

C.S.

WHALING

(Southern Whaling & Sealing Co.,)

DEP/WHA/4 # 1

1923

No. 746/23

of S. No. 60

SUBJECT.

1923

SOUTHERN WHALING AND SEALING Co.,

24th July.

Refusal of permission to take
Humpbacks during 1922/1923
Season.

Previous Paper.

251/22

MINUTES.

Sof S despatch No 60 of 24 July 1923

Encl ①

Magistrate, South Shetlands.

*Will you please request a report
from Mr. A.G. Bennett, Whaling Officer
for 1922/23 Season and submit same with
your observations thereon.*

*W.H. 13
O.C.S.W.
15 Oct 1923.*

Hon. Col. Sec.

*I have drawn the attention of
Mr. Bennett to this m.p. he will
prepare a report on the completion of
his current work on the last (Oriana)
camps, which will probably terminate
this week.*

*27 May I have the m.p. back please
J.R. Hamilton
Govt. Naturalist
22/10/23*

Subsequent Paper.

*22 July
1923*

*E.A.
11/10/23*

26. Submitted

G.R.B.

Di' C' See

25 Oct 1923

For each report

~~Atttt~~ 25 Oct 23

Government Naturalist

Referred

G.R.B.

Di' C' See

25 Oct 1923

Hon. Col. Sec.

Reports from Mr. Bennett and myself herewith please.

both 3/24

G.R.B. Hamilton.

Govt. Naturalist.

1/11/23.

27. Submitted

G.R.B.

Di' C' See

15 Nov 1923

Attach sup a which the issue of permits for killing beaver backs was authorized.

Both Mr. Bennett and Mr. Hamilton

lay stress on imputations of false returns by the Co. of the quantity of oil obtained. I doubt very much whether any such imputations are justified. It is very difficult for accurate measurements to be made of bulk oil and very factory which goes home has to have its quantities amended. This is of course liable to happen in a greater degree with a new factory or when new ~~tanks~~ tanks are used. The Royal Commission was 1400 barrels out in half a shipment last year. One unfortunate result of this is that it vitiates the statistics, and it seems to me that all past ~~statistics~~ statistics should be amended ^{by} ^{qualifications} ^{shown} in the working out figures in the ^{landings} certificates.

ttttt

5 Nov. 23

Draft despatch put up

ttttt

3 Dec. 23

Despatch to S. of S. No. 153 of the 5th of December, 1923.

Encl.

(4)

S of S despatch no 25 of 5th April 1924 - Encl (5)
Letter to Southern Whaling & Sealing Co
of 12th March 1924 — (5A)

Y.S.
Submitted
The Whaling Office to note?

ttttt 17 Aug 24
M
14 Aug 1924

Mr. A. E. Bennett
Accounting

ttttt 19 Aug 24

Hon. Col. Seay

Notes

Ag Bennett
20/5/24

S of S despatch no 52 of 24th May 1924 - Encl (6)
Letter from Southern Whaling & Sealing
Co of 30th April 1924 — " (6A)

Letter to Southern Whaling & Sealing Co.
of 23rd May 1924 — " (6B)

Copy of memorandum — " (6C)

Y.S.
To file?

ttttt 14 July 24
M
15 July 1924



1410

(1)

FALKLAND ISLANDS

DUPLICATE

DOORING STREET,

NO. 60

24 July, 1923.

Sir,

I have the honour to transmit to you, for report, the accompanying copies of letters from the Southern Whaling and Sealing Company Limited regarding the refusal of the Magistrate of the South Shetlands to permit their floating factory the s.s. "Southern Queen" to take Humpback Whales during last season.

S.S. Whaling & Sealing Co. Ltd.
5 MAY

Fr. do. 22 June

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient,

humble servant,

(Signed) DEVONSHIRE

THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING
THE GOVERNMENT OF
THE FALKLAND ISLANDS.

THE SOUTHERN WHALING AND SEALING COMPANY LTD.

A 18, Exchange Buildings,
Liverpool

5th May, 1923.

The Under Secretary of State,
Colonial Office,
London, S.W.1.

Sir,

Magistrate's refusal to grant permission to
shoot Humpback Whales at South
Shetlands.

We have the honour to refer to the interview which the undersigned had with your Mr. Allen on the 6th ultimo on the above subject, and we give below full particulars of the case so far as it is known to us.

The Whaling Season at South Shetlands opened very badly with bad weather and scarcity of whales. These conditions continued and the Managers in charge of the various Expeditions operating down there could judge that their total productions were going to be very small, and that the position was somewhat critical.

An application, we understand, was forwarded to you by Mr. Rasmussen of Sandefjord, Norway, on behalf of the Companies registered in Norway, requesting permission for their whalers to augment their productions by catching humpback whales at South Shetlands.

The undersigned also made, personally, a similar application on behalf of this Company.

Your decision was to the effect that permission would be granted to the various Companies, to shoot humpback whales, subject to the discretion of the Magistrate at South Shetlands.

We

We then sent a wireless message to the Manager of our Floating Factory s.s. "Southern Queen" at South Shetlands, reading as follows.

"Colonial Office (London) cabling Magistrate Shetlands permission shoot Humpbacks left to discretion Magistrate stop. Try to get permission Shetlander".

to which we received his reply

"Shetlander - 15500 barrels 6th February few whales stop Humpback Licence refused - Andersen".

and in consequence we wired him again, asking him to let us have the reason for the refusal, and we received the following reply.

"Licence refused because we have more whales than other factories. Andersen".

Needless to say we were very much surprised at this reply and we find it very difficult to believe that the explanation given "we have caught more whales than other factories" - is the correct one. If the explanation is the correct one, then we feel that we have received unfair treatment from the Magistrate at South Shetlands, and in consequence, respectfully request that a fully enquiry should be made into the matter.

When we sailed our Expedition to the South Shetlands it was with the intention to catch as many whales as possible, and to produce the maximum amount of oil therefrom. It is only by big production that we can expect our Balance Sheet to compare favourably with the other Companies, as we floated our Expedition on post-war prices, whereas the other Companies were launched many years before the Great War, on very low prices.

To ensure that we would catch the maximum possible number of whales and produce the maximum quantity of oil, we did not spare expense, but provided material of the very highest quality and efficiency.

Bearing in mind that the Whaling Staffs are paid on
catch

catch and production, it will be readily understood that our Expedition attracted the most expert gunners and factory personnel, and in consequence our catch of whales and production of oil, we admit, has exceeded the other Companies This we had anticipated.

We are writing to you now on this matter, as we would like you to have the full facts of the case before our Expedition sails for South Shetlands next season.

At the moment it is impossible for us to estimate accurately the loss we have suffered through not being allowed to shoot humpback whales, but the undersigned will be meeting our Manager from South Shetlands at the latter end of this month, and he will obtain from him a full detailed report on the subject. This report will be posted on to you for your information, in due course.

We have, etc.

The Southern Whaling & Sealing Co. Ltd.
(Sgd) N.C. Watt
Managing Director.

THE SOUTHERN WHALING AND SEALING COMPANY LIMITED

A 18, Exchange Buildings,

LIVERPOOL.

22nd June, 1923.

The Under Secretary of State,
Colonial Office,
London, S.W.1.

Sir,

Magistrate's refusal to grant permission to
shoot humpback whales at South Shetlands.

We have the honour to refer you to our letter of the 5th ultimo, and beg now to attach hereto a report by our Manager who was in charge of our expedition, giving his version of the Magistrate's refusal to allow our gunners to shoot Humpback whales during the 1922-23 season.

You will note that it is estimated that we could have captured 60 Humpback whales up to the 18th March, the date on which we were eventually allowed to take this species. The estimate is based on the catches obtained by the Norwegian Companies, but it must be borne in mind that our gunners are more efficient, and consequently we can quite reasonably believe that our catch might easily have exceeded our estimate of 60 Humpback whales.

Regarding the latter paragraph of our Manager's Report we would like to mention that in fairness to our gunners we were obliged to compensate them, and we actually paid them on the basis of production of 30,000 barrels instead of the actual turn-out of 23,706 barrels.

We have, etc.
The Southern Whaling & Sealing Co. Ltd.
(Sgd) N.C. Watt.

MANAGING DIRECTOR.

SOUTHERN WHALING AND SEALING COMPANY LIMITED.

From

To

S.S. "SOUTHERN QUEEN"

N.C. Watt, Esq,
Managing Director,
Messrs The Southern Whaling
& Sealing Co. Ltd.

Liverpool.

1st May 1923.

Dear Sir,

LICENCE SHOOTING OF HUMPBACKS

In accordance with the instructions contained in your telegram re the above, I sent a wireless telegram to Magistrate Bennet who at the time was stationed at Deception Island, South Shetlands. My Factory was lying at anchor in Charlotte Channel, South Shetlands. My telegram transmitted on 5th January last read as follows:

"Floating whaling factory Southern Queen begs permission to take humpback as other whales scarce. Andersen".

Magistrate Bennett wired as follows on same day:

"Yours received please report total catch also catch in last seven days. Bennett"

To which I replied on same day as follows:

"Total catch 136 whales last seven days 19 whales Andersen".

Magistrate Bennet then wired on same day:

"Permission declined, Bennett".

I then wired you accordingly.

I discussed the position at length with Whaling Officer A. Hardy who was stationed at that time on my Factory but he informed me that he had no authority to do anything in the matter.

On 16th May Mr. Hardy was good enough to wire to Magistrate Bennett asking permission for our Company to take

Humpback

Humpback and permission was granted on 18th March.

I believe that all the other Companies were permitted to take Humpbacks throughout the season and consequently I am at a loss to understand why we were not granted the same concession. It was only after continued pressing on my part that permission was eventually granted to us on 18th March which permission was granted too late in the Season to prove any appreciable advantage.

The actual number of Humpback we caught totalled 50. Had we been treated in a similar manner to our competitors and granted a permit at the same time as they received theirs, I estimate we could have caught 60 more Whales. Some of the other Companies had actually caught 50/60 Humpback Whales before we commenced taking this specie.

As you know our Factory is able to cope with much more material than the other Floating Factories, and owing to the unusual poorness of the season there were very many days when our Factory was only working half time., and in fact there were only 3 days during the season when we had the Factory working at full pressure.

I can assure you that it was a very depressing sight for us to see numerous Humpbacks and not be allowed to shoot them, particularly during the bad weather when other species of whales were not in evidence.

I estimate our loss in Oil through not receiving early permission to shoot Humpback to be as follows:

60 Humpback Whales = 300 tons whaleoil.

or 174 tons	No.1 Oil at £35 per ton	£5742
66 "	No.2.Oil at £30 " "	1980
60 "	No.3.Oil at £26 " "	1560
		<u>£9282</u>

I would like to mention that the Gunners were very dissatisfied when permission was refused us and contend

that

that they should be compensated for Humpbacks which they would have caught had our Company been on the same footing as the others.

Yours faithfully

(Sgd) L. Andersen

Manager

Floating Factory "SOUTHERN QUEEN"

(2)

Sir

The catching of Hump-backed-whales was intended from the outset to keep crews of Ships in some work at least during very slack times, As the factories are well scattered over a considerable area, it by no means follows that a bad time at one spot means a bad time at another.

The guide I followed was the previous week's catch in every case, & except at the end of the season I saw no valid reason to grant S. Queen a permit

The statement of the total declared catches at the end of my report upon the past season 1922-23, fully confirms that the action I took was the correct one, although at the time a decision was not so easy. In this Tabulated Statement, Southern Queen is most conspicuous by having by far the greatest number of whales for a single

Factory (SS Ronald being two), and at the same time the very worst average per whale.

The letter of 22.6.23 shows that S Queen actually landed 28,706 barrels against 26,000 declared to. These figures raise the average from 50.19 to 55.41 per whale & even this is not good.

It should be noticed that S Queen in her one week's permit managed to secure more Hump-backs, with one exception, than any other Factory.

The letter of 1.5.23. from S Whaling & Sealing Co states that they estimate their loss at 30 bbls per Hump-back. This is, in my opinion a far too high an average, especially when their results from larger whales are considered 20 barrels per Hump-back. would be much nearer correct.

I would finally point out that, failing to report & declare so large an amount as 27,06 barrels on a catch. does not point to careful management, or is it satisfactory from a Revenue point for a Sum of £ 676.10/- to be withheld.

To The Government Naturalist

I am Sir

Your obedient servant

Alfred D. Hill's 24.12.23

The primary object of the system of humpback permits was the avoidance of prolonged idleness of the whalers' crews which it was considered, might lead to disturbances. So far as I am aware there was no idea of assisting factories to make a full catch.

2. Mr. Bennett's report summarizes his method of dealing with the question, and he considers that he was justified by the general results: his method appears to have been sound.

He further comments on the inaccurate returns made by the Southern Whaling and Sealing Company, pointing out the difference the corrected figures make to the average per whale and he remarks on the high value this company sets on Humpbacks as regards their oil value.

3. With further reference to the letter of 1st. May, Mr. Bennett informs me that the belief that "all other companies were permitted to take humpbacks throughout the season" is without foundation; permits were only issued when it was considered absolutely necessary. The statement that "some of the other Companies had actually caught 50/60 Humpback Whales before we commenced taking this specie" is scarcely correct. In the first place, Southern Queen's 30 was only exceeded in one case, that of Pythia, in which 55 whales were taken, of the remaining factories two had 28 and 25 respectively and the rest less than 20 each.

4. I concur with Mr. Bennett's statement that the average value of a South Shetland Humpback is 20 not 30 barrels

5. With reference to the letter of the 22nd. June, it is to be remembered that the gunners of this company are Norwegian like those of the others, although it is reported that the very high rate of pay offered by the Southern Whaling and Sealing Company results in their being able to command the best men.

6. It is difficult to see why the gunners should have considered that they should be recompensed for a supposititious catch and it is unusual for the oil output to affect the pay of a gunner, who is paid a stated salary and so much for each whale he brings in. The case of Mr. Lars Andersen, manager of Southern Queen, is different, since he acted as a gunner, and would receive payment for his whale, but being also catch manager would receive so much per barrel of oil.

7. Having regard to the various points raised I beg to state that I consider that this company has no grounds for complaint with reference to unfair treatment, and that Mr. Bennett who was on the whaling grounds must have been well able to judge of the necessity of granting or withholding permits.

8. Finally, I would suggest that it would be interesting to learn what explanation may be given of the return of this company to the whaling officer at the end of the season, which was 2,700 barrels short of what the "actual turn-out of 28,700 barrels." The figure returned was 26,000 barrels.

John A. Milton.
Govr. of Naturalist

AND ISLANDS.

153.

4

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

STANLEY,

5th December, 1923.

My Lord Duke,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Grace's despatch of the 24th of July with copies of letters from the Southern Whaling and Sealing Company on the subject of the refusal of the Whaling Officer to permit that Company's floating factory "Southern Queen", operating at the South Shetlands, to capture humpback whales prior to the 18th of March last season.

In duplicate.
In duplicate.

2. I attach a copy of a report from the Whaling Officer and of the comments of the Magistrate, South Shetlands thereon.

3. It appears that the Southern Whaling and Sealing Company have misunderstood the grounds on which permission was given to kill humpbacks last season. The instructions to the Whaling Officer were that permits were only to be issued for the avoidance of labour discontent if a factory was lying idle - or practically so - in the absence of whales, other than humpbacks, and

if/

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE,

P.C., K.G., G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O.,

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES.

.4
11/

if the latter were numerous. The alleged discontent of the gunners of the s.s. "Southern Queen" was not due to the fact that they were idle, but was owing to some other factories having received permission to kill humpbacks for periods of one week.

4. The particular instance quoted of refusal of permission occurred in the month of February. The s.s. "Southern Queen" captured during the month 136 blue and finback whales. The greatest number obtained by any other factory was 96, namely by the "Ronald", with five catchers. In my opinion the "Southern Queen" - a vessel flying the Norwegian flag, with a crew composed entirely of Norwegians and discharging her oil in a Norwegian port - received more favourable treatment than any other factory.

5. The following table shews how slight was the ground for dissatisfaction on the part of the owners of the vessel :-

<u>Ship's Name.</u>	<u>No. of Blue and Fin Whales.</u>	<u>Hum- backs.</u>	<u>Barrels of Oil.</u>	<u>Barrels per whale.</u>
Maudie	332	3	23588	70.4
Orn II	306	25	22547	68.0
Falk	327	14	22800	66.9
Solstreif	373	8	23918	63.0
Pythia	275	55	20521	62.2
Ronald (5 catchers)	604	3	37098	61.1
Neko	302	2	17000	55.9
Southern Queen	488	30	28706	55.4
				All/

All the factories are included in respect of which information has been received as to the quantity of oil landed. The amounts differ materially from those declared by the masters for the payment of duty on export. The conclusion that the "Southern Queen" was the most inefficiently managed factory is impossible to avoid. The Southern Whaling and Sealing Company consider that through the refusal of a permit they lost 60 humpback whales. In other words that they should have been enabled to catch 90 humpbacks, or three times as many as any other factory, with one exception, and thirty times as many as the s.s. "Ronald" with five catchers.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord Duke,

Your Grace's most obedient,

humble servant,

H. Henniker-Heaton.

ENCLOSURE 1 OF FALKLAND ISLANDS DESPATCH No. 153 of the
5th December, 1923.

Copy of Minute from Mr. A. G. Bennett to the Government
Naturalist.

Stanley,

29 th October, 1923.

The catching of humpback whales was intended from the outset to keep crews of ships in some work at least during very slack times. As the factories are well scattered over a considerable area, it by no means follows that a bad time at one spot means a bad time at another.

The guide I followed was the previous week's catch and except at the end of the season I saw no valid reason to grant Southern Queen a permit.

The statement of the total declared catches at the end of my report upon the past season 1922/23 fully confirms that the action I took was the correct one, although at the time a decision was not so easy. In this tabulated statement Southern Queen is most conspicuous by having by far the greatest number of whales for a single factory (s.s. "Ronald" being two) and at the same time the very worst average per whale.

The letter of 22/6/23 shows that Southern Queen actually landed 23,706 barrels against 26,000 declared to. These figures raise the average from 50.19 to 55.44 per whale and even this is not good.

It should be noticed that Southern Queen in her one week's permit managed to secure more humpbacks with one exception than any other factory.

The letter of 1/5/23 from the Southern Whaling and Sealing Company states that they estimate their loss at 30 barrels per humpback. This is, in my opinion, a far too high average, especially when their results from larger whales are considered. Twenty barrels per humpback would be much nearer correct.

if the 5th of I would finally point out that failing to report and declare so large an amount as 2,706 barrels on a catch does not point to careful management, nor is it satisfactory from a revenue point for a sum of £676 10/- to be withheld.

permits was the avoidance of prolixity. The issue of the whalers' crews which (sgd.) A. G. Bennett, might lead to disturbances. So far Whaling Officer. there was no idea of assisting factories to make a full catch.

2. Mr. Bennett's report summarizes his method of dealing with the question, and he considers that he was justified by the general results; his method appears to have been sound.

He further comments on the inaccurate returns made by the Southern whaling and sealing company, pointing out the difference the corrected figures make to the average per whale and he remarks on the high value this company sets on Humpbacks as regards their oil value.

3. With further reference to the letter of 1st May, Mr. Bennett informs me that the belief that "all other companies were permitted to take Humpbacks throughout the season" is without foundation; permits were only issued when it was considered absolutely necessary. The statement that "Some of the other Companies had actually caught 50/60 Humpback whales before we commenced taking this specie" is scarcely correct. In the first place, "Southern Queen's" 30 was only exceeded in one case, that of "Pythia", in which 55 whales were taken, of the remaining factories two had 26 and 25 respectively and the rest less than 20 each.

4. I concur with Mr. Bennett's statement that the average value of a South Shetland Hump-

ENCLOSURE No. II TO FALKLAND ISLANDS DESPATCH No. 153
of the 5th of December, 1923.

The primary object of the system of humpback permits was the avoidance of prolonged idleness of the whalers' crews which it was considered, might lead to disturbances. So far as I am aware there was no idea of assisting factories to make a full catch.

2. Mr. Bennett's report summarizes his method of dealing with the question, and he considers that he was justified by the general results: his method appears to have been sound.

He further comments on the inaccurate returns made by the Southern Whaling and Sealing Company, pointing out the difference the corrected figures make to the average per whale and he remarks on the high value this company sets on Humpbacks as regards their oil value.

3. With further reference to the letter of 1st May, Mr. Bennett informs me that the belief that "all other companies were permitted to take Humpbacks throughout the season" is without foundation; permits were only issued when it was considered absolutely necessary. The statement that "Some of the other Companies had actually caught 50/60 Humpback Whales before we commenced taking this specie" is scarcely correct. In the first place, "Southern Queen's" 30 was only exceeded in one case, that of "Pythia", in which 55 whales were taken, of the remaining factories two had 26 and 25 respectively and the rest less than 20 each.

4. I concur with Mr. Bennett's statement that the average value of a South Shetland Humpback/
back/

back is 20 not 30 barrels.

5. With reference to the letter of the 22nd June, it is to be remembered that the gunners of this company are Norwegian like those of the others, although it is reported that the very high rate of pay offered by the Southern Whaling and Sealing Company results in their being able to command the best men.

6. It is difficult to see why the gunners should have considered that they should be recompensed for a suppositious catch and it is unusual for the oil output to affect the pay of a gunner, who is paid a stated salary and so much for each whale he brings in. The case of Mr. Lars Andersen, Manager of "Southern Queen", is different, since he acted as a gunner, and would receive payment for his whales, but being also catch manager would receive so much per barrel of oil.

7. Having regard to the various points raised I beg to state that I consider that this company has no grounds for complaint with reference to unfair treatment, and that Mr. Bennett who was on the whaling grounds must have been well able to judge of the necessity of granting or withholding permits.

8. Finally, I would suggest that it would be interesting to learn what explanation may be given of the return of this company to the whaling officer at the end of the season, which was 2,706 barrels short of the "actual turn-out of 28,706 barrels." The figure returned was 26,000 barrels.

(Sgd.) J. E. Hamilton,

Government Naturalist.

DUPLICATE

5

FALKLAND ISLANDS.

NO. 25



Downing Street,

5 April, 1924.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch No. 153 of the 5th of December, and to transmit to you, for your information a copy of a letter which I have caused to be addressed to the Southern Whaling and Sealing Company in reply to their complaint regarding the issue of permits to take hump-backs at the South Shetlands during the season 1922-23.

As regards the last paragraph of the letter to the Company I have to refer you to my despatch No. 24 of the 5 April.

12th March.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient,

humble servant,

(Signed) J. H. THOMAS

THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING
 THE GOVERNMENT OF THE
 FALKLAND ISLANDS.

3010/1924

Downing Street,

12th March, 1924.

Gentlemen,

With reference to the letter from this Department of the 24th of July, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Thomas to inform you that he has now received a report from the Officer Administering the Government of the Falkland Islands with regard to the working during the season 1922-23 of the system of temporary permits to take humpback whales at the South Shetlands.

2. Having carefully considered this report in consultation with the Governor, the Secretary of State sees no reason to take exception to the methods adopted by the Whaling Officer which do not appear to have resulted in any unfair discrimination against the "Southern Queen" since, with one exception, the catchers of that vessel took more hump-backs than any other expedition, the average for the catchers of the "Southern Queen" being 10 hump backs each, whereas the average per catcher for the whole field was less than 6.

3. The relaxation of the regulation prohibiting the catch of hump-backs was agreed to in the interests of the whaling companies themselves in order to minimise the risk of labour discontent; but, if it should prove that the discretion of the Whaling Officer in dealing with the matter is constantly to be questioned, the

Colonial

THE SOUTHERN WHALING AND
SEALING COMPANY.

Colonial Government may be compelled to consider whether the relaxation should not be entirely withdrawn, though, in the interests of the industry itself, the Secretary of State would regret the necessity for such a course of action.

4. I am also to point out that the Colonial Government has drawn attention to the fact that the production of oil per whale by the "Southern Queen" in the season 1922-23 was one of the smallest in the whole field, being only 56.5 barrels landed as compared with the maximum of 70.5 barrels landed in the case of another floating factory. Further, the quantity of oil returned to the Whaling Officer at the end of that season was 26,000 barrels only, or, 2,706 less than the return of oil landed. The Secretary of State regrets that he cannot regard these figures as satisfactory; but he would be glad to receive any observations which you have to make with regard to them.

5. I am to add that the Officer Administering the Government has suggested that all floating factories operating at the South Shetlands should be required to call at Stanley each year on the return voyage from the Dependency. The Secretary of State has given careful consideration to this proposal; but as the only vessels employed at the South Shetlands which do not call regularly at Stanley each year are those belonging to the British Companies which also operate at South Georgia and in view of the extensive diversion involved he is not prepared at present to insist on such a requirement as a general rule. The Secretary of State is, however,

of

of opinion that some further measures of control are necessary; and, with the concurrence of the Governor, the Officer Administering the Government is being requested to amend the regulations to provide:-

(1) That any floating factory which does not enter at Stanley on the way to the South Shetlands may at the discretion of the Governor be required to clear from that port on the return voyage, and,

(2) that in the case of applications for the renewal of licences at the South Shetlands the name of the responsible manager of the floating factory shall be reported to the Colonial Government for insertion in the licence subject to the approval of the Governor.

It is proposed that these amendments should take effect from and including the next season 1924-5: and the necessary notification should accordingly now be made to the Colonial Government direct.

I am, etc.,

(Sgd) G.Grindle.

DUPLICATE

FALKLAND ISLANDS.

HOWLING STREET,

No. 52

31st May, 1924.

Sir,

714/23

716/23

Encl. 20

Encl. 3

↓

↓

With reference to my despatches No. 24 and No. 25 of the 6th April, I have the honour to transmit to you the accompanying copy of correspondence with the Southern Whaling and Sealing Company Limited, regarding whaling operations at the South Shetlands.

Advantage was taken of the presence in this country of Mr. J. Hamilton, to obtain his observations on the Company's letter and I enclose a copy of a memorandum ^{by him} on the subject.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient,
humble servant,

(Signed) J. H. THOMAS

GOVERNOR

J. MIDDLTON, ESQ., C.M.G.

etc., etc., etc.

r. S. Whaling &
Sealing Co. Ltd.
to -do- 23 May.
Minute.

6A
The Southern Whaling and Sealing Company, limited.

A 18, Exchange Buildings,

Liverpool,

30th April 1924.

Your Ref. 3010/24.

The Under Secretary of State,
Colonial Office,
LONDON, S.W.1.

Sir:-

We have the honour to refer to your letter of the 12th ult. dealing with the following points :-

- (a) Temporary permits during the 1922/23 Season to take humpback whales.
- (b) The low average production of oil per whale by the "SOUTHERN QUEEN" during 1922/23 Season.
- (c) Compulsory clearing at Port Stanley, outwards or homewards, of the Floating Factories and the insertion of the Floating Factory Manager's name on the License.

(a) We admit that, with one exception, the whalecatchers attached to our South Shetlands Fleet took more humpback than any other Expedition and we would add that in total our production exceeded the other Companies' individual productions by some thousands of barrels of whaleoil.

The large amount of Capital which was spent on our Fleet provided us with superior boats and material and as a result we had no difficulty in obtaining the services of the very best Factory Personnel, Gunners and Crews and consequently our productions are high compared with

with our competitors. But then again our working costs are higher than our competitors' and we felt it very keenly that our crews should be handicapped in their competition with the Gunners of the other Companies through the Government's representative restricting this Company's operations.

The effect it had on our crews when the boats from the other Companies were shooting humpback whales within sight of the men on our boats can be readily appreciated, and it was only due to the strong personality of our Manager, under such adverse conditions, that our men were kept under control and in a contented state. We had to compensate our Gunners at the end of the Season in order to put them on the same footing as the Gunners of the other Companies.

Competition between boats is the whole life of the Industry and when a Company suffers restrictions which are not applied to their competitors, you will understand that the work of Management becomes difficult and further difficulties are experienced when engaging crews for the following Season.

(b) Our explanation regarding our low average of oil per whale caught is that our vessels were operating at the most Southerly end of the Straits and near the position occupied by the a.s. "ROALD AMUNDSEN", whose average was only one barrel higher per whale than ours. During a period of the Season whales were very scarce, and the Factories were all doing very badly. We, however, kept going pretty well, as owing to our employing large catchers and powerful gear, we were able to take whales in the open sea but in all cases these whales were miserably thin and consequently, while increasing the number of whales caught, our average number of barrels per whale dropped very much indeed.

We

We understand that for the greater part of the Season a Customs Officer was stationed on our vessel, and if he had not been satisfied with our working he would certainly have reported that we were allowing undue waste of material to occur.

The reason why our Manager reported 2,706 barrels less than actually landed was due to the fact that the 1922/23 Season was the first Season that the "SOUTHERN QUEEN" operated as a Floating Factory and the capacities of her tanks were calculated at 40 cu. ft. to the ton instead of 38 cu.ft, by the Builders, and our Manager worked on the Builders' figures. We regret this occurrence but there was no desire on his part to give incorrect quantities and now that we have discharged a cargo from this vessel through a weighing machine we have all the tanks correctly calibrated and therefore such a discrepancy is not likely to occur again.

(c) We note that the following two amendments to the Regulations will come into force during the 1924/25 Season:-

1. Floating Factories will be required to clear at Port Stanley, either outwards or homewards at the discretion of the Governor.
2. The name of the responsible Manager of a Floating Factory will be inserted on the License, subject to the approval of the Governor.

We are grateful for your courtesy in affording us an opportunity to comment upon these amendments before they come into operation and trust that you will give the matter your further careful consideration.

In regard to the first amendment, we do not quite follow its purpose, but we are glad to note that at present those Companies who make South Georgia their laying up port, will not be obliged to order their Floating Factory to Port Stanley for clearance, as they would suffer loss of time and considerable expense by the said diversion, should the amendment be put into force.

Regarding the second amendment, we are greatly concerned about this and we feel that this amendment may be open to many objections.

We would be glad if you will kindly indicate, or furnish us with some idea, of the nature of the grounds on which the Governor might base his disapproval of an appointed Manager as such information would be very helpful when considering such an appointment.

It can be quite understood that the Government would take exception to any Company employing a Manager who had previously committed a flagrant breach of the Regulations, but in that case doubtless the Board of the Company concerned would not re-engage a Manager who did not carry out the terms of the License or who in any way transgressed the Law.

We realise that the Regulations laid down by the Falkland Islands Government regarding the Whaling Industry in the Antarctic are made in the best interests of all concerned and we wish to assure you that it is our desire to carry out those Regulations loyally and to assist the Government by every possible means within our power.

We have, etc.,

THE SOUTHERN WHALING & SEALING CO. LTD.,

(Signed) N. Charles Watt

VICE CHAIRMAN.

6B

20671/24.

Downing Street,

13 May, 1924.

Gentlemen,

I am directed by Mr. Secretary Thomas to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 30th April with regard to Whaling operations at the South Shetlands, and to inform you that a copy of it is being sent to the Governor of the Falkland Islands.

2. As regards the amendment of the Whaling regulations, I am to say that the Secretary of State highly appreciates the assurance given in the last paragraph of your letter and that you may be satisfied that it is not the desire of the Colonial Government to impose undue restrictions upon the industry, nor to exercise the powers conferred by the new regulations, except when necessary to ensure compliance with the Whaling ^{Ordinance} Orders and Regulations, and to uphold the authority of the Colonial Government and its officers.

I am, Gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,

(Signed) G. GRINDLE

THE SOUTHERN WHALING AND
SEALING COMPANY, LIMITED.

Memorandum.

(a) It is correct that Southern Queen has large and powerful catchers and very energetic gunners. I have been informed that the pay of the latter is higher than in the case in any other company.

The greater quantity of coal which is burnt by such catchers with such gunners is doubtless an important cause of the working costs being relatively high.

In the past season it became clear that the issuing of permits for one ship at a time produced a feeling of injustice in the minds of managers who might not be granted permits simultaneously; this mental attitude is no doubt an indication of that of crews also.

The method which I adopted was therefore one of general permits to all factories, but I was more cautious about granting such than I would have been had the single ship system been continued.

(b) A large number of their whales will naturally show a low average but I incline to the view that on the whole catch the relative distribution of fat and thin whales is not very likely to be greatly different between different ships, excluding perhaps Ronald which is confined to deception, whereas the other factories can move about.

The Captain (Thorstein Andersen) of Southern Queen during the past season, took some pains to demonstrate to me that the average was being closely attended to.

I understand that in the case of a new tank ship the actual capacity of the tanks is somewhat uncertain until they have been filled and emptied.

(c) ? Is it not the case that a principal object of the new Regulation No.2 is the removal of a manager who is given to breaches of the Regulations.

A manager can however, do a good deal to make himself objectionable and a source of trouble to the Whaling Officer without breaking the law, and can probably do that also at such times and in such a way that proof is not possible.

(Sd) J.E.Hamilton.

Magistrate.

S.Shetland.

14.5.24.