you live with those two words? United States.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Yes, Mr. Chairman, that would be all right with me if it is all right with the Secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you; you are most helpful. Mr. von der Assen, can you accept it too? That satisfies you, Mr. Yonezawa? Are we all satisfied? The Secretary is not

satisfied. Can we hear from the Secretary?

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I do not think that this gives a very clear guideline on what I should do with any document that I receive. Who decides where it is appropriate? I do? You give me discretion?

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): The proposed change in the rule of procedure says that we will make public the copies or the information after being reviewed by the Commission, or something, so when the Commission reviews I expect that certain instructions will be given for guidance to the Secretariat. This is my understanding.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Secretary is now satisfied and I hope we are all satisfied. Is it agreed by everyone because it means an amendment to the rules of procedure and it is important? I see no dissenters so the necessary addition will be made. Thank you. Anything further in regard to the infractions or the observer scheme? No, it is finished.

The next item is to adopt the report of the Scientific Committee and we need a mover and a seconder for that.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): I think we still have not dealt with Agenda Item 25.3, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right. We cannot adopt the report until we have dealt with that. 25.3, Review of Information Required Section. Mr. Asgeirsson?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): I pass to the Secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you give us a reference, Dr. Allen?

AUSTRALIA (Dr. Allen): It is dealt with in 18.2 on the Scientific Committee report, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: What distribution is that?

AUSTRALIA (Dr. Allen): Distribution 6.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will point out the quotation.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the Technical Committee received the report of the Scientific Committee on this matter and noted specifically the need for systematic sightings of whales and the idea that experienced observers should be placed on research vessels and a third item which it noted was the concept of experimental whaling to be undertaken, but this should be done within the existing catch limits set by the Commission.

A specific recommendation which should be brought to the plenary session is that a standard log book be developed so that the data needed by the scientists for more thorough assessment of the stocks should become available in a standardised form.

A second recommendation, which involves a schedule change, is that in the schedule paragraph 26(a)(i) there should be rewording effectively to remove words 'and tissue' samples from one testes', so there are three items to note and two specific recommendations, one of which is a schedule change.

THE CHAIRMAN: As one of these recommendations involves a schedule change, are you quite clear what is involved? We did discuss this in the Technical Committee, but if you wish it to be read again, we will do so.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the requirement for standard log books was indicated to also require a schedule change - that is that it should be a schedule requirement. I must admit I cannot find precise wording.

AUSTRALIA (Dr. Allen): The Scientific Committee

did not develop precise wording in this case. I think it has on a number of occasions left the wording for development during the Technical Committee meeting and I regret that this was not drawn to the attention of the Technical Committee in this form.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we have had advance notice of such a schedule change and we can treat it best then as a recommendation at this stage bringing it forward next time for a schedule change. So, we could word it as a specific recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that acceptable to the Commissioners? We will accept it as a recommendation at this stage. Thank you. Mr. Asgeirsson, can we now adopt the report of the Scientific Committee?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): I hope so. I think this concludes at least the report of the Technical Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have to adopt the report of the Technical Committee and also that of the Scientific Committee and Agenda Items 22 and 21. Will someone move the adoption of the report of the Scientific Committee?

The Secretary wants me to make sure that you are aware of this minor change to the schedule in paragraph 26(a)(i), which will now read:

THE SECRETARY: "Both ovaries or the combined weight of testes".

THE CHAIRMAN: You recall this from the Technical Committee. I think they are all aware of it. Thank you.

Denmark has moved the adoption of the report of the Scientific Committee. Do I have a seconder? Seconded by Norway. All those in favour? Contrary? We have accepted the report of the Scientific Committee.

The adoption of the Technical Committee: do I have a mover? Australia; seconded by Denmark and Canada. In the adoption of the Technical Committee report I wish to thank Mr. Asgeirsson and his committee, but particularly Mr. Asgeirsson and particularly Dr. Gambell, for the very difficult job they have had to do, as well as being criticised by the Chairman of the Commission.

Of course, their job has been made more difficult by the loss of all the manuscript belonging to the Chairman by an unfortunate incident late this afternoon, which has made our job just that much more difficult and, for that reason, I wish to congratulate Mr. Asgeirsson and Dr. Gambell on the work that they have done in pushing this work forward to the plenary session. Once again, Mr. Asgeirsson, I hope that having served two years in charge of this - two sessions in charge of the Technical Committee, you will be spared for the rest of your life from ever chairing another Technical Committee and I thank you very much.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Thank you. I am going to withdraw. (Applause)

THE CHAIRMAN: As a result of our decisions made from the Technical Committee, Dr. Aron, are there any further work that you want to bring forward in respect to your committee?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I think, Mr. Chairman, that we have been left with something of a problem that I perhaps can work with the Secretary in terms of developing this interim budget and also preparing for the December meeting. I am not sure what else we can decide in the Finance and Administration Committee at this stage, in view of the decision to reconsider this whole item in Decemb.

I would urge, however, because of the serious nature of the financial situation, that each Commissioner return to his home government and pose these very difficult questions so that when we assemble once again in December at the special meeting we will be able to have definitive answers on contributions, willingness to host meetings and any other advice Commissioners may have to improve the financial status of the Whaling Commission and allow Dr. Gambell and his staff to live on something other than a hand to mouth existence they have had to during the past year or so. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Aron, and we will depend upon this bare bones budget and a supplementary budget: is that right?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): I think one other comment on behalf of the Secretary, if I may. I think it is critical to remind you of Dr. Gambell's plea that member governments make their contributions in a timely way, well in advance of that December meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like Commissioners to make note of that and also those governments which have their subscriptions outstanding, it would be a great help if these could come forth as soon as possible.

So, I think that concludes our work in regard to the Finance and Administration meeting and to you, Dr. Aron, and your committee I wish to thank you most sincerely. I think this is the most difficult session for a finance committee. You have not found us all the money, but you have told us how to go and find it. That is the next stage of the work, and I was particularly gratified with the compliments you paid to members of your committee who had not worked on the Finance

and Administration Committee before and I am sure I say so on behalf of all the other Commissioners, we are all very pleased with the work you have done and I think you have a permanent position as Chairman of the Finance Committee in the future. Thank you once again.

This means that we have to adopt the report of the Finance and Administration Committee, with Agenda Item 23.5. Will someone so move? Canada moves; Denmark seconds the adoption of the report of the Finance and Administration Committee. All those in favour? Right.

Under Agenda Item 26, Adherence of Non-Member Whaling and Other Countries, you will recall that the United States delegation handed in a paper, a resolution, with a list on the back, a table. Has that been revised? I do not seem to have a copy of that? Dr. Aron.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): Yes, Sir. I think the comments made by a number of observers have been taken into careful consideration. We have returned the Canary Islands to Spain. I think we have made the other adjustments, which, I trust, members of the Commission and the distinguished observers find acceptable and remove any unintentional embarrassment from this report.

THE CHAIRMAN: With the smiles on the faces of the observers, I think you have overcome this diplomatic problem. Thank you.

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): One minor comment: at the time this was drafted, not all quotas had been agreed to, so there is some slight housekeeping which must be done to bring this document up to speed. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you collaborate with the Secretary

on this?

UNITED STATES (Dr. Aron): Yes, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Aron.

Well, please correct me if I am wrong, but according to my agenda the work has been completed up to Agenda Item 31. Can you assure me that that is correct? It appears correct.

Now the time has come, of course, to elect a new Chairman. Actually, my chairmanship expired at midnight, so I am not quite sure of my position. I think I should rather hastily call nominations for a chairman of the International Whaling Commission for a period of three years or until such time as a successor is appointed. I will call nominations for the Chairman.  
Mr. Rindal.

NORWAY (Mr. I. Rindal): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to nominate the delegate from Iceland as the new Chairman of the Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Do I have a seconder? We have a seconder from Denmark, Japan, United States, Canada, Argentina, United Kingdom, South Africa, Panama, Netherlands, New Zealand, France. We have everyone except Iceland, I think. Mr. Asgeirsson, allow me to be the first one to congratulate you on being appointed to the position of Chairman of the International Whaling Commission and you have my complete commiserations.

(Applause)

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): Mr. Chairman, my fellow Commissioners. I most sincerely thank you for the great honour that you have shown me. I consider it an honour to be the Chairman of the International Whaling Commission because it is my firm opinion that this Commission has turned to be one of the most successful international organisations of its kind.

In my country, international commissions have, from experience, never been considered successful in managing and, thereby, conserving the marine resources which Iceland depends upon more than any other independent country in the world. This is why we have, for example, never put our faith into the hands of the North Atlantic Fisheries Commission, although we have participated actively in their work, both on a scientific and administrative level.

We have long believed in coastal states rights and responsibilities to conserve the marine resources as our livelihood depends on their conservation and rational exploitation. We have, however, accepted the IWC management over the whale stocks in our 200-mile fisheries jurisdiction and this shows, Mr. Chairman, better than anything else, the confidence that we have in the Commission and this proves how honoured I am to be your Chairman.

I know that I will not be able to live up to the standard of my predecessor, Mr. Bollen, or his predecessor, Mr. Rindal, but I will do my very best to follow into their footsteps. My only sad feelings at this moment are that maybe they will not be with us for much longer, but if you should retire from the IWC I sincerely wish you a very happy retirement, both of you. Thank you. (Applause)

NORWAY (Mr. Rindal): Mr. Chairman, before you leave the Chair, I am sure that all the Commissioners would like to thank you for your outstanding work over the three last years. I know from experience what a hard job it is and I must admit that the difficulties have not become less over the last years. But you have been able to conduct these meetings in a friendly and efficient way and I feel sure that we would not have been able to arrive at the point we are today if you had not been in the Chair.

We have admired you for your understanding and unchanging calm and good humour and for your always succinct remarks when the rest of us were unable to find our way, where we were in the jungle of documents and numerous numbers of written pages or the profusion of proposals and amendments. We were especially impressed by your calm this afternoon when the Commission was subject to a peculiar type of trial never experienced before.

Mr. Chairman, in thanking you for your tremendous contribution to the work of this Commission, we wish you every happiness in the future and wish you welcome back to the Commission meetings, even if you should be here as representative of a protectionist organisation. God bless. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. (Applause)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Rindal. I will say what I want to say in a few moments, but there is one duty I have yet to perform and that is to elect a Vice-Chairman to replace Mr. Asgeirsson; and I will call nominations for Vice-Chairman.

BRAZIL (Mr. S. de Moura): Mr. Chairman, I would like to nominate the Commissioner for Japan to be the Vice-Chairman.

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): I second the proposal, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Denmark, Soviet Union, South Africa, New Zealand, Norway, Canada; are there any further nominations?

JAPAN (Mr. Yonezawa): Although I think it is an honour to be nominated Vice-Chairman of this Commission, I do not think I can accept the nomination because of the commitments I have with other commissions, so that I sincerely request the nomination should go to other, more

suitable candidate.. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Yonezawa. Can I have another nomination.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): I would like to ask my colleague Commissioner on my left hand, Mr. Mercer from Canada, if he would be willing to serve as Vice-Chairman. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: You wish to nominate him and I now have to find a seconder, is that right?

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Definitely, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: United States, you second?

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: United Kingdom, Argentina, Iceland, Norway, New Zealand, Panama, Soviet Union, Netherlands, Australia, South Africa. Any other nominations? I declare the nominations closed and declare Mr. Mercer the Vice-Chairman of the International Whaling Commission. (Applause) I think it is most unusual and never before in the history of the International Whaling Commission has a Vice-Chairman been elected from the most junior Commissioners that has been at a Commission meeting in one session as a Commissioner. Mr. Mercer, do you wish to comment?

CANADA (Mr. Mercer): I did abstain, Mr. Chairman. I would wish to explain my vote. I would like to thank the Commissioners for the honour they have done me in electing me to this post. I have a very difficult act to follow. I would, however, be willing to attempt to do the duties of the Vice-Chairman's position if you would agree to allow me to review my position after one year and, on this understanding, I would be very happy to take on the position. If, after one year you work me as hard as you have my predecessor, perhaps I

will have second thoughts then.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Mercer. The next item on the agenda is 'any other business'. Am I right in understanding that Panama wishes to make a statement?

PANAMA (Mr. R. Decerega): Not quite a statement, Mr. Chairman, but I would just like to request the Secretary to inform the other Commissioners the actual position of the Panama delegation in the Commission.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the depository government for the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, 1946, has informed the Secretariat that they have received notification from the government of Panama withdrawing their notification of withdrawal from the Convention. In other words, Panama is still a member of the International Whaling Commission from midnight last night.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any observers who did not speak at the opening of the Commission meeting on Monday morning who now wish to speak? Fauna Preservation Society - we are still going to limit you to five minutes seeing we are running a little late.

FAUNA PRESERVATION SOCIETY (Mr. R. Fitter): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will certainly not take five minutes as I am sure everyone wants to go very quickly.

Death throes are always a painful affair and the death throes of both the whaling industry and the whale-based Eskimo culture, which we have mentioned at this 30th meeting of the IWC, are no exception. Many years of gross over-exploitation are now bringing their inevitable result. Ironically, the reaction of those most affected, the Japan Whaling Association and the Eskimos, have been to demand an acceleration of the process of extinction

of the whale stocks.

The Fauna Preservation Society deplores both <sup>the</sup> fixing of an unrealistically high quota for the bowhead whale and the inability of the whalers to see that their only hope of preserving the whaling industry lies in extremely conservative quotas for the sperm whale. The society believes in the use of wildlife resources for the benefit of the human population of the world. All the IWC has succeeded in doing the past thirty years is to deprive the world of an extremely valuable natural resource.

I apologise for delaying you yet further and I hope we can conclude the meeting. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I ask the forbearance of the delegates here for an intervention I wish now to make. I am somewhat concerned about making it at this hour because of what has just occurred - that is, that we have just seen a distinguished chairman about to resign and a new one selected and a distinguished vice-chairman. I was, however, advised that the 'other business' item was the proper time to bring this up.

Because of the hour I will be short and, furthermore if it is the sense of this group that it would not like to vote on what I will suggest that it vote on, I will withdraw the proposal I am about to make.

The proposal will be an amendment to the schedule of the ICW Convention which would allow the additional taking of two bowhead whales during the fall hunt. Let me tell you briefly why I bring this up at this time. It is in light of what has happened since the last vote. Compliance with what the IWC has done will either occur or not occur this October. The Eskimos

have reserved only two whales from the quota that was given them during 1978. We have debated today what the quota should be for 1979 and this Commission, with good sense, has decided that a quota of 18 and 27 is reasonable.

During 1978 this Commission, thinking that the population was 1,200 whales, determined that the take should be 12 whales and that the strike should be 18. When we knew what the real population was, about twice as much, we decided that the proper number was 18 and 27. It seems to me what I am asking is that we reflect back on 1978 and see whether in light of the population information we now have, we might believe that those two whales would be a more correct number.

I suggest this for only three reasons. One is because of the population count, which was true in 1978 as 1979. A second is because I believe the Eskimos will need additional food to see them through the winter and a third is because I believe that the Eskimos cannot help but comply with an additional reasonableness by this Commission.

Many delegates may not wish to vote on this. Some may believe that we decided this issue last year and they would be right if they felt that way. However, as I have mentioned, we decided it last year when we thought the population was lower. Some may point to a procedural irregularity here. This item was not on the agenda. One, I suppose, could argue, if I were put to it, that we had suggested a regime, a general regime, to the Commission which, if it had been adopted would have gone into effect this year and, therefore, would have applied this year. I do not make that argument. I simply ask that those who might focus on procedure rather focus on the merits of the case.

Some may have a very legitimate concern about the number of

whales taken from this herd. I share that concern. I am simply asking that for the fall hunt we allow two more whales. All I can say is that it is my judgment that we will all be better off if there is compliance and there is a much better chance of compliance with such a proposal.

I make this proposal again, suggesting that I will withdraw it, even without a vote, if there is a general feeling here that the hour is too late, the proposal is too irregular or for any other reason this Commission would not like to vote on it. The specific proposal is that there be an amendment to paragraph 11(a) of the agenda which would provide, as amended:

"In 1978, hunting shall cease when either 18 have been struck or 14 landed".

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether this is in order or not, but let me get a seconder first to see whether we can discuss it. The Soviet Union seconds. So, we have a seconder: we will discuss it.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Mr. Chairman, this is completely out of order seen from a procedural point of view, but since we are no longer under the Bollen rules of procedure but under the Icelandic rules of procedure, I would disregard those concerns and just mention that I think that in light of the new information we have got this year, Mr. Frank's proposal is a reasonable one and I would like to second it. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? To test the meeting I guess we vote, but I am not sure whether it is procedurally in order. Has anyone a view in that regard?

ICELAND (Mr. Asgeirsson): I have yet to know anything

about Icelandic rules of procedure, but I can, however, support the US proposal. I think that it is not necessary to vote on it. I thought the US Commissioner indicated that he would withdraw it if there was a vote to be taken, so I think you should just ask if there is a consensus of the meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think I could change the schedule without a three-quarters majority.

NETHERLANDS (Mr. von der Assen): Mr. Chairman, I cannot remember the United States offering to withdraw the proposal if a vote should be taken. I cannot seem to remember that.

UNITED STATES (Mr. R. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I would like to do two things: one is to clarify that and one is to clarify what I have said. It is two whales additional landed; no additional struck, that is the number would increase by two in both cases struck and landed. It would be 20 and 14 instead of 18 and 12. I respond to an across the table comment by the Commissioner from Canada. In other words, there would be no additional losses, except those that were landed.

In response to what the distinguished delegate from the Netherlands has said, I simply indicate if there is a feeling among this group that they would not like to focus on this issue at this hour, if there is a general feeling towards that, then I would be happy to withdraw the proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN: I feel that I could not be justified in having the schedule amended unless I was sure that there was a three-quarters majority and that is a rule that we have always followed very closely. On that basis, I feel that a vote must be taken.

SOUTH AFRICA (Mr. D.G. Newman): Mr. Chairman, for

clarification, I think when we first heard of this proposed suggestion it was that the schedule be amended to read 18 and 14, but I understand now from the second statement that it is 20 and 14. I would like some clarification on that, and I would also like to know whether this would conform with the 90-day period, whether the fall hunt would conform to that: whether there would be some difficulties about the practical implementation of this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can we clarify the figures, Mr. Frank, please?

UNITED STATES (Mr. Frank): Yes, Mr. Chairman. What I meant to suggest is that we would take - I propose landing two whales which takes two strikes, but that no additional or wasteful strikes would be allowed. The fall hunt is a very efficient hunt and it is much more efficient than the Spring hunt because of the nature of the hunt - that is, it is uncommon for there to be a strike and a loss. You have to increase the strike figure here the same as you increase the landed figure because you cannot land without a strike. That is why it is 20 and 14. We are just increasing two: they would be struck and landed. No whales under this proposal could be struck and lost and if a whale is struck and not landed then we lose the landing. Thank you.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, could I ask, because it has great relevance, when the fall hunt takes place?

UNITED STATES (Mr. Frank): Mr. Chairman, the fall hunt starts sometime in September and lasts through October into November. It sometimes starts as late as October and will run a commensurate period longer. In other words, while the 90-day period may be over after the hunt is started, the hunt would

continue and so if there were not an objection that would not be a problem - that is, a whale or two could be taken after the 90 day period.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the Convention, the wording there in Article 5 paragraph (3), is that amendments become effective 90 days following notification. Now, the Secretariat is going to be late getting the notification of schedule amendments out this year inevitably, because of going to Copenhagen and the aftermath of the two meetings. I cannot see that we are going to be able, with the best will in the world, <sup>to</sup> get the notification out very early in July.

UNITED STATES (Mr. Frank): Mr. Chairman, I feel that I am taking more than hospitality that is due me, but if in fact this Commission was so inclined to grant us this request, I would simply suggest that the Secretary, with our help if need be, get a notification on this issue early. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I still consider I should take a vote on this, Mr. Frank. That is not contrary to what you are thinking, is it? Is everyone quite clear of the position? The only way, I think, is to test the meeting by calling the roll. Any other comments? I am still not sure whether we are in order, but as we are under the new rule. Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): To make a little bit of order, Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to second Mr. Frank's amendment to the US proposal. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did not understand: I am sorry.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): I favour the figures 20 and 14.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I see. That is the figure: 20 have been struck or 14 landed. That is quite clear to everybody I hope. The Secretary will call the roll.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, the proposal is to change schedule paragraph 11(a) so that it reads:

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, I feel I must make one proviso, that we will take this vote and if it is successful I wish to refer it to the Commission lawyers to make sure it is in order and on that basis, if it is in order, it can be accepted. Would people agree to that, because I am worried about changing the schedule for 1978 without the item being placed on the agenda 60 days in advance of the meeting. I feel, as Chairman, I must do that. Thank you.

THE SECRETARY: The schedule paragraph 11(a) will read:

"In 1978 hunting shall cease when either 20 have been struck or 14 landed".

This, in fact, would have to be a new paragraph because we already have a paragraph (a) which refers to 1979, so it is a new paragraph still relating to 1978 in the new schedule, which also includes the paragraph for 1979. The voting this time starts at the USSR. It is an amendment to the schedule which is proposed and so it requires a three-quarters majority.

USSR (Yes): UK (No): USA (Yes): Argentina (Yes):  
Australia (Abstain): Brazil (Yes): Canada (Yes):  
Denmark (Yes): France (Abstain): Iceland (Yes):  
Japan (Yes): Mexico (Abstain): Netherlands (Abstain):  
New Zealand (Abstain): Norway (Yes): Panama (Abstain):  
South Africa (Yes).

There were ten votes in favour, Mr. Chairman, and one against and so it receives the three-quarters majority.

THE CHAIRMAN: And I will add that the schedule will be amended, subject to legal advice. Thank you.

ARGENTINA (Mr. Iglesias): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to explain my vote. I consider that in the particular situation that was explained just now, the Commission could accept the rule 6 of the procedure could be applied in this case in one large interpretation. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I called for statements from observers and I have a late one now from IFIAS, John Kelly, who wished to make a brief statement.

IFIAS (Mr. J. Kelly): I understand, the hour is late. The International Federation of Institutes for Advanced Study wishes to again express its appreciation to the International Whaling Commission for its newly received observer status. Over the past week I have found the interaction of scientific, economic, political and cultural considerations regarding whales and whaling most interesting and personally very educational. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other business? Before you close, Denmark.

DENMARK (Mr. Lemche): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a practical announcement regarding the Copenhagen meeting. In the invitation we sent out we indicated an opening hour at 10 o'clock in the morning on Tuesday, 4th July, and that is indeed the opening hour. However, we forgot that there has to be some time to register and we would like to see people coming around half an hour before or so, that means 9.30 - not everybody at the same time.

One more thing. Denmark is extremely expensive especially in tobacco and liquor, so please bring your own food. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lemche. I am sorry the hour is so late and I may not do justice to what I wish to say, but

I think the first thing I must say is how grateful I am to Dr. Gambell and Martin Harvey and the remainder of his staff for the work that they have done from the time we people started arriving at Cambridge until tonight and maybe you can see the amount of work being done by these people but I can see from a closer spot and I think it is amazing the amount of work that these people - a small staff-- get through and the efficiency with which they work. I would like you, Dr. Gambell, to convey to your staff the sincere appreciation of the Commissioners and the people in the delegations and also the observers.

Of course, we have had trouble getting paper on time, but I am not blaming the Secretariat for that at all. It is a situation where the International Whaling Commission lives on a shoestring and it is obvious that we need more staff for situations like this and it is unfortunate that you do not have the opportunity to draw on additional staff like we were able to when we were in Canberra where the number of people did not matter. But I do thank you for the work you have done and the way that you got through, Dr. Gambell, this evening with Mr. Asgeirsson after the papers had been destroyed. I only hope that you people bear with us on these occasions and not blame the Secretariat or Dr. Gambell at all.

I should mention, but unfortunately he has gone home, that you all knew that Reg Stacey, the previous Secretary, has been in attendance most of the week but I do not think we have ever been so late as this before and it is well past his bedtime. It does not worry me because in Australia we are all just getting out of bed, so I am quite happy to go on for quite a while.

I would, first of all, like to thank Mr. Rindal for those very kind words that he said about me. After all, he was the

person who trained me, he was the person who told me I had to speak more slowly and I had to sound my "a's" differently and get rid of the Australian accent. I failed very badly. But I am most grateful to the Commissioners for the courtesies that you have extended to me in over four meetings, the assistance you have given me and the support, particularly when situations become difficult and the ability to handle the vast documentation that has been going across our table.

I thank you all for your tolerance to me whilst I have been in the Chair. By now you would know that I am a fairly volatile person and I tend to show this very late at night, but because I am waking up in Australia I guess that this has all disappeared at this particular hour.

I have enjoyed working with the International Whaling Commission and I suppose what I do enjoy is meeting the different people - and goodness knows how many I have met since 1966 - but even in addition to that, I am happy to think of the associations that I have made and the friends that I have made which I am sure will last for the rest of my life.

I wish every success to my successor. I am sure he is ably supported by the Secretariat and also by his Vice-Chairman. I know he is relieved to think that he will be no longer involved in the chairmanship of the Technical Committee.

I have one thing yet to do and that is to wish you all, and the Commission, a very successful future and I look forward to seeing as many as I can in Copenhagen. A safe journey home to every one of you.

According to the rules of procedure, the chairman-elect can only take up office at the close of a meeting, so I am about to ~~gavel~~ the closure of this meeting which signifies that Mr.

