XII International organisations

International Court of Justice. Australian National Group. Consultations.

On 15 September 1982 the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Street, provided the following written answer to a question about consultations that preceded the elections to fill vacancies in the International Court of Justice in 1981 (Sen Deb 1982, Vol 95, 994-995):

> I take it that the questions relate to the triennial elections to fill five regular vacancies in the International Court of Justice held in New York in November 1981 during the 36th Session of the United Nations General Assembly. The answers are as follows:
>
> > The Australian National Group consulted the Deans, or their equivalent, of the faculties of Law at the following universities: University of Adelaide, Australian National University, La Trobe University, Macquarie University, University of Melbourne, Monash University, University of Newcastle, University of New South Wales, University of Queensland, University of Sydney, University of Tasmania, University of Western Australia.
>
> In addition, the heads of legal departments at the following Australian institutions of advanced education were consulted: Canberra College of Advanced Education, Capricornia Institute of Advanced Education, Caulfield Institute of Technology, Mitchell College of Advanced Education, N.S.W. Institute of Technology, Riverina College of Advanced Education, South Australia Institute of Technology, State College of Victoria at Coburg.
>
> Those consulted were informed of the names and nationalities of the five members of the Court whose terms of office expired so as to require elections in November 1981. They were also informed of the name and nationality of every candidate for election known to the National Group. The Group informed those consulted that it would be happy to receive their views of the suitability for nomination of each of the candidates referred to by the National Group, and their views as to the suitability for nomination of any other person.
>
> The attention of those consulted was drawn to Article 2 of the Statute of the Court, which reads as follows:
>
> > 'The Court shall be composed of a body of independent judges, elected regardless of their nationality from among persons of high moral character, who possess the qualifications required in their respective countries for appointment to the highest judicial offices, or are jurisconsults of recognized competence in international Law.'
>
> Those consulted were also informed that the National Group was consulting in the same terms the Chief Justice of Australia, the Deans of faculties of Law and the Heads of schools of Law at Universities and other institutions of advanced education, the President of the International Law Association (Australian Branch), the President of the Law Council of Australia, and the President of the Australian Bar Association.
>
> The Australian National Group, after due consideration of the views

received, nominated the Lord President of the Federal Court of Malaysia, Dr Tun Mohammed Suffian, for election to the Court. The Australian National Group made no other nomination. In the event, Tun Suffian was not elected.

On 27 October 1982 the Minister wrote further (Sen Deb 1982, Vol 96, 1922):

> The membership of the Australian National Group in 1978 and 1981 comprised Sir Garfield Barwick, Sir Maurice Byers, Sir Clarrie Harders and Emeritus Professor K.O. Shatwell.
>
> As indicated to the honorable senator by the Attorney-General in his answers to Senate Question Nos. 755 and 972 in 1978, the Australian National Group nominated Ambassador J. Sette Camara (Brazil), Professor Roberto Ago (Italy), Dr Abdullah El Erian (Egypt) and Professor Richard Baxter (United States).

He concluded by stating that no nomination had been put forward to the Group on behalf of the Government in either 1978 or 1981.

International organisations. The Commonwealth of Nations. Nature of entity.

On 13 October 1981 the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, tabled the Declaration by the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting held in Melbourne in October 1981, and said of the Commonwealth (HR Deb 1981, Vol 125, 1892):

> The Commonwealth is an instrument which enables the leaders of many countries, from many continents, to come together as colleagues and friends to make a contribution to the continuing process of resolving the world's problems. That is what the Meeting at Melbourne was all about.

International organisations. United Nations. Effectiveness and reforms.

On 23 August 1983 the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Hayden, wrote in answer to certain questions (HR Deb 1983, Vol 132, 82-83):

> The Australian Government takes a constructive, positive approach to the question of making the United Nations more responsive to the needs of its member states. As a practical matter however there is little likelihood of securing the necessary degree of agreement to amend the organisation's charter to remove the power of veto from the permanent members of the Security Council, since such a proposal would require the assent of the permanent members themselves.
>
> Charter reform has been a difficult exercise, although Australia participates in consideration of this question and will continue to do so. The United Nations can only function effectively on the basis of consent. If major parties to a dispute refuse to heed the demands of the United Nations, including the Security Council, experience has shown that the United Nations' ability to resolve the problem is limited.
>
> Countries like Australia have a duty to encourage member states to accept a greater role for the United Nations and the related arbitral and juridical process, but until this acceptance has become more widespread, moves for substantive amendments to the charter are unlikely to be successful.
>
> Australia would support any constructive proposal for reform of the United Nations Charter and, as stated in the reply to your previous question on this matter, spoke in favour of the principles enunciated in President

Carter's report in the General Assembly. However as a matter of fact any agreement to reform the Charter will require widespread support from member states of the organisation, including the permanent members of the Security Council, and we must bear this in mind . . .

There is, however, no doubt that the United Nations' record on peace-keeping is not entirely successful. The Security Council, the primary organ for the maintenance of international peace and security, finds its resolutions often ignored. Those provisions of the Charter dealing with collective action for peace and security have been rendered largely ineffective. Member States have contrived to avoid bringing particular problems to the Security Council, or to do so too late for the Council to have any effective impact. Obviously the attainment of the ideals which the original participants held for the ability of the United Nations to keep the peace has proved elusive.

On 8 December 1983 Mr Hayden wrote in answer to a question (HR Deb 1983, Vol 134, 3615):

I have spoken before about the objective of the peaceful rule of international law. In my view, an effective form of world government, of the kind contemplated in this question, is not attainable in current circumstances. There already exist, in the Charter of the United Nations, provisions that aim for the peaceful regulation of relations between states. An attempt to launch a form of world government, or to promote an alternative to the United Nations, however well motivated this may be, would not, in the Government's view, be more likely to bring about international peace than the present provisions of the Charter. It is however necessary that the international community should bend its efforts to make the United Nations a more effective instrument for the promotion of peaceful relations between states.

International organisations. International criminal tribunal. Proposal.

Australia's representative on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, in the course of a statement on racism and apartheid made to the 37th Session of the Commission in Geneva in 1981, said (PP No 135/1981, p 28):

Mr Chairman, although Australia is not a party to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid and cannot, therefore, play an active role in consideration of the issues raised in Item 17 of the Agenda, we would wish to note that we have followed with interest the discussion among States Parties on the question of establishment of an international tribunal under Article V of the Convention. In the Australian view, it would not be wise to create an international tribunal in this area of international criminal law without having regard to the wider question of the need for a tribunal to deal as well with other forms of international criminality. For this reason Australia sympathises with the legal position set out by the Government of Romania in its response to questions on this subject which is contained in paragraph 21 of document E/NC.4/1417. In the Australian view, as apparently in the Romanian view, it is not at present necessary to create a tribunal of this kind.

International organisations. Membership and credentials. South Africa. Israel. Kampuchea.

On 4 September 1981 Australia's Permanent Representative to the United Nations in New York, Mr Anderson, said at the Eighth Emergency Session of the General Assembly on the First Report of the Credentials Committee (A/ES-8/PV.2, pp 24-25:

> The Australian delegation voted against the motion that South Africa should not be heard and against the report of the Credentials Committee. In voting against the report, we were concerned only with that part of the report which rejects the credentials of South Africa.
>
> Our position on the question of South Africa's being heard and on the credentials of South Africa is based on legal grounds and in particular on our long-standing support of the fundamental principle of universality of membership of the United Nations. I should add that Australia's vote in no way qualifies or detracts from its categoric rejection of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the Government of South Africa and its no less categoric rejection of the policy of *apartheid*.

On 18 September 1981 Mr Anderson said at the 36th Session of the United Nations General Assembly on the First Report of the Credentials Committee (A/36/PV.4, p 17):

> My delegation abstained in the vote on the question of the credentials of the Democratic Kampuchean delegation. At last year's session of the General Assembly Australia voted in favour of those credentials. Since then on 14 February 1981 — Australia has withdrawn recognition of that régime. We now recognize no régime in Kampuchea.
>
> There are a number of reasons for our decision to abstain. These include our withdrawal of recognition from the Democratic Kampuchean régime, the contested situation within Kampuchea itself and the efforts to establish an internationally and domestically acceptable alternative for that country.
>
> The Australian Government has repeatedly made clear that it hopes that a truly representative coalition will emerge in Kampuchea. In our view, it is too early yet to say that such a truly representative coalition has emerged. We shall, however, continue to watch closely developments following from the recent meeting in Singapore of the anti-Vietnamese Khmer groups and from other meetings that are planned.
>
> I stress that the Australian Government has no intention of recognizing the Heng Samrin rérime — a régime which is kept in power by the Vietnamese army which installed it — and I stress also that our abstention in the vote on credentials which has just taken place should in no way be seen as having such an implication.

On 9 December 1982 Australia's Permanent Representative at the United Nations in New York, Mr Woolcott, said in explanation of vote after a debate on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa (A/37/PV, 97, p 12):

> I should like to restate very briefly at this time a number of well-known Australian attitudes which are not affected by the votes we are about to cast.
>
> First, Australia cannot condone the use of force to achieve political change in South Africa.

> Secondly, we are opposed to the practice of singling out specific countries for criticism with regard to their policies towards South Africa. This opposition extends to other areas as well.
>
> Thirdly, we support the independence and integrity of the international financial institutions and consider it to be inappropriate for the General Assembly to seek to undermine that independence. Australia adheres to the principal of universality of these international financial institutions and does not support attempts to breach this principle.
>
> Fourthly, and finally, I should like to reiterate Australia's resolute and continuing opposition to the repugnant policy of *apartheid* and our willingness to support proper and effective measures which will lead South Africa to change its policies.

On 30 November 1982 the Treasurer, Mr Howard, provided the following written answer to a question about the approval given by the Executive Board of the International Monetary Fund on 3 November 1982 to a request by South Africa for two drawings totalling SDR1,000m from the Fund (Sen Deb 1982, Vol 97, 2957):

> The Australian Government remains firmly opposed to the system of apartheid and is ready to lend its support to internationally supported measures which will exert effective pressure on the South African regime to change its policies. In this regard, we appreciate the objections which many countries have to the provision of financial support to South Africa.
>
> However, the Government respects the legal independence of international financial institutions, such as the IMF. The Government has no basis for objecting to the South African drawing given the terms of the Fund's Articles of Agreement and given the terms of the Fund's Relationship Agreement with the United Nations.

On 8 December 1982 the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Street, wrote in answer to a question (HR Deb 1982, Vol 130, 3199):

> Australia has adopted a number of measures, which could be regarded as sanctions in the broadest sense of the term, against both the Soviet Union and South Africa. These measures are designed to curtail the range of our bilaterial relations with those countries and are an expression of the Government's condemnation of the policies and actions of the governments of those countries.
>
> There is no inconsistency between the measures adopted in the cases of South Africa and the Soviet Union.

For an announcement of Australia's ratification of the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO), on 12 July 1981, see Comm Rec 1981, 1703. UNIDO's Constitution entered into force on 21 June 1985. The organization became a specialized agency on 17 December 1985.

On 20 October 1982 the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Street, said in answer to a question (HR Deb 1982, Vol 129, 2255-2256):

> The Australian Government is greatly concerned at recent proposals to exclude Israel from the United Nations and some of its agencies. We have always strongly supported the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations. To exclude Israel from the United Nations and its related

agencies would undermine this principle and indeed frustrate the main purpose of the United Nations, which is to resolve disputes among nations. The United States Secretary of State has made it clear that, in the event of Israel's exclusion from the current session of the United Nations General Assembly or specialist agencies, the United States could withhold payment to the United Nations or certain agencies until Israel's right to participate was restored. This obviously would have very serious implications. The very strength of the American reaction underlines the damage which would be caused to the United Nations by a move to exclude Israel. We, for our part, would carefully consider how best we should react if there were a successful challenge to Israel's right to participate in the current UNGA session. We call on all members of the United Nations to oppose measures to exclude Israel, because such action would only damage the organization.

International organizations. Privileges and immunities. Legislation.

On 29 October 1981 the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Street, presented the International Organizations (Privileges and Immunities) Amendment Bill 1981 to Parliament. He explained the purpose of the Bill as follows (HR Deb 1981, Vol 125, 2736-2737):

The purpose of this Bill is to amend in two respects the International Organizations (Privileges and Immunities) Act 1963 to enable Australia to meet certain treaty obligations. The first amendment, dealt with in clauses 2 to 5 of the Bill, is achieved by making individual amendments to a number of sections of the Act. The need for this amendment has arisen from the terms of an agreement which is to be concluded between Australia and the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, which we expect will set up its headquarters in Hobart in early 1982.

Under the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, which was concluded at a conference in Canberra in May 1980 and which Australia ratified on 6 May 1981, Australia agreed to accord the Commission and its staff certain privileges and immunities as required by international practice. International practice also requires that a person attending a conference convened by the Commission as a representative of a member country be accorded privileges and immunities. These privileges and immunities for both staff of the Commission and representatives of member countries can be accorded under the 1963 Act as it stands. In the case of the Convention, however, not only countries may become parties but also regional economic integration organizations, such as the European Communities, may accede once the Convention has entered into force. In addition, representatives of regional organizations and international organisations in which Australia participates might be invited to attend meetings in Australia of the organs set up under the Convention.

When the 1963 Act was drafted it was not contemplated that international organizations, as well as countries, would become members of other international organizations. It is necessary, therefore, to expand the power to make regulations under the Act so that representatives of international organizations attending the Commission's conferences in Australia may be accorded similar privileges and immunities to those accorded to the representatives of member countries. The Bill makes a number of

amendments to the principal Act to achieve this. In effect, every reference in the Act to representatives of countries will be extended to include a reference to representatives of certain prescribed international organisations.

The representatives of certain international organizations only will be eligible to be accorded privileges and immunities under the Bill. The international organizations are those of which Australia is a member and those which the Bill describes as 'overseas organizations' such as the European Communities, of which Australia cannot become a member because the organizations are composed of countries in a particular geographical region. For the Act to apply to an international organization it must be so declared by regulations under the Act.

At the same time, the definition of 'international conference' is amended so that it will include not only a conference attended by representatives from Australia and representatives from another country, but also a conference attended by representatives from a prescribed international organization. This will enable Australia in future to accord the appropriate privileges and immunities to those representatives.

The second amendment, dealt with in clause 6 of the Bill, will enable Australia to implement by regulation a taxation obligation under two specific agreements — one establishing the Common Fund for Commodities and the other establishing the Asian Development Bank. Those agreements provide, among other things, that foreign experts and committee members be accorded exemption from Australian income tax when visiting or working in Australia. As the Act now stands, there is no provision in the Fifth Schedule which would enable regulations to be made to grant income tax exemption to persons in those categories. Clause 6 of the Bill will amend the Fifth Schedule of the Act to include such a provision.

If the Bill is passed, regulations will be made as soon as practicable to accord this exemption. I understand from the Treasurer (Mr Howard) that exemption will be extended under present taxation policy to experts and committee members involved in the work of an organization only if the agreement establishing the organization specifically permits Australia to tax Australian citizens working for that organization, regardless of their employment status or location. This is the case with the Common Fund and the Asian Development Bank. This measure should not be significant in terms of revenue foregone. The exemption is likely to be available in respect of few organizations in the future and the total number of persons involved should be small. I commend the Bill to the House.

The Bill was assented to on 22 March 1982 as Act No. 4 of 1982.

International organizations. Privileges and Immunities. Taxation exemptions. Whether a "consultant" is an "official". UNESCO.

On 18 May 1982 the Commonwealth Taxation Board of Review No 3 handed down its decision in 25 CTBR (NS) Case 108 (p 787). Its reasons were as follows:

Chairman, Mr M.B. Hogan; Members, Dr P. Gerber and Dr G.W. Beck:

The short issue in this case is whether a "consultant" engaged by UNESCO

and whose rights and privileges are governed by the International Organizations (Privileges and Immunities) Act 1963-1966 (Cth) is an "Official" within the meaning of s 23(y) of the Income Tax Assessment Act and reg $4_{AB}(2)$ of the regulations. If the answer is in the affirmative, his UNESCO income is exempt from Australian taxation.

2. The taxpayer, a scientist of high repute engaged by an Australian Statutory Corporation, was invited by UNESCO to a Third World country to assist it with his expertise. The written contract stated that it would come into effect "approximately 1 August 1978" and expire "end of September 1978". Terms and remuneration are spelt out in detail. In the result we do not consider that anything turns on the terms.Suffice it for present purposes that the taxpayer claimed his salary in the amount of $3,969 as being tax exempt pursuant to s 23(y) whilst the Commissioner included said amount in accordance with s 25(l). Hence this reference.

3. Section 23(y) provides that the salary and emoluments of an official of a prescribed organization of which Australia is a member shall be exempt from income tax. There is no dispute that UNESCO is "prescribed" (cf reg $4_{AB}(1)(k)$), the question is: Who or what is an "Official"?

4. Regulation $4_{AB}(2)$ provides (so far as relevant):

"For the purposes of paragraph (y) of section 23 of the Act, the organizations specified in the last preceding sub-regulation and the International Finance Corporation are prescribed, and the official salary and emoluments of an official of such an organization or the International Finance Corporation are, in accordance with that paragraph, exempt from income tax —

(a) in the case of an oficial of the United Nations or of an official in respect of whom Australia is bound to accord the privileges and immunities accorded to diplomatic envoys in accordance with international law, to the extent that Australia is bound by an international convention or agreement to exempt from taxation his official salary and emoluments:

(b) . . .

(c) in the case of an official (other than one referred to in paragraph (a) of this sub-regulation) who is a resident of Australia, to the extent that his official salary and emoluments are for services rendered out of Australia."

5. The problem raised in this reference involves issues of International Law. We propose, therefore, to deal briefly with the background of the United Nations and to the extent the International Organizations (Privileges and Immunities) Act 1963-1966 (Cth) and the Statutory Rules thereunder affect the privileges and immunities of the Specialized Agencies as organs of the United Nations.

6. Notwithstanding that UNESCO is a prescribed organization for purposes of s 23, it is worth pointing out that the United Nations Charter draws a distinction between the privileges and immunities of the Organization, representatives of member-States and officials of the Organization (art 105, UN Charter). A second category of beneficiaries is spelled out fully in the Convention of 13 February 1946 on Privileges and

Immunities of the United Nations and to conferences convened by the United Nations (art IV, s 11). Under s 16 of art IV the meaning of the term "representative" has been widened to include all delegates, advisers, technical experts. Article V, ss 17-20 and art VI, 22 22-23 create a third category — *Officials* of the United Nations and experts on missions for the United Nations. In the Convention of 21 November 1947, on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, two classes of privileged persons are mentioned — representatives of member-States and officials (United Nations Year Book 1947-1948, p 190 et seq; and see generally Schwarzenberger on *International Law* vol III). The parties to the Convention of 21 November 1947 are the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations and members of the United Nations and other States members of one or more Specialized Agencies which have acceded to the Convention. For the sake of completeness, it merely remains to point out that the introductory words used to make the statutory rules, made under the International Organizations (Privileges and Immunities) Act (Cth) state that:

"Australia has acceded to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, being the Convention approved by a resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted on the twenty-first November, 1947, as modified in accordance with the terms of the Convention and has, subject to certain specified considerations, undertaken to apply to the Specialized Agencies specified in the following Regulations the provisions of the Convention."

7. I now turn to the term "Official". It is not defined in the Charter nor in the Income Tax Assessment Act. International institutions are, of course, merely creatures of treaty and do not qualify for any privileges or immunities under international customary law. Thus any privileges and immunities which international institutions are to enjoy must be granted to them by the States concerned. Turning to Commonwealth legislation, we find s 18 of art VI of the International Organizations (Privileges and Immunities) Statutory Rules, 1962 No. 105 enacting art VI of the 1947 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, which states:

"*Officials*

Each specialized agency will specify the categories of officials to which the provisions of this article and of article VIII shall apply. It shall communicate them to the Governments of all States parties to this Convention in respect of that agency and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The names of the officials included in these categories shall from time to time be made known to the above-mentioned governments.

"*Section 19*

Officials of the specialized agencies shall:

(a) . . .

(b) Enjoy the same exemptions from taxation in respect of the salaries and emoluments paid to them by the specialized agencies and on the same conditions as are enjoyed by officials of the United Nations;"

Annex IV of the said Rules is headed "United Nations Educational,

Scientific and Cultural Organization'' and states that the standard clauses shall operate in respect to the said organization and are to be complementary to the privileges and immunities as far as possible to those enjoyed by the United Nations. Clause 3 of Annex IV provides:

> ''3.(i) Experts (other than officials coming within the scope of article VI) serving on committees of, or performing missions for, the Organization shall be accorded the following privileges and immunities so far as is necessary for the effective exercise of their functions, including the time spent on journeys in connection with service on such committees or missions:
>
> (a) Immunity from personal arrest or seizure of their personal baggage;
>
> (b) In respect of words spoken or written or acts done by them in the performance of their official functions immunity of legal process of every kind, such immunity to continue notwithstanding that the persons concerned are no longer serving on committees of, or employed on missions for, the Organization.
>
> (c) The same facilities in respect of currency and exchange restrictions and in respect of their personal baggage as are accorded to officials of foreign Governments on temporary official missions.
>
> (ii) Privileges and immunities are granted to the experts of the Organization in the interests of the Organization and not for the personal benefit of the individuals themselves. The Organization shall have the right and duty to waive the immunity of any expert in any case where in its opinion the immunity would impede the course of justice, and it can be waived without prejudice to the interests of the Organization.''

8.0 This, then, is the statutory background. Applied to this reference, it would appear to us that the status to be accorded to this taxpayer whilst engaged on his UNESCO-sponsored trip is that of an expert performing a mission for a Specialized Agency. Such privileges and immunities which he enjoys as an ''expert'' are to be found in cl 3 of Annexe IV contained in the Statutory Rules 1962 No 105 made under the International Organizations (Privileges and Immunities) Act 1948-1960 as stated above. To the extent that the taxpayer claimed to be an ''Official'' pursuant to art VI of the said Rules, it is for him to show that he has been nominated as such and his name communicated *inter alia,* to the Commonwealth Government (cf s 18 of art VI above). No such evidence was tendered. To rebut a case which had not been made out, the Commissioner called for legal experts from the Department of Foreign Affairs, whose principal purpose, it appears to us, was to give expert evidence on Australian law. However, en passant, this witness deposed that as a result of telex enquiries made to UNESCO, that organization considered the taxpayer a ''consultant'' during the relevant period. The Tax Office sought further and better particulars with respect to this hybrid, and whether a consultant fits into the genus ''specialist'' and sent off yet another telex. The reply stated:

''Please be informed (taxpayer) engaged by UNESCO as 'consultant' not 'official' of the Organization under art VI of Convention on Privileges and

Immunities. Stop. Status of UNESCO 'consultant' is assimilated to 'expert' within meaning of Annex IV para 3 of Convention.''

9. We have included the above since it appears that what constitutes an ''official'' for purposes of Australian tax law has indeed been delegated to the various Specialized Agencies. The Crown's evidence having shown conclusively that with respect to this taxpayer, there has been no compliance by UNESCO with respect to either manner or form to elevate him to the status of ''official'', we are compelled to conclude that his UNESCO income is not tax exempt under s 23(y) or any other provision dealing with exempt income. We can understand this taxpayer's irritation with the denial of his status since he was certainly an official in every sense that word is used in common parlance. However, for purposes of tax exempt status, an ''official'' under s 23(y), which takes its colour from the International Organizations (Privileges and Immunities) Act and the rules and regulations made thereunder, the word has a narrow, technical meaning, involving — like marriage or divorce — the official intervention of another party; one cannot become an ''official'' aided only by one's bootstraps.

10. In the result, we have no alternative but to uphold the Commissioner's decision on the objection.

International organizations. Privileges and immunities. Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources. Headquarters Agreement.

On 15 August 1983 the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Hayden, issued the following statement (Comm Rec 1983, 1249-1250):

> The Minister for Foreign Affairs, the Hon. Bill Hayden, today signed an interim headquarters agreement for the first international organization to have its headquarters in Australia — the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources which is based in Hobart.
>
> The Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources which came into force in 1982, established the Commission to take appropriate management and conservation measures for the only resource of the Antarctic presently being exploited — the marine living resources, principally fish and krill — a shrimp-like organism which is rich in protein and which occupies a vital position in the food chain for fish, whales, seals and birds in the Antarctic.
>
> Members of the Commission are Argentina, Australia, Chile, the European Communities, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Japan, New Zealand, South Africa, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The Commission and the Scientific Committee will meet regularly in Hobart. The next meeting will be held in Hobart from 29 August to 9 September.