

## International Commission for



## the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries

Serial No. 3663  
(A.a.4)

ICNAF Comm.Doc. 75/36  
(Revised)

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1975Statement to the Panel 5 Commissioners by the Italian DelegateAllocation of squid: Illex and Loligo

The Italian Delegation submits to the attention of the members of the Panel that in determining the quota allocations of squid for 1976 the two species were considered separately without a reference to the total quota allocation of 1975.

The result was therefore much different from what it should have been if a pro rata reduction would have been applied on the quota of 1975.

A glance at the figures will indicate what has happened.

	Quota 1975	Quota 1976 as decided for the two species			On a pro rata reduction from 1975	
		<u>Illex</u>	<u>Loligo</u>	<u>Total</u>		
FRG	1,000	-	1,000	1,000	900	+ 100
ITALY	4,700	1,000	2,500	3,500	4,200	- 700
JAPAN	24,300	-	15,700	15,700	21,600	-1,900
POLAND	6,800	5,000	1,700	6,700	6,000	+ 700
SPAIN	13,000	5,000	9,100	14,100	11,500	+2,600
USSR	8,500	7,500	2,000	9,500	7,500	+2,000
USA	5,600	7,500	8,500	16,000	-	-
OTHERS	7,100	4,000	3,500	7,500	-	-

These numbers indicate that the reduction was not made according to any definite criteria and how unfairly and unjustly the burden of reduction has been put only on two member countries. Italy particularly is affected by such a resolution which represents a ruinous and deadly blow to its Atlantic fishery

which up till now have relied in the ICNAF Area on squid fishing. Italy finds it difficult to accept a decision made on these two stocks (Illex and Loligo) individually. We request that a uniform criteria should be adopted in allocating quotas, and, should it not be possible to take account of the special and vital needs of Italy in this particular fishing area and for those species, we demand at least that reduction be based on a strict pro-rata on the total figure of 1975.

On the understanding that the split of this species into two may have created confusion, we urge the Panel to reconsider the matter having before it the figure of a pro-rata allocation; as no vote was taken on the total of the two species but only on the two stocks individually. Commissioners may, therefore, have been misled in giving their vote which was against any principle of the Panel and the Commission.

If, however, the Panel refuses to go back to allocating on a pro-rata basis, Italy asks, alternatively, that her quota be raised to 4,500 tons with an additional 1,000 tons of Loligo to be taken from the "Others" allocation. The figure for "Others" should then read 2,500 tons instead of 3,500 tons as it reads now.