

INDIA AT THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION



A Policy Document on India's Involvement in the IWC 1981-2003

Vassili Papastavrou



The Wildlife Trust of India (WTI) is a non-profit conservation organization committed to initiate and catalyse actions that prevent destruction of India's wildlife and its habitat. In the long run, it aims to achieve, through proactive reforms in policy and management, an atmosphere conducive to conservation. WTI works through building partnerships and alliances and its strengths lie in its willingness to work with innovative conservation techniques like acquiring land for wildlife and rescue and rehabilitation.

Suggested Citation: Papastavrou, V. (2004). 'India at the International Whaling Commission': A Policy Document on India's Involvement in the IWC 1981-2003. Wildlife Trust of India, New Delhi. Pp

Keywords: Conservation; Wild Enforcement and Law, Whaling, International Whaling Commission, Whale Conservation, Policy

The designations of geographical entities in this publication and the presentation of the material do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the authors or WTI concerning the legal status of any country, territory or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this publication for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged and appropriate credit given. Reproduction of material in this information product for or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to the Executive Director, Wildlife Trust of India or by e-mail to info@wti.org.in

This report was prepared in May 2004
First published in this form in May 2005
Copyright © WTI/IFAW 2005

Photo credits

Cover photograph: Minke whales are flensed aboard the Japanese factory ship Nisshin Maru during a Japanese hunt in the Southern Ocean Sanctuary (photo taken between Nov. '92 and April '93). © IFAW
Title page: A plate of minke whale meat in Hagkaup Supermarket, Iceland.
© IFAW/Ragnar Th. Sigurdsson

INDIA AT THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

A Policy Document on
India's Involvement in the IWC
1981-2003



Vassili Papastavrou

May 2004

An Occasional Report by Wildlife Trust of India and
the International Fund for Animal Welfare on
India's Involvement in the International Whaling Commission



CONTENTS

Foreword	vi
Preface	viii
1. India's Involvement in International Whaling Commission 1981-2003	1
2. India's statement at the IWC 1981- IWC/33/VR	3
2.1 Opening Statement - IWC/33/OS India	3
2.2 Agenda Item 13 - Small Cetaceans	4
3. India's statement at the IWC 1983- IWC/35/VR	4
3.1 Agenda Item - Opening Statement	4
4. India's statement at the IWC 1985 - IWC/37/VR	6
4.1 Agenda Item - Opening Statement	6
4.2 Agenda Item 12.2.2 - Whale Stocks and Catch Limits	7
4.3 Agenda Item 13.3.2 - Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling	7
5. India's statement at the IWC 1986 - IWC/38/VR	9
5.1 Agenda Item 6 - Future Activities of the Commission	9
6. India's statement at the IWC 1988 - IWC/40/VR	11
6.1 Agenda Item 8 - Scientific Permits	11
7. India's statement at the IWC 1989 - IWC/41/VR	12
7.1 Agenda Item 9 - Comprehensive Assessment of Whale Stocks	12
8. India's statement at the IWC 1991 - IWC/43/VR	13
8.1 Agenda Item 7 - Scientific Permits	13
8.2 Agenda Item 11 - Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling	16

8.3	Agenda Item 12 - Socio-economic Implications and Small-Type Whaling	16
8.4	Agenda Item 14 - Adoption of the Report of the Scientific Committee	16
9.	India's statement at the IWC 1993 - IWC/45/VR	17
9.1	Agenda Item 7 - Humane Killing	17
9.2	Agenda Item 8 - Socio-Economic Implications and Small-Type Whaling	17
9.3	Agenda Item 20 - Whalewatching	18
10.	India's statement at the IWC 1994 - IWC/46/VR	19
10.1	Agenda Item 14 - Scientific Permits	19
11.	India's statement at the IWC 1995 - IWC/47/VR	19
11.1	Agenda Item 7 - Socio-economic Implications and Small-Type Whaling	19
11.2	Agenda Item 10.2 - Report of Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Sub-Committee	21
11.3	Agenda Item 9 - Mechanism to address small cetaceans in the Commission	22
11.4	Agenda Item 13 - Southern Ocean Sanctuary	22
11.5	Agenda Item 15 - Scientific Permits	24
11.6	Agenda Item 19 - The responsibility of IWC for the conservation and sustainable use of whale resources	26
11.7	Agenda Item 27 - Adoption of Report of Finance and Administration Committee	27
12.	India's statement at the IWC 1998 - IWC/50/VR	27
12.1	Agenda Item - Opening Statement	27
12.2	Agenda Item 21 - Amendment of the Rules of Procedure	20
12.3	Agenda Item 14 - Scientific Permits	30

13.	India's statement at the IWC 2000 - IWC/52/VR	30
13.1	Agenda Item 7.4.2 - Southern Ocean Sanctuary	30
13.2	Agenda Item 7.3 - South Pacific Sanctuary	31
14.	India's statement at the IWC 2001 - IWC/53/VR	31
14.1	Agenda Item 16 - Administrative Matters	31
15.	India's statement at the IWC 2002 - IWC/54/VR	32
15.1	Agenda Item 9.2 Revised Management Scheme	32
15.2	Agenda Item 10 - Sanctuaries	34
15.3	Agenda Item 18 - Formula for Calculation Contributions	36
	Appendix I	37
	Appendix II	47

FOREWORD

Conservation is inter-twined with politics and increasingly so with the passage of time. But nowhere have I encountered such politics, diplomacy and international stakes in conservation related conferences as in the annual meetings of the International Whaling Commission (IWC).

India became a Member of the IWC and started participating in the meetings from 1981 onwards. Whales do feature in Schedule I of the Wildlife (Protection) Act and they do occur in India's territorial waters sporadically. We also have a long coastline where dead whales sometimes wash ashore. However, whales have not been a focus of any great conservation effort in India and despite their size, have not acquired any fan following in India as do tigers and elephants. Despite this, and despite the very considerable pressure brought by whaling nations, including Japan, to bear upon the Government of India, India has been steadfastly against whaling. India has continuously supported the concept of the Indian Ocean Sanctuary for whales and the stoppage of whaling, including the cessation of whaling in the name of science which gives both science and the nations who perpetrate it, a bad name.

I have vivid memories of the annual jousts with the Japanese. Always courteous and disciplined, the only time when I have found the Japanese ruffled was when we took a stand against them to prevent whaling under some garb or the other. One episode in particular I recollect very well. Peeved at the continued obstinacy of India to not tow the policy of the whaling nations, the then Prime Minister of Japan Mr. Nobusuke Kishi had specifically spoken to our Prime Minister Mr. Rajiv Gandhi that India should either support Japan in the Whaling Commission and if that is not possible, at least to abstain from voting against it. My name had been

cited specifically in this regard and it was suggested that at least I should not attend. The Ministry of External Affairs was in favour of falling in line and the Japanese Ambassador to India had in my presence met the Minister of State for Environment and Forests and clearly stated the extent of foreign aid being given by Japan to India at that point of time. There was an overt hint that this external aid could be in jeopardy.

As the Whaling Commissioner of India and the Director of Wildlife Preservation of the country, I had put up a note to the Prime Minister Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, that we had only two options. The first option was that we should not participate in the forthcoming meeting of the IWC and in which case, we should withdraw from the IWC itself rather than continue to pay the substantial subscription to the IWC, without participating in it in the future. The second option was that we continue with the policy of supporting the ban on whaling and the continuation of a moratorium on whaling in the Indian Ocean Whale Sanctuary. I had added in my note a third option, that if we changed our policy *vis-à-vis* whaling, it would be very humiliating and therefore it would be not appropriate to participate in the IWC meetings and abstain from voting, let alone support the whaling nations. I had also mentioned that I would personally not go to the forthcoming Whaling Commission meeting in Auckland, New Zealand in 1988, if there was to be a change in India's policy *vis-à-vis* whaling.

The date of my departure for Auckland arrived and there was no word yet from the PMO. The file came back that afternoon, with a hand-written note from Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

“The Japanese, I believe have a problem with whaling.
The whales, however, have even a greater problem.
We should continue to support the ban on whaling.”

That night I caught the plane for Auckland with the message of the P.M. in my briefcase. A lot of water has flowed through the Palk Strait since then and things have changed, haven't they ?

This is an excellent account of the role played by India in the International Whaling Commission and it does show that some things, at least, have not changed. Let us take heart from that !

April 29, 2005
New Delhi

Dr. M. K. Ranjitsinh
Trustee
Wildlife Trust of India

PREFACE

This Occasional Report of the Wildlife Trust of India and the International Fund for Animal Welfare aims to chronicle the consistent conservation stance of India at the International Whaling Commission meetings for more than two decades. It is intended as a briefing booklet for officials and NGOs who may attend such meetings in the future so that the historical context to any Indian intervention is well known.

It is clear that India has adopted a uniformly pro-conservation and anti-whaling position and other countries could also draw inspiration from the recorded interventions of India, which has opposed whaling philosophically, ecologically and economically.

As the speeches of the delegates on the floor of the house are recorded verbatim, there is no textual addition to them and such passages are reproduced in full from the Verbatim Records (VR).

It is hoped that making these records available to the delegates of the IWC will help inform the debate and serve as an archival reference. Vassili Papastavrou of IFAW has done yeoman's service in putting these records together.

May 20, 2005
New Delhi

Vivek Menon
Executive Director
Wildlife Trust of India

1. INDIA'S INVOLVEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION 1981–2003

India has been an important voice for whale conservation since joining the International Whaling Commission in 1981, and has maintained a consistent position which has included:

- Voting for key conservation measures such as the moratorium on commercial whaling (1982), the Southern Ocean Sanctuary (1994) and the Berlin Initiative to create a conservation committee (2003).
- Opposing measures proposed by the whalers that would result in the legitimisation of existing commercial and scientific whaling (more than 1,300 whales will be killed in 2004) (see Appendix 1 for voting record)
- Supporting the inclusion of small cetaceans (i.e. dolphins and porpoises) under IWC jurisdiction
- Strictly defining aboriginal whaling (the special category of whaling by indigenous people).
- Opposing attempts by Japan to create a new category of whaling “Small-type coastal whaling”
- Opposing “scientific” whaling by indicating that whales do not need to be killed in order to be studied.
- Supporting efforts to address the serious problem of entangle-

ment of whales and dolphins in fishing gear (the La Jolla workshop)

- Supporting whale watching as a sustainable use of whales
- Opposing proposals by Japan for secret ballots
- Supporting the continuation of the Southern Ocean and Indian Ocean sanctuaries. Also supporting the declaration of new sanctuaries in The South Pacific and the South Atlantic

India's voting record is included as Appendix I (page 37).

A listing of India's Commissioners to the IWC is included as Appendix II (page 47).

The information on India's contributions to the International Whaling Commission is taken from the Verbatim Record (VR) of the IWC and from documents submitted by India (listed with a document number). For clarity, where India associates with the position of another country, that intervention is included as well.

2. INDIA'S STATEMENT AT THE IWC MEETING 1981- IWC/33/VR

2.1 Opening Statement - IWC/33/OS India

Thank you, Mr Chairman. India has always shared the concern for preserving for future generations the inestimable natural resources represented by the cetaceans which is in itself a symbol of the much broader concern for the preservation of man's environment. Itself not a whaling nation, India's policy is one of prudent use and management of its maritime resources and the present Government, under the leadership of Prime Minister Mrs Indira Gandhi, has lent full support to the concept of conservation coupled with sustained development as enunciated in the World Conservation Strategy which has also called for a moratorium on commercial whaling. It is in recognition of this, and to strengthen the cause of conservation, that India has recently joined the Commission and become party to the Convention for the Regulation of Whaling. This is, therefore, the first Meeting of the International Whaling Commission in which India is participating and we look forward to useful and fruitful deliberations where as well as meaningful results hereafter.

India is fully conscious of the urgent need for the conservation and proper management of the whale stocks of the world which, despite the monitoring and quota regulation by the Commission, has actually resulted in only depletion of stocks, particularly of the large baleen whales and now the sperm whales. The present situation is one of grave apprehension for the future. The objectives set forth in the International Convention of 1946 are far from being realised. There is world-wide concern on the score, amply reflected in a resolution passed by the Third Meeting of the conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, held at New Delhi four

months ago, whereby the sperm whale, the fin whale and the sei whale have been placed on Appendix I of that Convention. As Chairman of the Standing Committee of CITES, representing the interests of all the Contracting Parties, which now number seventy, India considers it necessary to draw the attention of this gathering pointedly to this important development and to urge the need for a similar consensus in our deliberations here.

It is with this expectation that India pledges its support to the Whaling Convention and has full faith in our ability to carry out its overall goals and objectives. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2.2 Agenda Item 13 - Small Cetaceans

Resolution on White Whales and Narwhals

Mr. Chairman before we switch from Item Number 13 which relates to the small cetaceans India would like to go on record saying that it regrets the failure of the IWC to extend protection to the small cetaceans. While appreciating the legal and other reasons put forward in this respect, we are deeply concerned that several small cetacean species are increasingly threatened and sincerely hope that it will be possible to find some effective way of addressing the special needs of the small cetaceans.

3. INDIA'S STATEMENTS AT THE IWC MEETING 1983 - IWC/35/VR

3.1 Agenda Item - Opening Statement

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I do not wish to interrupt proceedings but since this is the stage for making opening statements I have a rather important message from our Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi, which I seek your permission to read out if I may.

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I bring to you from India warm greetings as well as the weather for this 35th Annual Meeting of the IWC. In 1981, I had the pleasure of making an opening statement for India to the 33rd Meeting, today I have the privilege of reading out to this meeting an important message from our respected Prime Minister, Mrs Indira Gandhi, whose commitment to nature and wildlife conservation is well known. I quote from the message:

“Two years ago India joined the International Whaling Commission because it shares the worldwide concern for preserving for future generations the largest and most mysterious of all mammals. It is good that in these two years the Commission has increased its membership appreciably, strengthened the research programme on whales in the Indian Ocean and decided in favour of cessation of commercial whaling activities by 1985/1986. As one who has grown up with a sense of kinship with nature in all its manifestations, I have found whales fascinating since I first saw one in childhood. Their size, their habits, how they raise their young and the recent findings about their intelligence, their relationships with each other, with other sea creatures and with humans. Our interest in the Indian Ocean is obvious, and we should like to see appropriate arrangements made for the conservation and development of the marine mammals of our region. We are equally concerned about the status of the smallest cetaceans.

My good wishes to the 35th Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission. Signed Indira Gandhi”.

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

4. INDIA'S STATEMENT AT THE IWC MEETING 1985 - IWC/37/VR

4.1 Agenda Item - Opening Statement

PRIME MINISTER

MESSAGE

The deliberations and development of the International Whaling Commission have always been of interest to India. Four years ago we joined the Commission, not because India ever was or wishes to be a whaling nation, but because we wish to join other nations of the world in their endeavour to save this most fascinating and remarkable member of our planet's living fraternity.

Conservation of whales in the Indian Ocean is naturally of interest to us. But whales are not of any single bay, sea or ocean. They are the world's most awe inspiring and oldest international community in the true sense of the term.

The late Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi had always expressed deep concern for the well being of the whales. I share her concern.

The International Whaling Commission is poised at a critical moment of its history. The future of the whales too is similarly poised. The world would be watching your deliberations and let the world be your judge.

My good wishes to the 37th Annual Meeting of the Commission.

New Delhi

July 3, 1985

4.2 Agenda Item 12.2.2 - Whale Stocks and Catch Limits - Minke Whales

Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Indian delegation re-insist the expression that they have already made about this North Eastern Atlantic Stock, which has been very badly depleted, and would still insist that this stock should be classified as protected. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

...

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I strongly feel that it is a question of treating a patient. When a patient is critically ill, it is deferring the treatment to some-time later. So I still insist that it should be expressed that is as a protected stock, because it is very badly depleted already. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

4.3 Agenda Item 13.3.2 - Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling - Bering Sea Stock of Bowhead Whales

Thank you Mr. Chairman. In this context I would like to draw the attention to the proposal that India has made on the definition of aboriginal subsistence whaling. This word in the circular IWC/37/22. In view of the growing need, and implication of protection we strongly feel that this definition should be clear and the proposal on the definition is this, "aboriginal subsistence whaling means whaling from traditional vessels, conducted exclusively by aboriginal peoples for purposes of personal consumption or use by them, and requires that both whale meat and other products derived from such hunting be used only to satisfy the nutritional, subsistence and cultural needs of the peoples concerned, and shall not be used for any non tradition commercial purposes. Including sale or exchange for money or credit, either within the country or outside it."

For the purpose of this definition, "tradition" implies any method, practice or equipment employed in the nineteenth century or earlier.

India

I mean this definition of the aboriginal subsistence whaling. I have given this, our proposal is contained in the circular IWC/37/22. So this will be incorporated in the Schedule, which is appearing under the definition. That is what our proposal is.

Document - IWC/37/22

DEFINITION OF ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING **PROPOSED BY INDIA**

BACKGROUND

Schedule paragraph 13(a) includes the term “aboriginal subsistence whaling,” in listing the procedures to be used by the Commission in establishing catch limits for such operations.

PROPOSAL

As there is no definition of the term “aboriginal subsistence whaling,” it is proposed that the following definition be inserted in schedule paragraph 1 (Interpretation), General:

“Aboriginal subsistence whaling” means whaling from traditional vessels conducted exclusively by aboriginal peoples for purposes of personal consumption or use by them, and requires that both whale meat and other products derived from such hunting be used only to satisfy the nutritional, subsistence and cultural needs of the peoples concerned, and shall not be used for any non traditional commercial purposes, including sale or exchange for money or credit, either within the country or outside it.

For the purpose of this definition, “traditional” implies any method, practice or equipment utilized in the nineteenth century or earlier.

5. INDIA'S STATEMENT AT THE IWC MEETING 1986 - IWC/38/VR

5.1 Agenda Item 6 - Future Activities of the Commission

6.4 - Listed Species

New Zealand

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to take the opportunity just to explain New Zealand's position on this issue. There are only two legal texts to which member governments have subscribed and which govern our actions under this Convention. One is the International Convention signed in Washington on 2 December 1946. The other is the Schedule to the Convention, which, together with its amendments, is stated by the Convention to be an integral part of that Convention.

Turning to the Convention itself, throughout it refers to whales. It states that this is 'a convention to provide for the proper conservation of whale stocks and thus make possible the orderly development of the whaling industry.' The Convention does not attempt to define a whale. It assumed that the parties involved knew a whale when they saw one. It does not say that the Convention applies only to whales over a certain size. It applies to whales generally. The Schedule does give on pages 5 and 6 a list of the alternative names employed for certain species of whale. It does not say either that only animals listed are whales. It is not restrictive in any way, but it obviously does assume that the species listed come within the competence of the Commission in one way or another, otherwise there would have been no point in including them in the Schedule. The list, incidentally, includes Baird's beaked and pilot whales.

Reference has been made in the past to the Annex entitled Nomenclature of Whales to the "Final Act of the 1946 International Whaling

Conference". This has no binding force in our view. It does not form part of the Convention or of the Schedule. The background as we understand it is that at the International Whaling Conference in 1946 different national delegations were using different names to describe certain species of whale. This led to confusion. In an effort to clarify the situation, the Secretariat produced a list of all the names commonly used to describe certain species. This was the origin of the Nomenclature. It was used as a guide, and as a conference document was annexed to the Final Act, the record or minutes of the discussions at the meetings. But to the best of our knowledge, the Nomenclature was never debated much less adopted as a definitive list of the species of whale to be regarded as coming within the competence of the Commission. Since then some delegations have sought to accord it that status. New Zealand does not agree that a Secretariat paper produced for guidance purposes should somehow be used to restrict the range of the Commission's activities today.

Sir, that explains our attitude towards the question envisaged and encompassed by this item. We can also see retention of this item. Thank you, sir.

...

India

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My delegation would like to extend its support and we are in harmony with the opinion expressed by the delegation of New Zealand, Australia and some of the others with regard to the competence of the Commission to extend itself to the small cetaceans as well. We are concerned with all whales. Thank you.

6. INDIA'S STATEMENT AT THE IWC MEETING 1988 - IWC/40/VR

6.1 Agenda Item 8 - Scientific Permits

8.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

India

Thank you Mr. Chairman. What I am proposing to say just now does not concern any particular individual countries research programme, but scientific whaling per se concerning across the board whoever may be doing scientific whaling or scientific whaling as a subject Mr. Chairman. I would confine myself to remarks, my remarks would pertain only to that aspect of Scientific Whaling, which involves the killing of whales and not what is termed as benign scientific whaling which does not involve the killing of whales. I will confine myself to what I may call malignant scientific whaling, malignant being the antithesis of the word benign.

Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware of the sovereignty of the individual countries both in their own territorial waters as well as under the constitution of this particular Commission and I am not questioning that, but on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, India has as much right to explain its position in this regard and voice its view because, and I am doing this, because this has a bearing on whatever action we may take in future in this regard. We are not proselytising, we are not preaching and we will not adopt a 'holier than thou' attitude but something has to be said at certain times. Mr. Chairman, after considerable discussion and mulling about we are of the view that there is nothing before us that would really justify in our opinion the killing of whales for purposes of science. There is, has been, a large number of whales killed from which all that need to be garnered could have been garnered, and if it had not been garnered then there can only be, in our opinion, whales should be killed for two broad

specific purposes. Firstly the killing of whales which is essential and required for the long-term survival and better management for that survival of the whales themselves, Mr. Chairman, and secondly for the survival of the human race. Survival as different from economic benefit or economic survival. If, Mr. Chairman, there is any whaling that is to be done for these conditions, these parameters, these criteria, and if that is governed by an effective international body of scientists independent which would control that whaling for these purposes, yes we would go along with that because we do believe that the whales are a shared world resource. But anything that is not within those parameters, Mr. Chairman, we would refrain from supporting such whaling if it means the sanctioning of permits and of quotas and of that which does not very well come within those parameters we may wish to refrain, we may wish in future to abstain, because Mr. Chairman we believe that by giving acceptance to quotas, sorry, not to quotas but to whaling which does not meet with these parameters, is tantamount to overt approval, overt concurrence and approval of whaling in the name of science. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

7. INDIA'S STATEMENTS AT THE IWC MEETING 1989 - IWC/41/VR

7.1 Agenda Item 9 - Comprehensive Assessment of Whale Stocks

9.2 - Report of Joint Working Group

India

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to add to the colleagues who have just mentioned their viewpoints ahead of me, especially the view point expressed by the distinguished delegate from Germany. I would

just like to add one point. That is, before one comes to a safe limit or any limit, one must understand carefully and take a conscious decision as to what level the whale stocks are to be restored to.

What is a harvestable safe unit before you consider what you are going to harvest? Are you going to maintain stocks at 5,000 of a species, 6,000, 7,000 or much more? This is a question I raised when I first attended this august body's meeting way back in 1985. Whenever you do a management programme you must be very sure about the level you want to take a particular population up to. Do you consider that it is the extinction level and anything more than that is safe, or do we restore it to its pristine or its original population? I do not know whether we can go back to that level with the disturbance that is going on, etc. but what is the level that a particularly species' numbers should be built up to before you can consider an offtake. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8. INDIA'S STATEMENT AT THE IWC MEETING 1991 - IWC/43/VR

8.1 Agenda Item 7 - Scientific Permits

7.1 - Report of the Scientific Committee

Chairman of the Scientific Committee

Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The next permit we looked at was the one from the USSR. This is found in our Agenda Item 10.2.2 on page 36. The Committee reviewed the proposals in our document 011 only with respect to the proposed lethal taking of minke whales from the waters of the Okhotsk Sea. Last year the Committee noted that at its 1985 meeting it had agreed that the documents on any proposed scientific permits should be provided to the Secretary at least 60 days in advance of an annual

meeting of the Scientific Committee so that the proposal and any supporting documentation could be sent out at the same time as the Provisional Agenda. This current proposal was received by the Secretariat and forwarded to the Scientific Committee on 20 April this year. Before discussing the proposal in the context of the Commission's guidelines, some general comments were made and these can be found on page 36 of our report. We then looked at the various headings that we review these research permits under and the first one is the proposal itself. The main objective of the research is to obtain material that will provide morphological and physiological characteristics of the population. In addition, biological samples will be collected for determining age, sexual and physical maturity and reproductive condition. Stomach contents will also be examined to investigate the role of minke whales in the food web. The proposal envisions a catch of 90 minke whales during June and July of this year. No selection for size or sex will be made of the minke whales taken and all the catches will be from the Okhotsk Sea. Based on discussions of the North Pacific minke whales at this year's meeting, whales killed in the Okhotsk Sea will be from two previously accepted management stocks. One of them is the Okhotsk Sea West Japan West Pacific and the other is the Sea of Japan Yellow Sea East China Sea stock. The Committee noted that the proposal had not adequately specified the objectives of the research, although some clarification had been provided by the scientists present.

The next thing that we looked at were the objectives of the permit. There is insufficient information given regarding aims and methodology to be able to comment on sample size. No reasons are given in the proposal justifying sample size other than the proponents' belief that such catches will not deplete the stock. There is no statement of the method of killing to be used. However, the proposal notes that a catcher boat will be used

which is the same one that is used for aboriginal subsistence whaling of gray whales.

Next, we looked at the methodology. Several observations were made on the methodology proposed and these can be found on the middle of page 37 of our report. The Committee noted that the level of information given in the proposal made it difficult to comment in detail on the methodology.

The next thing that we looked at was the effect of catches on the stock. The Committee noted that the new abundance estimate of whales in the Okhotsk Sea was just over 19,000 animals. It also noted some degree of mixing, as I mentioned before, from animals from two stocks occurred in Okhotsk Sea north of Japan at least in April. Minke whales from the Sea of Japan Yellow Sea East China Sea stock were not able to be assessed at this year's meeting, as I mentioned yesterday. They are currently classified as a Protection Stock by the Commission. It's not possible to say what proportion of the proposed research catch might be taken from the two mixing stocks nor what the level of mixing might be in June or July.

The next and last item that we looked at was the question of research cooperation and it was noted that the research proposal stated that participation of foreign scientists was welcomed and this is an item that we usually have as one of cooperation aspects of research proposals. That was just noted. Thank you.

India

Chairman, India also wants these scientific experiments to be stopped by the Soviet Union.

India

Thank you, Chairman. India is not against scientific research but it is against lethal scientific research.

8.2 Agenda Item 11 - Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling

11.3 - Action Arising - Bowhead Whales

Chairman

Any comments? Anything else on page 24? India.

India

I want to change, in fact what I said is that India was concerned that setting a block quota may lose the aboriginal subsistence character of the hunt and give it commercial characters.

8.3 Agenda Item 12 - Socio-economic Implications and Small-Type Whaling

12.1 - Report of Working Group

India

Thank you, Chairman. India is against any kind of relaxation for coastal whaling except as subsistence for aboriginal communities.

12.2 - Action Arising

8.4 Agenda Item 14 - Adoption of the Report of the Scientific Committee

14.1 - Small Cetaceans Subject to Significant Takes

Thank you, Chairman. I would like to stress India's commitment to consider the recommendations of the La Jolla Workshop and to take possible steps to protect and conserve cetaceans in the Indian EEZ in collaboration with the concerned fishery management authorities. India is not

in favour of large-scale driftnet and other fishery operations which are harmful not only to cetaceans but the marine ecosystem in general. India would also like to know about the possibilities of international cooperation in evaluating the effects of various fishing operations on marine ecology, assessment of cetaceans, stocks and migratory behaviour of marine mammals including marine turtles. IWC may also think of the scope of seeking cooperation in this area with the Indian Ocean countries like Sri Lanka, Seychelles, etc.

9. INDIA'S STATEMENT AT THE IWC MEETING 1993 - IWC/45/VR

9.1 Agenda Item 7 - Humane Killing

7.2 - Action Arising

India

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, during our deliberations for the last two days and even while discussing this item, questions have been raised about the competence of the Commission with regard to certain species of cetaceans. I would like to mention that we believe this Commission has full competence for the conservation of all species of cetaceans which include whale, dolphin and porpoise. I would also like to mention that the killing of cetaceans is of concern for this Commission, therefore we support the Resolution moved by UK and others. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9.2 Agenda Item 8 - Socio-Economic Implications and Small-Type Whaling

8.3 - Action Arising

India

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, one can understand the Government of Japan's concern for its communities used to whaling, but I understood from the presentation of the Japanese Commissioner that the communities have managed to do without whaling for over a period of seven years. Even in the case of aboriginal subsistence whaling the ultimate objective is to phase it out with the introduction of alternative means of living. In the present case communities have lived for nearly a decade without whaling. Efforts should be made to encourage them to move further away from whaling. Further, any proposal for interim catch limit will amount to breach of the moratorium imposed on whaling. The grounds for the moratorium still remain intact. Further, any agreeing to the request is likely to open floodgates of requests from other coastal states as indicated by the Commissioner of Korea. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we are against this proposal. Thank you.

9.3 Agenda Item 20 - Whalewatching

India

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join some of my other colleagues in thanking UK for bringing this important item and a very interesting item on agenda. We welcome this proposal because the question of sustainable utilisation of species may not mean consumerism only, but can derived from non-lethal activities like ecotourism associated with these species. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

India

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that Agenda 21 does not necessarily mean that sustainable use must be lethal use. In fact, in adopting Agenda 21, signatories expressly recognised that nothing must take the right of an international organisation to prohibit, limit or regulate the exploitation of marine mammals more strict-

ly than it generally says in Agenda 21. IWC being entrusted with the responsibility of management of whales, should decide their statute themselves and no harvesting of whales should be done unless the stability of the species has been established beyond any doubt and the removal of the increment can be done, keeping the main stock at maximum sustainable level. Pending that, non lethal utilisation of whale resources such as whalewatching which is suggested by UK this afternoon, can be a good example of sustainable use of living marine resources. We feel time is not ripe for commercial whaling to be resumed. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10. INDIA'S STATEMENT AT THE IWC MEETING 1994 - IWC/46/VR

10.1 Agenda Item 14 - Scientific Permits 14.1 - Report of the Scientific Committee

India

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. India would like to share the views offered by Netherlands, New Zealand, UK and USA. India considers that non-lethal research only should be carried out on the whales. Thank you.

11. INDIA'S STATEMENT AT THE IWC MEETING 1995 - IWC/47/VR

11.1 Agenda Item 7 - Socio-economic Implications and Small- Type Whaling 7.1 - Report of Working Group

India

Thank you Mr. Chairman. India had earlier taken a stand that even aboriginal subsistence whaling should also be phased out by introduction of

alternative means if that is required for the conservation of the species. We definitely appreciate the good work done by Japan, about the various additions made by them, but as we know Japan is a developed country and the societies there are evolving fast. Since the moratorium of the commercial whaling is continuing since long, I am sure that the traditional communities which primarily depended on the small type coastal whaling must have adjusted themselves to the changed situation and adapted to some sort of livelihood otherwise how are they subsisting for so many years? So, we do not find any special reason to open this small type of whaling especially on an interim basis which according to India is nothing but opening up commercial whaling in some form or other. We understand that Japan will have a little bit of a problem in taking back this idea to their country but if, as for their own report, some of the vessels have already been out of commission, some of the communities are also trying to switch on to other activities with difficulties. Is it not the appropriate time now that we explore further to see that the bases which were otherwise being used, which has been reduced today, the communities which have partially slipped into some sort of activities there are oriented, guided, in future to resort to activities which is consistent with conservation? Thank you very much.

7.3 - Action Arising

USA

Thank you, Chairman. On Tuesday, we voted against an amendment to the Schedule for an allocation of 50 minke whales for several communities in Japan. The primary reason my delegation and a number of other delegations opposed that amendment is that small type coastal whaling is fundamentally incompatible with the moratorium on commercial whaling. While my delegation appreciates the revisions that Japan has made to its Action Plan, we note that its purpose remains the management of

an interim relief allocation. We presume this new version of the Japanese Resolution is predicated on Japan's expectation that a future meeting of the IWC will result in Japan's receiving an interim relief allocation. Interim in the sense that the RMS would not yet have been completed and the moratorium on commercial whaling would still be in effect. Mr. Chairman, my delegation view is such an expectation is unwarranted. We would not want to raise false expectations as may have occurred in 1993 by passing this Resolution. As I stated earlier in this meeting, one way to alleviate the distress of these communities is for the Commission to work expeditiously to complete the RMS. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, my delegation remains opposed to this Resolution. Thank you.

India

India would like to share the view expressed by the United States. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11.2 Agenda Item 10.2 - Report of Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Sub-Committee

India

Thank you Mr. Chairman. India definitely subscribes in the present situation to the idea of the aboriginal subsistence whaling. But, Chairman, you may remember that this subsistence whaling was given under three main premises. The first premise was to ensure that the risk of the extinction to the individual stocks are not seriously increased by aboriginal whaling. Second, to enable the original or the aboriginal people to harvest whales in perpetuity at levels appropriate to their cultural and nutritional requirement. Third, to maintain the status of the whale stock at or above the level giving the highest net recruitment and with respect to the stocks below that level they are attempted to move towards it. Well, the subsistence whaling can continue, but India strongly feels that with the change of sit-

uation a drive must be made to gradually phase out and new avenues for economic development of the development communities to be explored by the concerned countries. We feel that not much has been done to ensure this prohibition. It will be appropriate if the Scientific Committee look into these issues to ensure that these three conditions are properly followed and that an attempt is made to gradually phase out the aboriginal subsistence whaling.

11.3 Agenda Item 9 - Mechanism to address small cetaceans in the Commission

9.1 - Report of Working Group

India

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. India notes its concern that there are at least 66 species of small cetaceans in nearly 200 population stocks around the world. There are 140 coastal states but only a little over 40 IWC members. Well, this is perhaps because there are little incentives for the non member states which indulge in small cetacean fisheries operations to co operate with the IWC. India therefore feels that the IWC should have higher level conservation of the small cetaceans, while the Secretariat may consult the coastal states to know their reaction, I am in keeping the sovereignty of the coastal states intact I personally feel the Scientific Committee can start looking into the issues which will be necessary for the IWC to concern in future years regarding the mechanism to address the issue of the small cetacean in this Commission. Thank you.

11.4 Agenda Item 13 - Southern Ocean Sanctuary

13.1 - Report of the Scientific Committee

India

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I will be limiting my submission only with respect to Southern Ocean Sanctuary, which is perhaps the issue here. I

am very happy to see that the Scientific Committee has gone into depth about the future working modalities of the sanctuary and have suggested that some sort of research in proper format is required to be done. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit that the Southern Ocean Sanctuary has been approved by the IWC only last year. In terms of IUCN, the word 'sanctuary' perhaps falls under the category 4 of the protected area network system, which is an instrument for habitat and species management in a specified area. The effect of the formation of the sanctuary will require time to manifest itself. If the research is intended on the biology of the species, the results obtained from other areas or even this sanctuary prior to its formation, when research or even little research was going on there, may be indicative enough to guide us for current management system. But if it is intended to study the status, distribution, ecology or the biology of the species in the sanctuary, and study the habitat interaction for future management, I personally feel, Mr. Chairman, any lethal method of research will not only be premature but perhaps against the concept of the formation of the sanctuary. The Indian Government will therefore not suggest any lethal research to start in the sanctuary now because time has not come. But, if for the purpose of future database, any non lethal research programme is undertaken, Indian Government will welcome it. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

11.4 - Action Arising

Australia

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What we're referring to is the draft Resolution contained in document IWC/47/30 Rev 1. Before proceeding we have an addition to the co-sponsors. We understand that the Russian Federation would like to join the other co-sponsors. The development of the Resolution has come from the deliberations of quite a number of delega-

tions, as can be seen from the number of co sponsors there. It originally arose from discussions amongst the Valdivia group and others. The draft has had a lengthy process of consideration leading to the present text which you have before you.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation is concerned about the matter of the continuing conduct of research under special permit, particularly in sanctuaries. We are very much aware of the continuing practice of granting such permits under national jurisdiction in the Southern Ocean. We have raised bilaterally with Japan our concerns about scientific whaling by Japan in the Southern Ocean sanctuary. The Australian Government reminded Japan of the preference of the IWC that it should revise its research programme to use only non lethal techniques. We had hoped the spirit surrounding the declaration of the sanctuary would have persuaded Japan to change its programme in order to employ only non lethal methods. Australia is deeply concerned that Japan is now also proposing to increase its take of minke whales and to expand the area where they'll be taken under its special permit. Australia considers that non lethal techniques are providing increasingly powerful means of addressing issues central to the long term conservation of cetaceans. We would like to promote increased effort to developing alternatives to lethal techniques. We cannot, however, accept that Japan needs to continue to use lethal methods. Mr. Chairman, Australia together with those co-sponsoring governments are particularly unhappy about the continuation of such a significant programme of killing whales in an area which has so recently been designated by the IWC as a sanctuary. We commend the Resolution to all member governments. Thank you.

India

Accepting, Mr. Chairman, the spirit for which a sanctuary is established,

India strongly supports this Resolution. Thank you.

11.5 Agenda Item 15 - Scientific Permits

15.1 - Report of the Scientific Committee

New Zealand

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to associate myself with the remarks of the United States and others that have already been made. New Zealand recognises that the killing of whales for research purposes may be within the letter of the Convention. However, it is our view that with modern techniques the information necessary for the management and conservation of whales can be obtained from non lethal methods. We are therefore opposed to what is usually described as scientific whaling and we are concerned that the numbers of whales being killed for research purposes appear to be increasing. We are particularly concerned at the proposal to increase the quota by a further 100 in the coming year that has now been foreshadowed and we are, above all I suppose, concerned that these activities are occurring in the newly established Southern Ocean Sanctuary. We had taken the view that the establishment of that sanctuary was particularly appropriate because the area had been the scene of some of the worst excesses of commercial whaling over the past century and it's therefore a cause of great concern to my country and my delegation that whales continue to be killed in this area. We call, Sir, for an end to this activity and we call for the future use of non lethal research methods for obtaining the information that is required for the management and conservation of whales.

India

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I simply reiterate the view expressed by the Commissioner for New Zealand. Thank you.

15.2 - Action Arising

India

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can I make just for the clarification of the Commissioners here some observation on the point raised by the Commissioner from St Vincent and The Grenadines and partly Commissioner for St Lucia? Thank you. Well, the Commissioner for St Vincent and The Grenadines had raised the issue, why restriction is being imposed for whales only regarding non lethal research programme. I may mention here to all the Commissioners that India houses 65 per cent of the world population of tiger, 50 per cent of the Asiatic elephant, 100 per cent of the Asiatic lion and 60 per cent of the Asiatic rhino. We do not carry out any lethal research but we do have research programmes and get a lot of feedback from non lethal research. I also do not think other countries which houses this megaspecies also rely on lethal research for knowing the ecology, biology, status or distribution of the species. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11.6 Agenda Item 19 - The responsibility of IWC for the conservation and sustainable use of whale resources

India

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the decision has been taken last year I don't know whether it should be discussed, but India would like to state that we fully respect the principle of sustainable development reiterated in the Earth Summit at Rio in June 1992 which also includes the component of sustainable use. India, however, believes that the principle of sustainable use need not be consumptive use alone. We must explore the possibilities of non consumptive use also. Given, however, the result of the past experiences of consumerism in various areas of the world, India urges that for consumptive utilisation of the living resources the following conditions should be satisfied first. One, the consumptive use should be

practiced only when the population of the species is adequate, viable and evidently growing so that only the normal increment is taken out. Two, the demands of indigenous rural people for their own consumption are first fully met. Three, there are adequate national legislation to take care of the situation and proper implementation machinery to enforce the law to ensure that illegal trade do not take place. Four, there are proper and periodic monitoring and evaluation mechanism to review the situation from time to time in order to evolve a long term future direction. And last, sustainable use must have proper regard to the ethics, culture and acceptable traditions of the people of the country. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11.7 Agenda Item 27 - Adoption of Report of Finance and Administration Committee

India

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. India believes in humane killing of animals and is opposed to any method that causes cruelty to animals, but the records produced in the document or even the findings of the Workshop appeared inconclusive to Indian delegation. Further, the wording of the document appearing in different paras of the Resolution IWC/47/44 also appeared to Indian delegation a bit inconsistent, if not self contradictory. Therefore Indian delegation choose to abstain from voting. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12. INDIA'S STATEMENT AT THE IWC MEETING 1998 - IWC/50/VR

12.1 Agenda Item - Opening Statement Statement by Government of India

We are happy that the 50th Meeting of the IWC is being held at Muscat, Oman from 16-20 May 1998. We are grateful to the Government of Oman for hosting this Conference and it is a reflection of their commitment to the conservation of whales and long term sustainability of marine ecosystems.

It is necessary to point out that in the past India has played a prominent role in bringing about the moratorium on commercial whaling and strengthening the Whaling Commission. Any serious proposal to address the IWC's growing problems merits full consideration and discussion by the IWC. The way the proposals develop needs close monitoring to assess whether they could result in a real improvement in the long term level of protection for whales.

In this regard, we agree with the position taken by the WWF which is summarised as under:

- A. Halt the current increase in the annual numbers of whales killed by commercial whalers and decrease it in the future;
- B. Prohibit pelagic whaling;
- C. Close the loophole that allows IWC regulations to be evaded through "scientific whaling", and ensure that current scientific whaling by Japan is phased out rapidly;
- D. Ensure that international trade in whale products does not resume, so removing the incentive for whaling to be a means of making quick profits;

- E. Close the loophole which allows whaling countries to exempt themselves from IWC catch limits by lodging Objections (as Norway has done)

- F. Maintain the current moratorium on commercial whaling, and ensure no whaling is authorised as exception to the moratorium unless and until:
 - all the safeguards of a comprehensive Revised Management Scheme (including watertight provision for observation and inspection) are in force, fully funded and operational, and

 - all the above actions have been taken.

We hope that the discussions in the meeting will contribute to conservation of whales and long term sustainability of marine ecosystems.

12.2 Agenda Item 21 - Amendment of the Rules of Procedure

21.1 - Voting Procedures

India

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by thanking the People of Oman and the country and the Government for having organised this excellent function and for the hospitality. I would also like to compliment the Secretariat of the IWC on the excellent arrangement they have made here, and coming to the issue and discussion right now: While the views of the Caribbean countries have been very adequately expressed, and I am sure all of us respect and agree with the views that it is a matter of reality which has been happening in the intentional fora, this threat of economic caution or whatever, at the same time we cannot disagree with the point that we need to have greater transparency in the functioning of the international organisations and keeping this in , we cannot agree to the

proposal on secret balloting. While at the same time, we urge the Commission to take into account the views and the fears expressed by the Caribbean countries and explore for alternative which is acceptable mutually. Thank you.

12.3 Agenda Item 14 - Scientific Permits

14.2 - Action Arising

India

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I associate myself with the comments made by the distinguished colleague from Italy and I would like to record that this position of India against scientific whaling itself, it has been very clearly stated in the Opening Statement issued by our Government, I will read it very fast. It states in item (C) "close the loophole that allows IWC regulations to be evaded through "scientific whaling", and ensure that current scientific whaling by Japan is phased out rapidly". I think this is very self-explanatory. Thank you very much gentlemen.

13. INDIA'S STATEMENT AT THE IWC MEETING 2000 - IWC/52/VR

13.1 Agenda Item 7.4.2 - Southern Ocean Sanctuary Action Arising

Australia

Thank you Chairman. As you say we should be brief, particularly since we have debated this issue before so I will be. In relation to the science Chairman, the Sanctuary was, of course, established on scientific findings that identified the depleted state of the whale stocks in the region of significance of the Southern Ocean as the location and major feeding

grounds for many species and the need for zero catch limits to allow recovery. Similarly, there is no question about the legal validity of the Sanctuary. It was established, the Schedule amendment was in accordance with Article V and having been voted on and adopted by three quarter majority it was quite firmly established and its redundant too Chairman to reiterate the requirements of V(2) of the Convention in a new paragraph in the Schedule. So Chairman, we associate ourselves with previous delegations who have made similar points. Thank you.

...

India

India shares the remarks made by our colleagues from Australia and we support it. Thank you.

13.2 Agenda Item 7.3 - South Pacific Sanctuary

India

Mr. Chairman thank you. I will be very brief. India wholeheartedly supports the Australian and New Zealand proposal for the establishment of a South Pacific sanctuary for great whales. Thank you.

**14. INDIA'S STATEMENT AT THE IWC MEETING
2001 - IWC/53/VR**

14.1 Agenda Item 16 - Administrative Matters

**16.3.2 - Commission discussions and action arising
Statement by Governments of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, India,
Mexico, Oman and South Africa expressing their satisfaction
with the first outcomes of the proposed dialogue on enhancing
the participation of scientists from developing countries
in the Scientific Committee.**

Argentina

Thank you Mr. President. Taking into account what has already been said by Brazil, a group of delegations want to make a joint statement which reads as follows: "The Governments of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, India, Mexico, Oman and South Africa express their satisfaction with the first outcomes of the proposed dialogue on the enhancement of the participation of developing country's scientists in the Scientific Committee. They also note with satisfaction that the recommendations arising from this year's Scientific Committee meetings, endorsed by the Finance and Administration Committee, have been forwarded to the Commission under total consensus. Within this context, they stressed the need to give special attention to the selection of qualified scientists from developing countries to attend as invited participants, workshops as well as meetings of Working Groups, Sub-committees and of the Scientific Committee. We appreciate this joint statement being included in the Commission's report." Thank you Mr. President.

15. INDIA'S STATEMENT AT THE IWC MEETING 2002 - IWC/54/VR

15.1 Agenda Item 9.2 Revised Management Scheme 9.2.2 - Proposal to amend the Schedule (by Sweden)

Sweden

Thank you Mr. Chairman. As most other countries, Sweden supports the principle of sustainable use of living resources. That use itself can take different forms. When we discuss whales, it's important to us that both consumptive and non-consumptive use are considered for the conservation of whales. This use must be performed with full respect to the ecosystem approach and the precautionary principle. The marine ecosystems have been seriously damaged by the disastrous way in which whaling has been performed by several nations. This has had a very seri-

ous effect also on the whaling itself and I think that we can all agree that this should never happen again. It will, however, take many years before the ecosystems have recovered if they ever will. Possible irreversible processes and effects of climate change, together with stock depletion due to whaling and over-fishing might hinder this. Also, ongoing whaling activities might be a problem in this respect. At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention that many areas and cultures including the Nordic region in Sweden have strong traditions of hunting and fishing. In Sweden, every second man goes fishing and moose hunting is sacred. We therefore fully understand needs and wishes for hunting. It is obvious that both whale hunting and whale watching could be more rewarding once the stocks have recovered. IWC has now for too long a period been discussing what the RMS should look like. It is now time to reach a new milestone on the road forward. All our friends outside this hall strongly call for that. It is vital for the credibility and future of the IWC that we can make a decision on the precautionary management system. What has happened earlier during this meeting clearly proves this. To reach our common goals of restored ecosystems including large whale stocks and subsequently increasing use of whales we must find a common ground for future work. Japan has already made a proposal that has some merits even if we did not feel that it was enough. We therefore have put forward a schedule amendment co-sponsored by several countries including Peru, Chile and Portugal. This proposal, not only takes care of the RMP where there is a fairly strong common ground, but it also includes a strong inspection scheme and an effect DNA system as well as the moratorium and the sanctuaries. We hope for broad support for this schedule amendment from all camps. We must realize that a strict control system supported by a large majority of members is the only way forward for sustainable use and for preservation of all whale stocks.

Mexico

Mr. Chairman, I'll be very brief we associate ourselves entirely with the statement which was made by the distinguished Commissioner of New Zealand earlier on in this discussion regarding this RMS proposal or any RMS proposal and we will vote against this schedule amendment.

India

Chairman, sir, I associate myself with the statement made by Mexico and we will oppose this because the RMS has to be adopted most cautiously and the best approach would be what the committee has suggested that have one intersession meeting and consider a plan which is agreed by consensus in the next meeting.

15.2 Agenda Item 10 - Sanctuaries

10.1.1 Commission discussions and action arising

Document IWC/54/26

Mexico

Thank you Mr. Chairman. We have over the last few years seen, and I specifically refer to our annual report of this Commission of the year 2001 in Annex E, where there is a paper entitled Instructions from the Commission to the Scientific Committee for Review of Sanctuaries, the last instruction from the Commission to the Scientific Committee was, and I quote number 6, "provide advice on whether the sanctuary is consistent with the precautionary approach". That was last year. The Scientific Committee met this year and if you refer to the Scientific Committee's report, you will see that the Scientific Committee was unable to come to any consensus agreement on the answer to that question and I can make reference, but I don't think it is necessary, to all the paragraphs in the Scientific Committee's Report where that is reflected. Therefore, it is the view of those delegations who has sponsored IWC/54/26, that this

Commission needs to make the decision and give guidance to the Scientific Committee on the Sanctuary Review Progress and therefore we have introduced this resolution. What we intend to do with this resolution, is not to make any specific reference to any specific sanctuary review process, but rather to give a general guidance to the Scientific Committee that in reviewing sanctuaries there are a series of criteria that need to be taken into account and that those criteria do not only include scientific data from the sanctuaries that are being reviewed which can often be incomplete or scarce, but that there are other issues which need to be taken into account, consistent with the practice of establishing the sanctuaries themselves and that sanctuary establishment is part of an overall management scheme and that therefore a temporary overlap in management measures should not automatically invalidate a longer-term scientific and conservation value given to a sanctuary. Sanctuaries were established and have been maintained for a number of reasons, of which scientific considerations, although important, are not definitive nor exclusive in the validation process and when considering scientific arguments for sanctuary evaluation as was the case in the Scientific Committee this year, if consensus is not possible, as it was not possible this year, then we think that the Commission should make the decision that the precautionary approach should prevail. And that is the purpose of this resolution that is before you today. Thank you Chairman.

India

India supports the Mexico proposal. The cautionary principle should have prevalence and we can't indefinitely wait for scientific information to come. Therefore, we fully support the Mexico proposal.

10.1.2 - Indian Ocean - Commission discussions and action arising

India

India supports what Kenya and Monaco have said. The basic point is that non-consumptive use of the marine ecosystems have proved very successful in our part of the world and the range countries have the right to utilize this non-consumptive use and therefore the sanctuary has great relevance to us and the boundaries of this concept of sanctuary will be like throwing the baby to the cub. The basic issue we talk of is sustainable utilization but when scientific information is not available, how sustainable utilization will be done and it is under these circumstances that the precautionary principle comes into play. Even if the sanctuary is not coming to your expectations the management has to improve rather than throwing the sanctuary and saying it is not serving the purpose. Therefore, India will not like any compromise with the Indian Ocean Sanctuary. Thank you very much.

15.3 Agenda Item 18 - Formula for Calculation Contributions

India

Thank you Chairman. While I feel there is a need of addressing this problem of rationalizing contributions for developing countries and we cannot wait indefinitely, but I also realise that any solution as said by Mexico which is a simple majority is not a workable solution, therefore, the issue should not be decided by voting, it should be decided by consensus if all agree for an interim method it is welcome and I personally urge that the issue should not be put to voting so that there should be no further debate in the Commission.

Appendix I

India, Japan and New Zealand Vote History: 1991 - 2003

(All votes by India can be compared with the votes of Japan (whaling country) and New Zealand (whale conservation country). It can be seen that since joining the IWC India has consistently opposed Japan and supported whale conservation.)

Year	Vote no.	India	Japan	New Zealand
1991	1	N	Y	N
	2	N	Y	N
	3	Y	N	Y
	4	N	Y	N
	5	Y	N	Y
	6	Y	N	A
1992	7		Y	N
	8		Y	N
	9		A	A
	10		N	Y
	11		N	Y
	12		N	Y
	13		N	Y
	14		N	Y
1993	15	N	Y	N
	16	N	Y	N
	17	A	Y	N
	18	N	Y	N
	19	N	Y	N
	20	A	N	N
	21	N	Y	N
	22	N	Y	N
	23	A	N	Y
	24	Y	N	Y
	25	Y	N	Y
	26	Y	N	Y
	27	Y	N	Y
	28	Y	N	Y
29	Y	N	Y	
1994	30	N	Y	N
	31	N	Y	N
	32	Y	N	Y
	33	Y	A	Y
	34	Y	N	Y
	35	Y	N	Y
	36	Y	N	Y

Year	Vote no.	India	Japan	New Zealand
1995	37	N	Y	N
	38	N	A	N
	39	N	Y	N
	40	A	Y	N
	41	N	Y	N
	42	N	Y	N
	43	Y	N	Y
	44	A	Y	A
	45	Y	N	Y
	46	Y	N	Y
	47	Y	N	Y
	48	A	N	Y
	49	Y	N	Y
	50	N	Y	N
	51	Y	A	Y
1996	52		Y	N
	53		N	Y
	54		Y	N
	55		N	Y
	56		N	Y
	57		N	Y
	58		N	Y
	59		Y	N
1997	60		N	Y
	61		N	Y
	62		N	Y
	63		N	Y
	64	N	Y	N
1998	65	N	Y	N
	66	Y	A	Y
	67	Y	N	Y
	68	A	-	Y
	69		Y	N
1999	70		Y	N
	71		Y	N
	72		Y	N
	73		Y	N
	74		Y	N
	75		N	Y
	76		N	Y
	77		N	Y
	78		N	Y
	79		N	Y
	80		-	Y

India at the International Whaling Commission

Year	Vote no.	India	Japan	New Zealand	
2000	81	Y	N	Y	
	82	-	Y	N	
	83	-	Y	N	
	84	-	N	Y	
	85	-	Y	N	
	86	-	N	Y	
	87	-	N	Y	
	88	-	N	A	
	2001	89	Y	N	Y
		90	Y	N	Y
91		Y	N	Y	
92		N	Y	N	
93		N	Y	N	
94		N	Y	N	
95		Y	N	Y	
96		-	Y	N	
97		Y	N	Y	
98		N	Y	N	
99		Y	P	Y	
100		Y	N	Y	
101		Y	N	Y	
102		N	Y	N	
103		Y	N	Y	
104		Y	N	Y	
105		Y	N	Y	
106	Y	P	Y		
2002	107	N	Y	N	
	108	N	Y	N	
	109	N	Y	N	
	110	N	Y	N	
	111	N	Y	N	
	112	Y	N	Y	
	113	Y	N	Y	
	114	N	Y	N	
	115	Y	Y	N	
	116	N	A	N	
	117	Y	N	Y	
	118	N	Y	N	
	119	N	N	N	
	120	N	Y	N	
	121	N	Y	N	

Year	Vote no.	India	Japan	New Zealand
Special	122		Y	N
	123		N	Y
	124		Y	N
	125	Y	N	Y
	126	Y	N	Y
	127		N	Y
	128		Y	N
	2003	129	Y	N
130		N	Y	N
131		N	Y	N
132		N	Y	N
133		Y	N	Y
134		N	Y	N
135		N	Y	N
136		Y	N	Y
137		Y	N	Y
138		N	Y	N
139		N	Y	N
140		Y	N	Y
141		Y	N	Y

Vote No.	Vote Description
1	Japan's Interim Quota Proposal
2	Iceland, Norway, Japan RMP Proposal
3	Challenge by Iceland of the Chair's ruling that there could
4	Norway's request to lift the protected stock status of the N.E. Atlantic minke
5	Resolution on USSR "Scientific" Whaling Permit
6	Conservation RMP Proposal
7	Amendments by Japan and Norway to weaken the management plan resolution
8	Japan's request for an interim coastal quota
9	The management plan put forward by the conservation countries.
10	Resolution against Norway's "scientific" whaling permit
11	Resolution on small cets
12	Resolution on striped dolphins
13	Resolution on white whales and narwhales
14	Resolution on pilot whales

- 15 Proposed Schedule Amendment to Japan's quota request
- 16 Japan's resolution on Japanese scientific whaling
- 17 Amendment to resolution on Japanese scientific whaling
- 18 Vote on each paragraph of Resolution on the Revised Management Scheme
- 19 Resolution on the Revised Management Scheme
- 20 Motion by France to amend resolution on sanctuary
- 21 Motion by St. Lucia to amend resolution on sanctuary
- 22 Motion by Japan to amend resolution on sanctuary
- 23 Technical Committee vote on French sanctuary proposal
- 24 Addressing small cetaceans in the IWC
- 25 Resolution on Japan's scientific whaling
- 26 Resolution on Norway's scientific whaling
- 27 Resolution on the directed take of striped dolphins
- 28 Resolution on pilot whales
- 29 Resolution on sanctuary proposal
- 30 Proposal to establish an Antarctic sanctuary with an exemption to allow hunting of minkes.
- 31 Proposal to set a quota of 50 minkes for Japan.
- 32 Amendment to a proposal by Japan. original proposal delayed the vote on the sanctuary until after further advice from the scientific committee; amended proposal did not
- 33 Vote on amended proposal.
- 34 Proposal to establish the widely acceptable sanctuary (see map).
- 35 Trade resolution.
- 36 Resolution opposing Norway's scientific permit.
- 37 Amend the schedule to give Japan an interim quota of 50 minkes a year in the North Pacific.
- 38 Procedural motion to allow separate vote on part of the Resolution against Norway's whaling.
- 39 Amendment to weaken resolution language forbidding use of lethal methods in

- pollution research in the SOS.
- 40 Resolution on whale killing methods put forward by Norway and Japan.
- 41 Amendment to weaken the resolution on whaling under special permit in sanctuaries.
- 42 Resolution on scientific advice to CITES.
- 43 Vote on Chair's ruling that New Zealand's amendment to change Japan's resolution on research, so it forbids lethal research, did not mean the resolution must be treated as a new one.
- 44 Resolution by Caribbean countries to note that they may not allow IWC research on small cets in their waters.
- 45 Resolution against Norway's whaling.
- 46 Resolution on preventing illegal trade.
- 47 Resolution on whaling under special permit.
- 48 Resolution on whale killing methods put forward by like minded.
- 49 Resolution on whaling under special permit in sanctuaries.
- 50 Resolution on Japanese community based whaling, recognising their proposed plan as having "constructive management elements".
- 51 Vote to adopt the Scientific Committee report.
- 52 Japan's coastal quota of 50 minke.
- 53 Ban on use of electric lance.
- 54 Resolution to hold a workshop and intersessional meeting to study Japan's request for 50 minke.
- 55 Resolution on trade.
- 56 Resolution calling on Norway to stop whaling.
- 57 Resolution against Japan's special permit.
- 58 Resolution against Canadian whaling.
- 59 Schedule amendment to allow Japan to catch 50 minke
- 60 Resolution against Japan's "scientific" whaling in the Southern Ocean Sanctuary
- 61 Resolution against Japan's "scientific" whaling in the North Pacific
- 62 Resolution against Norway's whaling

- 63 Resolution on the monitoring of stockpiles of whale products
- 64 Moved Antigua and Barbuda, seconded Dominica - secret ballots on resolutions
- 65 Moved Japan, seconded Grenada - Quota of 50 minke for Japan
- 66 Challenge to chair by St Lucia on chair's ruling that item 2 1. 1 remained open after Japan withdrew its text
- 67 Challenge to chair by Norway on chair's ruling that IWC/50/21 is out of order
- 68 Dominica - limit length of interventions.
- 69 Norwegian amendment to Monaco's proposal on secret voting
- 70 Japan's proposal for secret voting
- 71 Norwegian proposal to amend rules of procedure to review accreditation of any international organisation
- 72 Japanese position on the participation of Greenpeace as an observer (vote to withdraw accreditation of Greenpeace)
- 73 Japan's proposal to abolish the Southern Ocean Sanctuary
- 74 Japan's proposed name change for the Humane Killing Working Group
- 75 US/Netherlands' proposal for access by observers
- 76 Resolution for the funding of high priority scientific research (on the environment and within the Southern Ocean Sanctuary - SOWER 2000)
- 77 Resolution on co-operation between the IWC and CITES. (This resolution specifies how the IWC Secretariat should comment to CITES on any downlisting proposals)
- 78 Resolution on whaling under special permits (a repeat resolution requesting Japan to refrain from issuing any permits for scientific whaling in the Southern Ocean Sanctuary and the North Pacific)
- 79 Resolution on DNA testing (this resolution determines how the IWC Scientific Committee should deal with this subject)
- 80 Resolution on Dall's porpoise
- 81 Australia and New Zealand's Proposal to amend Schedule and Establish the South Pacific Sanctuary
- 82 Japan's proposal for a schedule amendment to allow the taking of 50 minke

- whales for its small type community whaling
- 83 Japan's Resolution on the Review of the Southern Ocean Sanctuary
- 84 Resolution on the verification of catch data by genetic monitoring
- 85 Japan's resolution on helping "small-type coastal whaling" communities adversely affected by the moratorium on commercial whaling
- 86 Resolution on whaling under special permit in the North Pacific (requesting Japan refrain from issuing permits for 'scientific whaling')
- 87 Resolution on whaling under special permit in the Southern Ocean Sanctuary (requesting Japan to refrain from issuing an permits for 'scientific whaling')
- 88 Resolution inviting Canada to rejoin the IWC and to stop taking bowhead whales from the Eastern Canadian Arctic
- 89 Norway's challenge to the Chair ruling that the Iceland question needs to be resolved first
- 90 Iceland's challenge to the Chair ruling that the IWC has the competence to decide on the legal status of Iceland's reservation
- 91 Japan's challenge to the Chair ruling that Iceland should attend the meeting only as an observer
- 92 Japan's proposal to allow Russia to vote
- 93 Japan's proposal to amend Rules of Procedure E.3 (d)
- 94 Japan's proposal to amend para. 7(b) of the Schedule (Southern Ocean Sanctuary)
- 95 Australia and New Zealand's proposal for a South Pacific Whale Sanctuary
- 96 Antigua & B.'s Resolution on the Conduct of Non-Governmental Organisations
- 97 Brazil's Proposal for a South Atlantic Whale Sanctuary
- 98 Japan's Schedule Amendment on Japanese Small-type Whaling (new Schedule para. 10 (f))
- 99 Australia and US' Motion regarding Iceland's Reservation
- 100 New Zealand's Resolution on the Incidental Capture of Cetaceans
- 101 Germany and co-sponsors' Resolution on Commercial Whaling
- 102 Japan's Draft Resolution on Japanese Community-based Whaling

- 103 New Zealand and co-sponsors' Resolution on Southern Hemisphere Minke Whales and Special Permit whaling
- 104 USA and co-sponsors' Resolution on Expansion of JARPNII Whaling in North Pacific
- 105 UK and co-sponsors' Resolution on Dall's Porpoise
- 106 UK and co-sponsors' Resolution on Small Cetaceans - (proposed amendment withdrawn by Austria)
- 107 Objection to chairs ruling on Iceland - the Chair made a ruling to abide by last year's decision which was that Iceland can assist as an observer but cannot be a member of the IWC, the vote is to object to this ruling.
- 108 Objection to chairs ruling to close Agenda item 1.3 - ie objection to ruling that Iceland will be an observer
- 109 Vote to overrule chair's ruling to take only two arguments for and against secret ballots
- 110 Vote on secret ballots
- 111 Japanese proposed Schedule amendment to delete Paragraph 7 (a) - Indian Ocean Sanctuary
- 112 South Pacific Sanctuary
- 113 South Atlantic Sanctuary
- 114 Japan propose an amendment that the Southern Ocean Sanctuary is contingent on advice from the Scientific Committee (IWC/54/31)
- 115 Vote on order of assessment of Aboriginal Subsistence stocks - yes = St Vincent first
- 116 Vote on Norway's proposed changed to IWC/54/20
- 117 Vote on US/Russia Aboriginal Subsistence whaling without any changes, ie. IWC/54/20
- 118 Vote on Japan's proposed RMS (IWC/54/34)
- 119 Vote on Sweden's proposed RMS (IWC/54/35)
- 120 Norway challenged this ruling. Vote is to support Norway's challenge.
- 121 Vote on IWC/54/57 - revised US/Russia Aboriginal subsistence whaling

- 122 Norway's challenge to Chairman's ruling that the proposal from the UK for the meeting to proceed on the Iceland question in the same way that the Commission had done at the 54th Annual Meeting in Shimonoseki should be put to the vote immediately.
- 123 Mexico's challenge to the Chairman's ruling that Iceland should be allowed to participate in the vote on his previous ruling (this is, on his ruling that the meeting should follow the Shimonoseki procedure).
- 124 Resolution on Japanese community-based whaling
- 125 Guidance to the Scientific Committee on the sanctuary review process (IWC/54/26)
- 126 Chair ruled that IWC/54/20 be voted on including Norway's proposed changes - US challenge the Chair's ruling. Vote to uphold the US challenge to the Chair
- 127 Brazil's challenge to Chairman's ruling that the meeting should follow the same procedure used at the 53rd Annual Meeting in London in considering the question of Iceland's adherence with a reservation to paragraph 10(e).
- 128 Antigua and Barbuda's challenge to the Chairman's ruling that the London and Shimonoseki decisions stand and that Iceland should participate as an observer
- 129 To close the debate on the agenda - proposed by Australia
- 130 Motion to oppose Chair's rule re: adopt agenda as stands Japan
- 131 Secret Ballots - proposal from Japan
- 132 Challenge to Chair ruling to vote on Berlin Initiative
- 133 Berlin Initiative including minor amendment.
- 134 Japan propose change to Southern Ocean Sanctuary
- 135 Chair's Ruling on SPWS proposal challenge from Norway
- 136 SPWS Proposal Vote
- 137 SAWS Proposal
- 138 Schedule Amendment to take 150 Bryde's Whales
- 139 Schedule Amendment to take 150 Minke Whales
- 140 Resolution on Whaling Under Special Permit
- 141 Resolution on S. Hemisphere Minke Whales and Special Permit Whaling

Appendix II

India's Representatives at the International Whaling Commission

1981 - 2003

Brighton, UK, 1981 - Mr. S. Singh
Brighton, UK, 1982 - Dr M. M. Dhar
Brighton, UK, 1983 - Mr. Samar Singh, Dr E. G. Silas
Buenos Alres, Argentina, 1984 - Mr. G. Jagannathan
Bournemouth, UK, 1985 - Dr M. K. Ranjitsinh, Mr. B. B. Tarei
Malmo, Sweden, 1986 - Dr M. K. Ranjitsinh
Bournemouth, UK, 1987 - Mr. B. B. Tyagi
Auckland, New Zealand, 1988 - Dr M. K. Ranjitsinh
San Diego, USA, 1989 - Dr M. K. Ranjitsinh
Noordwijk, The Netherlands, 1990 - S. K. Aggarwal
Reykjavik, Iceland, 1991 - H. N. Paul
Glasgow, UK, 1992 - NOT PRESENT
Kyoto, Japan, 1993 - I. V. Chopra
Puerto Vallarta, Mexico, 1994 - V. Rishi
Dublin, Ireland, 1995 - S. C. Dey
Aberdeen, UK, 1996 - NOT PRESENT
Monaco, 1997 - NOT PRESENT
Muscat, Oman, 1998 - S. K. Reddy
Grenada, 1999 - NOT PRESENT
Adelaide, Australia, 2000 - V. Kumar, R. Kivakarla
London, UK, 2001 - A. Thakur, H. Singh
Shimonoseki, Japan, 2002 - S. C. Sharma
Berlin, Germany, 2003 - A. Kumar

Project Investigator

Ashok Kumar

Editorial Team

Series Editor: Vivek Menon

Technical Editor: N V K Ashraf

Editor: Rupa Gandhi Chaudhary



India has been a member of the International Whaling Commission since 1981 and has maintained a consistent stand on whale conservation. This report documents India's contribution to the IWC compiled from verbatim records and documents submitted by India's Commissioners between 1981 and 2003.



A-220 New Friends Colony, New Delhi-110065
Tel.: 011 26326025, 26326026, Fax: 011 26326027
Website: <http://www.wildlifetrustofindia.org>