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The Chairman convened the meeting at 3:00 p.m. and asked Mr. Allen, Chairman of the Committee on Rules of Procedure, to read a revised Rule 19. This was done, and the Commission adopted the rule in the form in which it appears in Document 11.

The Chairman then explained to the Commission and Observers that up to this point the Commission had been concerned primarily with its organizational machinery. It had discussed Articles I and II of the Convention, had selected a temporary headquarters, and had established standing committees. In a word, it had completed its organization and was now prepared to continue a study of the Convention in order that the Commissioners might have clearly in their minds the nature of their responsibilities. He suggested that the Commission proceed with the reading of the Convention with the view of reaching agreement upon the meaning of its provisions.

In connection with Article III 1 (a), the Chairman pointed out that the word "study" was important. Presumably, the studies are mandatory and should be along the lines of Article IV.

The Japanese Delegation explained that while it understood that no determination or recommendation was to be made during the first five years, it wished to know if the studies were to be started immediately. The Canadian Delegation was of the opinion that the studies are obligatory, should be continuous and should begin immediately.

The United States Delegation was inclined to agree with this interpretation, but pointed out that there are practical considerations. The question was one of priority. The protocol required that certain work be done as expeditiously as possible. Since no decision pursuant to Article III 1 (a) could be reached immediately, it appeared that the studies required by Article III 1 (a) are of less importance.

The Commission concluded the discussion of Article III 1 (l) with all Delegations agreed that the studies are mandatory and that they are among the studies which the Commission should consider from the beginning of its operations, and that the question should be referred to the Committee on Biology and Research for consideration of the precise nature of the studies.
With regard to Article III 1(b) (Item 14 a of the Tentative Agenda) the Chairman explained that it appeared to him that the words of this section meant that any Contracting Party might request the Commission to study any stock of fish, and asked if the other Delegations interpreted the Article in this way. All agreed with the Chairman's interpretation, but also agreed that any recommendation would depend upon the results of the study. The United States Delegation then asked how such a request was to be made, and after some discussion, the Delegations agreed that the request must come from a Contracting Party, that is to say, it might not originate in the Commission, but it might be delivered by a National Section.

**Article III 1(c) (i)** (Item 14 a of the Tentative Agenda)

The Chairman asked if the Delegations understood from these words that it was the Commission, consisting of three National Sections to which such requests would be addressed and which should undertake the studies. The three Delegations agreed that it was the full Commission, consisting of three National Sections, the United States Delegation pointing out that the Commission need not itself do the research, but might, following the provisions of Article III 3, use the research agencies of the Contracting Parties.

**Article III 1(c) (ii)** (Item 14 a of the Tentative Agenda)

The Delegations agreed that with the clarification of this article provided in Rule 11 of the Rules of Procedure, its meaning was clear to all.

**Article III 1(c) (iii)** (Item 14 a of the Tentative Agenda)

The Japanese Delegation informed the Commission that it had some suggestions to make regarding items which should appear in the reports required by this Article, but would wish to submit those suggestions at a later date.

**Article III 1(d)** (Item 14 a of the Tentative Agenda)

The Chairman pointed out that at some time the Commission would have to learn what kind of penalties the Contracting Parties now make use of, and wondered whether this might best be done by the Commission or by the Executive Director.

The Japanese Delegation suggested, and the Canadian and United States Delegations agreed, that the matter would best be taken up by the Executive Director, after which it might be considered by the Commission.
It was therefore agreed that an investigation of the penalties for violation of the Convention in use in the three countries would be referred to the Executive Director, when appointed, for implementation.

Article III 1 (e), Article III 1 (f), Article III 2, Article III 3, and Article IV, were disposed of without comment.

The Commission then agreed to dispense with further reading of the Convention and take up Item 14 of the Tentative Agenda, referring Item 13 of the Tentative Agenda to the Standing Committee on Biology and Research. The Commission first turned to the question of implementation of Article III 1 (a) (Item 14 a of the Tentative Agenda), in connection with which the Japanese Delegation stated that it had some suggestions to make, but desired that they be discussed in the Committee on Biology and Research before being discussed by the Commission.

The Canadian and United States Delegations agreed, the latter pointing out that the question here was not whether the Commission should undertake the studies but rather, since no determination could be made for five years, what would be the scope of the studies.

Item III 1 (b) (Item 14 of the Tentative Agenda) was disposed of with no comment.

Under Article III 1 (c) (Item 14 a of the Tentative Agenda), the United States Delegation delivered verbally to the Commission, a request from the Government of the United States of America, made pursuant to the provisions of Article III 1 (c), that the Commission undertake a study of the king crab resources of the Bering Sea. The United States Delegation stated that it would be prepared to discuss this matter in detail when the Committee on Biology and Research took up Item 13 a (1) of the Tentative Agenda.

The Japanese Delegation expressed a desire to be provided with the precise terms of the United States Government's request.

The United States Delegation offered to present the request in written form if desired. The Japanese Delegation agreed that such would be satisfactory, and the Chairman suggested to the Commission that such should be the procedure in the future.
He then asked the Commission if they wished to refer this request, when received, to the Standing Committee on Biology and Research. The Delegations agreed with that procedure.

The Chairman then asked the Commissioners to note well the fact that the Committee on Biology and Research had been presented with three items of high priority: 1) The provisions of the Protocol; 2) The provisions of Article III l(a); and 3) The request of the Government of the United States.

Article III, 2 (Item 14 b of the Tentative Agenda)

The Japanese Delegation suggested that in the first instance, at any rate, the Commission should require a report for its study. The Japanese Delegation explained that it had a list of items which it thought should be included in such a report and which it would be pleased to submit to the Committee on Biology and Research.

The Chairman pointed out that such a report might well involve matters other than biology, e.g., regulations and law enforcement. Should these be submitted to the Committee on Biology and Research or should the list be submitted to the full Commission?

The three Delegations agreed that the list should be submitted to the Commission, rather than to the Committee, when the Secretariat had reproduced it. The Commission agreed to postpone discussion of this item until the list became available.

Article VIII (Item 14 c of the Tentative Agenda)

The Japanese Delegation was of the opinion that the list which it wished to submit in connection with the implementation of Article III 2, would have considerable bearing upon a discussion of the implementation of Article VIII, and suggested that the discussion be postponed until the list was available.

The three Delegations agreed that Article VIII might involve considerably more than would be required in the report contemplated under Article III 2, that the matter should be discussed in full by the Commission rather than by the Committee, and that such discussion should be postponed until the Japanese Delegation's list was made available.

The Commission thereupon agreed that it would meet the following morning to complete its discussion of Item 14 of the Tentative Agenda. Thereafter the two Standing Committees would meet.
The United States Delegation informed the Commission that Mr. Farley would represent it on the Committee on Finance and Administration, with Mr. Phister as Adviser, and that its Advisers on the Committee on Biology and Research would be Dr. W. F. Thompson and Dr. L. A. Walford, the United States Commissioner on this Committee to be named in the next Plenary Session.

Finally the Commission agreed that the Commissioners might be accompanied at the meeting of the Committee on Finance and Administration, in addition to the Advisers provided for in Rule 19 of the Rules of Procedure, by other technical advisers, e.g., budget experts.

The Chairman then expressed the Commissioners' deep regret that Mr. Allen of the United States had found it necessary to leave the meeting because of his wife's illness, and their hope that they would see Mr. Allen soon again in happier times.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m. to meet again at 10:00 a.m., February 6, in a Plenary Session closed to the Press.

* * *