

European Communities

---

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

# Working Documents

1980 - 1981

---

7 January 1981

DOCUMENT 1-757/80

## Report

drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture

on/disturbance of the Community apple market

Rapporteur : Mr David CURRY



On 26 October 1979, the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr B. Patterson and Mr C. Jackson pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure on the sale of French apples in the United Kingdom was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

On 12 March 1980 Mr Ligios and others tabled a motion for a resolution, and on 13 March 1980 Mr Pranchère and others tabled a motion for a resolution, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure both with request for urgent debate on disturbance of the Community apple market.

The request for urgent debate was refused by the European Parliament at its plenary session on 14 March 1980 and the two motions for a resolution were referred, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on External Economic Affairs for its opinion.

The Committee on Agriculture appointed Mr Curry rapporteur on 23 April 1980.

The committee considered the draft report at its meeting of 26-28 November 1980 and 4-5 December 1980.

At the latter meeting the committee unanimously adopted the motion for a resolution and explanatory statement.

Present: Sir Henry Plumb, chairman; Mr Früh, vice-chairman; Mr Ligios, vice-chairman; Mr Curry, rapporteur; Mr Barbagli (deputizing for Mr Colleselli), Miss Barbarella, Mr Battersby, Mrs Castle, Mr Clinton, Mr Dalsass, Mr Davern, Mr Diana, Mr Gatto, Mr Helms, Mr Hord, Mr Jackson (deputizing for Mr Kirk), Mr Josselin (deputizing for Mrs Cresson), Mr Lynge, Mr Maher, Mr Papapietro (deputizing for Mr Maffre-Baugé), Mr Provan, Ms Quin, Mr Tolman, Mr Vernimmen, Mr Vitale and Mr Woltjer.

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION .....	5
B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	7
ANNEX I: Statistics relating to apples .....	17
ANNEX II: Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr B. Patterson and Mr C. Jackson pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure on the sale of French apples in the United Kingdom (Doc. 1-442/79) .....	21
ANNEX III: Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Ligios and others with request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on disturbance of the Community apple market (Doc. 1-15/80) .....	22
ANNEX IV: Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Pranchère and others with request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on disturbance of the Community apple market (Doc. 1-23/80) .....	23

The Committee on Agriculture hereby submits to the European Parliament the following motion for a resolution together with explanatory statement:

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on disturbance of the Community apple market

The European Parliament,

- having regard to
    - the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr B. Patterson and Mr C. Jackson on the sale of French apples in the United Kingdom (Doc. 1-442/79),
    - the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Ligios and others (Doc. 1-15/80)
    - the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Franchère and others (Doc. 1-23/80)
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-757/80),
1. Welcomes the steps taken in the UK to improve the grading, packaging, marketing and advertising of English apples and asks the Commission to examine ways in which the Community may assist this process in the United Kingdom and in the other Member States through EAGGF or other appropriate instruments;
  2. Welcomes the agreement on the part of the French producers to limit shipments for an initial period to the UK to Grade 1 apples and calls for renewed talks between representatives of French and British producers with a view to limiting shipments to Grade 1 fruit for a transitional period to allow the measures of reform in the UK reasonable time and conditions to become established;
  3. Calls on the Commission to review the operation of the existing grading system and report within six months on how it proposes to enforce grading regulations equally in all Member States for fruit destined for both the home and export market and to propose changes to the existing grading system which will enable the growers of apples with smaller average sizes to compete on more equal terms; .

4. Calls on the Commission to recalculate entirely the coefficients which govern the setting of the intervention price for all varieties on the basis of the market price commanded by the French-grown Golden Delicious plus the transport cost to the market. In the interim the coefficient for Cox should be raised to 1.3 to give growers the confidence to modernise their production;
5. Calls for a more rigorous monitoring of the practice of intervention to ensure that earnings from withdrawals are not averaged between producers contrary to the regulations;
6. Calls for an examination into national aids in the apple industry to see whether they distort competition within the EEC. It further calls for the publication of these findings and for the list of national aids held by the Commission to be made available for inspection by members of EEC institutions, national parliaments, and bodies recognized by EEC institutions;
7. Notes that a more vigorous application of grading rules, without changing the designated minimum size, will be more acceptable if there is an alternative outlet for outgraded fruit. Accordingly it asks the Commission to give greater support to the processing of apples in general and the production of apple juice in particular, and to examine and consider all applications for aid from the undertakings concerned as quickly as possible;
8. Calls for greater coordination between the directorates in the Commission responsible for internal relations and agriculture concerning policy towards import of apples from third countries in terms of European requirements and achieving a stable and long-term balance between imports and the home market.
9. Calls on the Commission to consult interested parties throughout the Community concerned with the production, marketing and consumption of apples and to report within 6 months on the introduction of criteria other than those currently employed to classify apples which will more effectively encourage the production of a greater variety of apples with taste and quality being given more emphasis than under the present grading system;
10. Instructs its President to forward this resolution and the report of its committee to the Council and Commission.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENTAPPLES.The nature of the problem

British apple production is being seriously jeopardised by the import of Golden Delicious apples from France. In 1979 imports of French Golden Delicious reached 245,500 tonnes against a domestic production of UK apples of 322,000 tonnes. In 1977 French sales totalled 193,390 tonnes compared with an average of 70,000 tonnes a year in the early 1970s. Talks aimed at reaching an 'orderly marketing' agreement for 1980 between British and French representatives have apparently failed, and M Charles Calleja, speaking to British journalists in August, said that France would ship more than 250,000 tonnes of apples to the UK in 1980 if the market would take it.

For the past three years British growers have suffered severe losses, ranging up to £330 per acre. In 1979 about 12,000 acres - or 5 per cent of apple orchards - were destroyed in the UK.

French growers have voted to restrict voluntarily exports of Grade II apples and 28 lb jumble packs until the end of October.

British producers have blamed the situation on their own lack of organization and insufficient product development and quality control, and on EEC rules which favour the larger 'southern' apples grown in France, particularly at the withdrawal stage. They also attribute substantial subsidies to French growers from the French Government.

The task of your rapporteur has been to seek solutions which would give the British apple industry time to organize its own affairs more effectively without trying to impose penalties on French producers. He has sought to recommend measures which will improve the functioning of the whole EEC apple market. He has specifically rejected certain proposals advanced by British producers which he does not believe would be in their long-term interest and he has emphasized the need for the industry in the UK to organize its production and marketing more effectively.

Your rapporteur believes there are strong similarities between the cases of sheepmeat and apples. In the former a well-organized British industry was seeking access to a vulnerable and inadequately organized French sector. In the case of apples an organized industrial production in France, which is geared to export, has now reached the point in its sales to the UK which threatens the existence of the British industry. Just as the solution reached over the sheepmeat war will permit French farmers to absorb greater competition, he seeks sympathetic understanding from Community and national

authorities towards the very energetic steps now being taken to put the British industry's house in order.

#### Historical background

Prior to the UK's membership of the EEC in 1973 the UK apple market was protected by a quota which restricted apple imports from the non-sterling area to 15,200 tons from July to December and 62,750 tons from January to June, with an additional 1,000 tons imported from Eastern Europe. After UK entry imports from the rest of the EEC were without restriction but a voluntary quota applied for imports from South Africa, New Zealand and Australia.

From 1973-78 British growers were protected to some extent by the payment of Accession Compensatory Amounts of £50 a ton phased out over five years. The decline in the value of sterling, and the relatively poor crops of home-grown apples in this period, deferred the full crisis of competition between imports and local varieties. However, even by 1975 French apples accounted for a third of all imports.

The Golden Delicious enjoys certain advantages in the UK market. It yields twice as heavily as British varieties for climatic reasons, and its storage characteristics are much better than those of the leading UK variety, Cox. Golden Delicious are also larger apples than Cox's, but because of the particular British taste for smaller, green fruit it can be delivered to the British market continuously from August onwards. Its continuity of supply and excellent packaging and promotion make it an attractive product for wholesalers. Since there is a structural surplus of apples in the EEC with an average output of 6.6m tonnes against an average consumption of 6.2m tonnes, there is no difficulty in maintaining export markets supplied with premium fruit. At the same time, the intervention system is organized around the Golden Delicious as the 'pivotal' EEC apple and this provides relatively greater security to the producer of the high-yielding Golden than it does to the grower of more northern varieties which are characterized by lower yields and smaller sizes. The Top Fruit Working Party, established in the UK to recommend ways of improving the position of UK apples, calculated that Golden Delicious of 70 mm diameter yielding 30 tonnes to a hectare are worth £1,529 per hectare at intervention against £600 for Cox apples at 60mm yielding 15 tonnes per hectare.

However, as intervention prices are designed to reflect different market prices rather than differences in the cost of production your rapporteur has approached the question of changes in the intervention system with great caution. He notes, nonetheless, that intervention is intended to be a 'safety net' not a regular part of marketing strategy, and has therefore, in the Motion for a Resolution, called on the Commission to prevent



disciplined withdrawals and averaging of withdrawal prices taking place contrary to the letter of the law.

Your rapporteur has also recognized that grading standards are almost universally ignored. On both the British and French markets apples are offered for sale which should never be permitted onto the counter. The inspectorates are usually inadequate, often permissive, and their powers clearly insufficient. It is quite clear that a significant part of the structural surplus is created by apples which fail to reach minimum quality standards and which are, nonetheless, offered for sale.

#### The way the system works

Your rapporteur's recommendations will only be understood if certain of the features of the EEC support system for apples are appreciated. The following are the main elements:

#### Intervention and coefficients

The withdrawal prices are set by the Council of Ministers, but the actual price applying to each variety is determined by a coefficient. The starting point is the Golden Delicious which has a coefficient of 1 which lasts throughout the season. The Cox apple has a coefficient of 1.20 from September to February - i.e. receives a higher buying-in price than Golden - but this drops to 1 from March to May. The coefficient for Bramley, the main British cooking variety and a large-fruited apple, is 0.65. The price levels are increased progressively throughout the season with a higher payment for the large sized apples. The British industry has constantly argued for a higher coefficient for the Cox on two grounds: that intervention price ought to reflect more accurately comparative production costs rather than just price differential; and that intervention ought to be geared to the price of the most characteristic apple in the market in each country.

Your rapporteur feels that coefficients have been adjusted and tinkered with too much already and that it is time for a much more fundamental re-organization of the system.

At present the coefficients are organized around a pilot apple - the Golden Delicious. But it is the Golden Delicious grown in each national market, not the internationally traded French or Italian Golden Delicious. This creates obvious distortions. For example, in Belgium and Holland there is a tendency to pick locally grown Golden Delicious very early in order to obtain a green apple so that the price is not representative. Equally, there are very few Cox's on the Dutch and Belgian market. In Britain and in Denmark there are almost no Golden Delicious grown, so any attempt to work out relatives is highly suspect.

Your rapporteur recommends that the Golden Delicious should remain the pilot apple, but that it should be the French or Italian grown apple plus transport costs to each national market which should be the bench-mark of price rather than the locally-grown Golden Delicious which might be a wholly unrepresentative apple. Such a recalculation would restore some logic to the determination of relative price. At the same time your rapporteur rejects the idea that intervention prices should be based on production costs, since this would be a wholly unacceptable way of falsifying any move towards rationalizing production in the EEC.

Intervention is only available to producer groups. It is argued that if its availability is widened to include looser groups of producers it will undermine the discipline which is imposed on co-operatives. The opposite argument is that it may be the producers who are denied intervention who unload poor quality fruit onto the market. There is evidence that some co-operatives are organized to use intervention systematically, with withdrawal prices averaged between growers. This is against the letter of the law.

#### Derogation

Apples are classified as Extra, Class 1, Class 2, and Class 3 which is not normally allowed on the market. Apples which do not conform to these standards must not be offered for sale. To prevent immature fruit being rushed to the market at the start of the year in August the EEC permits national governments to apply higher standards for a limited period. These higher standards are called derogations. It is a limited measure because it is up to each state to decide whether to apply or not, and it applies only to the national crop.

The UK applied the derogations in the current year as follows:

Cox's Orange Pippin	65 mm up to September 21
Worcester Pearmain	60 mm up to September 7
James Grieve	65 mm up to September 14
Golden Delicious	65 mm up to September 14
Discovery	60 mm up to August 10
Tydeman's early	65 mm up to August 24

The British Apple and Pear Development Council recommended minimum standards throughout the season to the trade, and these were adopted on a voluntary basis by the main wholesale organization the National Federation of Fruit and Potato Trades. The main aim of this was to improve the quality of English fruit reaching the market and is one of the measures which illustrates the effort being made to improve the competitiveness of the locally-grown crop.

### What the British industry must do

The plight of the British industry has been the subject of an investigation by a special group called the Top Fruit Working Party set up under the auspices of the Apple and Pear Development Council which is the statutory body with responsibility for fruit promotion. Your rapporteur thinks it is important to include a summary of its findings so that it may be appreciated that the British industry is trying to solve its own problems and that any Community action is complementary to the prime need to modernize the structure of domestic production. The following are the main recommendations:

- (i) The Cox apple must aim at a premium market and establish a brand image with the public;
- (ii) UK growers must concentrate on a limited number of varieties. Cox must be the main apple - one of the difficulties now is that retailers cannot get enough Cox apple of sufficient quality - and Bramley, Spartan and Discovery the main subsidiary varieties. Pear planting should concentrate on Conference and Comice;
- (iii) Grading, packaging and marketing must be co-ordinated. Growers should adopt a standard pack of 10, 20, 30 or 40 pounds weight either telescopic or one-piece corrugated container. In particular, a premium pack should be developed under the APDC aegis which would license its use to specific packers under very strict quality controls subject to detailed inspection. This would be backed by a sustained market intelligence service;
- (iv) The APDC itself should be strengthened to undertake marketing and promotion. One object should be to make the smaller size of apple characteristic of Cox more acceptable on the grounds of enhanced taste;
- (v) EEC minimum size for Class 2 large-fruited varieties should be increased to 60 mm. The minimum for Golden Delicious should be 65 mm and for other dessert varieties 55 mm;
- (vi) Subsidies should be available to replant orchards with modern varieties;
- (vii) There should be an investigation into the possibilities of establishing a juicing industry;
- (viii) The quality norms governing what fruit may be offered for sale must be rigorously enforced so that outgraded fruit does not find its way onto the shelves.

### National support for the fruit-growing industry

The TFWP, the British NFU and various bodies in the UK associated with the fruit industry maintain that the volume of aid given by the French Government to its industry is such as to distort competition, when added to the natural bias the EEC intervention system has towards the Golden Delicious variety.

Your rapporteur has not been able to establish a clear case for subsidy in contravention of the Treaty of Rome, and the accumulation of legal subsidies cannot be held to create an illegal situation by the mere fact of their accumulation.

He notes that the French Government attached a relatively bigger political importance to its agricultural sector, for historic and social reasons, than the British Government, and observes also that agricultural commodities are an important part of French exports whereas they figure very slightly in Britain's export performance.

However, he finds it absurd that the lists of national aids should be regarded as a closely guarded secret. If the Community is democratic the list of aids should be available for inspection. The excuse that they are so numerous that publication would be too expensive is totally unacceptable: it is a question of making available for inspection not publication in six languages. Your rapporteur also suspects that much information is communicated to the Commission well behind schedule and that availability of information on national aids would demonstrate just how notional the Community's control really is.

The following is the list of aids compiled by the TFWP which your rapporteur includes without comment:

France

UK

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Withdrawal prices favour French varieties, i.e. November 1979 Golden Delicious. 70 mm. yielding 30 tonnes per hectare = £1.529 per hectare. | November 1979 withdrawal prices for Cox, 60 mm yielding 15 tonnes per hectare = £559 per hectare. Bramley, 80 mm yielding 20 tonnes per hectare = £744 per hectare |
| 2. Subsidized loans available. Value calculated to be £170 per hectare per annum.  | No subsidized loans available.   |
| 3. Growers receive subsidies for the establishment of pear, cherry, plum orchards and soft fruit plantation.                                   | Growers receive assistance for the establishment of plum orchards.   |
| 4. Calamity fund available to cover frost and hail disasters.  | Not available  |
| 5. Hail insurance premium subsidies available.   | Not available  |
| 6. Strong support available with national funds for export.  | Limited support with national funds for export.  |
| 7. Promotion subsidized by French Government.  | No subsidy available for promotion.  |
| 8. Market information bulletin sent free every day to all growers at government expense.   | Not available.   |

The main agencies involved in French apple marketing and promotion are:

Forma - an agricultural marketing fund financed through compulsory levies on producers and producer groups, and aided by Government. It receives national and EEC financial support for specific promotions;

Afcofel - the national producer group organization financed through voluntary contributions from growers;

Sopexa - handling national food advertising and promotion at home and abroad. Its 'administrative' costs, including office rentals, salaries, travel expenses, are paid for by the French Government and this may amount to 60 per cent of its funds. It is estimated that television advertising for French Golden Delicious in the UK last year cost some £250,000.

The claim that the intervention system favours French producers is based on the following calculation:

The withdrawal prices are determined by a variety co-efficient which regulates the relative level of support for each variety. The co-efficient for Cox from September to February inclusive is 1.20 and from March to May inclusive is 1.00. The Bramley co-efficient is 0.75 and Golden Delicious is 1.00 for the whole season. The price levels are increased progressively for all varieties throughout the season, with a higher payment for larger sized apples. This scheme has the effect of favouring high yielding large sized dessert varieties such as Golden Delicious, and discriminating against the main UK varieties.

The differential in payments for larger sizes gives Golden Delicious an important advantage over Cox. Golden Delicious, at the French average size of 70 mm, qualifies for the larger sized category. Cox, at its average size of 60 mm is given a reduced level of support. In the following example the Green currency differentials have been ignored. In November 1979 a grower of Golden Delicious, Class II at 70 mm, was entitled to support of £50.98 per tonne. At a yield of 30 tonnes per hectare of marketable fruit a French Golden Delicious grower received £1,529 per hectare. Cox, Class II and upwards, at 60 mm, was entitled to support, in the same month, of £39.94 per tonne. At a yield of 15 tonnes per hectare of marketable fruit, the Cox grower received £599 per hectare. Bramley, Class II and upwards at 80 mm attracted support of £37.18 per tonne. At a yield of 20 tonnes per hectare the Bramley grower received £744 per hectare.

The TFWP report calls for the total abolition of the intervention system over five years with its replacement by an export market development fund with resources similar to those devoted to intervention. In the meantime it wants the coefficient for Cox to be raised to 1.6 and for Bramley to 1. It thinks that the range of price levels for various sizes should be eliminated and the price levels be the same for all types and containers. It wishes to see disposals permitted at the farm not just at the pack house. Finally it calls for a short-term limitation on French exports to the UK.

#### Options for Community action

##### The abolition of the system of intervention

Your rapporteur does not believe that this would be in the long-term interests of the British or the EEC industry. It is argued that it is the intervention system which encourages the over-supply which leads to pressure on export markets. Your rapporteur believes that the pressure on both domestic and export markets could become even more severe without the facility of intervention. He believes also that British growers who are being asked to modernise their production should have the safety-net of intervention available because, however efficient they may become, climatic factors alone mean that the northern variety of apple has to sell as a premium product which, in certain economic conditions, may find market penetration difficult.

Your rapporteur is also sceptical about the idea of a market development fund. Since there is only one apple which is produced in surplus - the Golden Delicious - this is likely to be the only beneficiary of the fund, whereas British apples are unlikely ever to play a role in exports except as a speciality line. Production is too small for sustained exports.

However, in the motion for a resolution your rapporteur asks Parliament to instruct the Commission to make sure intervention is not being misused as a systematic market for apples rather than a safety net.

### Make intervention available to all registered growers not merely co-operatives

This is argued as a way to prevent 'rogue' producers destroying market discipline. The danger is that it might permit 'bidon' co-operatives to come into existence just to benefit from intervention and undermine the existence of the disciplined co-operatives. Your rapporteur understands the concern not to undermine the role of the co-operative but is aware that this constitutes a disadvantage for countries which have developed without a co-operative structure. The Commission should renew its attempt to find ways of enforcing wider market discipline appropriate to the characteristic method of farm organization in each Member State.

### Raise the coefficients

Your rapporteur believes that the system of coefficients has been manipulated too much already. He does not wish to encourage the use of intervention but recognizes that the criteria now employed to determine coefficients are outdated. He therefore recommends a reworking of the coefficients as already outlined.

Your rapporteur has also considered whether intervention should take place at one price and not be differentiated on the types of pack or fruit size. While he accepts that size is not necessarily a criteria of intrinsic quality it has to be recognized that it is impossible to judge intrinsic quality in any case (for example, taste), and if size qualifies for a premium on the market it clearly is logical for it to qualify for a premium at withdrawal. There is also quite a strong sentiment in the UK in favour of the traditional smaller apple, and your rapporteur is cautious about recommending a change which would tend to push the smaller apples into intervention leading the public to accuse the Community of forcing it to eat large 'tasteless' apples.

### Complete withdrawals before December 31

It is argued this would permit a balance between supply and demand to be achieved over the remainder of the year. It is claimed that this would benefit UK varieties with a short storage life. The difficulty here is that there is a danger that apples would go into intervention in excessive quantities leaving the market short towards the end of the season. This would inevitably increase complaint that the Community was encouraging apples to go into withdrawal rather than into consumption. The effect of closing withdrawal after the end of the year would also be to place much more uncertainty around the import of southern hemisphere apples. At the moment about 350,000 tonnes are imported annually, and apart from offering the consumer a fresher apple than the Community crop they tend to help the price of EEC apples to firm. In addition, they aid certain EEC production by making relatively fresh Golden Delicious varieties (many imports are variations of Golden Delicious, e.g. Cape Delicious) available throughout the year.

There is a parallel suggestion that the cut-off date for fruit to be sold from a season's crop - EEC or imported - should be August 1. Your rapporteur believes the impact would be minimal and the problem of policing difficult in relation to the gains to be achieved.

Raise minimum sizes for apples and pears of Class 2 by 5 mm

Your rapporteur is sympathetic to this but realizes that without a greatly strengthened inspectorate trying to improve quality at the retail level is very difficult. It is also clear that such a step could only be taken if the outlets for small fruit - e.g. juicing - were more readily available.



APPLE PRODUCTION

('000 t)

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980
EUR 9	5844	6556	5866	7205	6500	6450	5688	6966	5528	7091	6071	5134	6660	6930	6810
Ger	1473	2274	1570	2465	1723	1923	1224	1980	1266	2035	1487	1175	1780	1950	1760
Fr	1119	1201	1437	1480	1504	1508	1506	1761	1416	1847	1477	1243	1770	1750	1800
It	2289	1932	1932	2010	2062	1697	1884	2002	1844	2078	2084	1826	1850	1990	1950
Neth	345	488	340	475	450	520	400	450	385	430	380	390	510	450	510
Bel	205	280	175	300	241	272	255	237	201	258	220	115	265	315	305
Lux	7	11	6	6	6	5	6	5.3	5.2	6	3.5	5	7	7	8
UK	335	294	328	391	438	439	345	445	335	346	344	278	390	370	390
Irl	-	-	-	-	-	13	9.1	11.9	9.8	10.2	10.7	12	12	15	15
Dk	71	76	78	78	76	73	59	74	66	81	65	90	75	80	80

EEC APPLE PRODUCTION ('000 tonnes)

	1980 projections	
	Eurostat	National experts
West Germany	1 760	1 950 (a)
France	1 800	1 900
Italy	1 950	1 980
Netherlands	510	575
Belgium	305	310
Luxembourg	8	7
UK	390	357 (b)
Ireland	15	10
Denmark	80	85
<b>Total</b>	<b>6 810</b>	<b>7 174</b>

(a) of which: marketable production 750 000 (800 000 tonnes in 1979); (b) England and Wales only.

EEC apple production according to varieties ('000 tonnes)

Variety	1978	1979	1980
Gravensteiner/J. Grieve	117	126	117
Boskoop/Canada Renette	376	415	391
Cox Orange	499	550	451
Golden Delicious	2 631	2 540	2 674
Red Delicious	601	510	619
Morgenduft	340	450	339
Other	2 297	2 414	2 583
<b>Total</b>	<b>6 861</b>	<b>7 005</b>	<b>7 174</b>

IMPORTS OF APPLES FROM THIRD COUNTRIES

(tonnes)

		<u>EUR 9</u>	<u>Ger</u>	<u>Fr</u>	<u>It</u>	<u>Neth</u>	<u>Bel-Lux</u>	<u>UK</u>	<u>Irl</u>	<u>Dk</u>
1974	(Aug/Dec)	132242	127733	243	89	148	268	3732	5	24
	(Jan/Mar)	9203	-	9	235	711	1487	6424	45	292
	(Apr/July)	215759	-	6214	128	53457	27618	112749	5853	9740
1975	(Aug/Dec)	27891	18966	482	814	775	1588	5081	177	8
	(Jan/Mar)	27608	10599	446	468	7273	627	8006	113	76
	(Apr/July)	345147	109844	14516	596	65054	29627	108930	5055	11525
1976	(Aug/Dec)	21412	14450	644	-	2406	159	3093	291	369
	(Jan/Mar)	34029	11894	188	770	7050	770	12862	316	179
	(Apr/July)	328279	99390	11359	906	54014	36892	109658	4576	11484
1977	(Aug/Dec)	82309	21379	20267	10997	12417	4996	11699	554	-
	(Jan/Mar)	23093	10559	755	4	7975	342	5169	139	150
	(Apr/July)	226523	57699	8434	269	59813	30061	61201	2220	6826
1978	(Aug/Dec)	36787	13569	662	4879	2871	4324	10269	212	1
	(Jan/Mar)	49220	12504	4459	2246	15368	2383	11855	323	82
	(Apr/July)	339101	93822	10903	4756	83628	50561	86486	2009	6936
1979	(Aug/Dec)	34616	13814	911	5983	3253	381	10075	142	57
	(Jan/Mar)	25148	5482	904	2018	8926	91	7448	208	71
	(Apr/July)	317688	86886	6414	4557	75340	44919	91506	1687	6379

IMPORTS OF APPLES FROM THIRD COUNTRIES 1979

	<u>EUR-9</u>		(tonnes)
	<u>Aug/Dec</u>	<u>Jan/Mar</u>	<u>Apr/July</u>
SWITZERLAND	767	912	873
PORTUGAL	543		
SPAIN	6330	1171	
YUGOSLAVIA	1773		
GREECE	2126		
HUNGARY	2283	1328	
SOUTH AFRICA	9105	2277	117023
USA	3268	3857	2948
CANADA	1995	1563	395
CHILE	692	10473	35244
ARGENTINA	674	2693	83942
AUSTRALIA	2663		29778
NEW ZEALAND	1810		46820

UK IMPORTS FROM FRANCE

		(tonnes)	
1974 (Aug/Dec)	64968	1975 (Aug/Dec)	80328
(Jan/Mar)	46089	(Jan/Mar)	50377
(Apr/July)	40868	(Apr/July)	37468
1976 (Aug/Dec)	75184	1977 (Aug/Dec)	
(Jan/Mar)	66528	(Jan/Mar)	69297
(Apr/July)	70249	(Apr/July)	55592
1978 (Aug/Dec)	88759	1979 (Aug/Dec)	99972
(Jan/Mar)	61659	(Jan/Mar)	73852
(Apr/July)	40701	(Apr/July)	71432

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION  
DOCUMENT 1-442/79

tabled by Mr B. PATTERSON and Mr C. JACKSON

pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure  
on the sale of French apples in the United Kingdom

The European Parliament

- considering reports that 300,000 tons of French Golden Delicious apples, a quantity equal to the total British production of dessert apples are about to be offered for sale on the British market,
  - considering that the reported price of these apples scarcely covers the transport costs, let alone the costs of production,
1. Calls on the Commission to prepare, as a matter of extreme urgency, measures to prevent the sudden undermining of a national market in this way;
  2. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the national Governments.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

DOCUMENT 1-15/80

tabled by

Mr LIGTOS, Mr COLLESELLI, Mr DALSSASS, Mr DIANA,  
Mr BARBAGLI, Mr COSTANZO, Mr ADONNINO, Mrs AGNELLI,  
Mr ARFE<sup>1</sup>, Mr BARBI, Mr BERSANI, Mrs CASSANMAGNAGO CERRETTI,  
Mr GHERGO, Mr GIAVAZZI, Mr LEGA, Mr LEZZI, Mr LIMA,  
Mr MACARIO, Mr NARDUCCI, Mr ORLANDI, Mr PEDINI, Mr TRAVAGLINI  
and Mr ZECCHINO

with request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of  
the Rules of Procedure,

on DISTURBANCE OF THE COMMUNITY APPLE MARKET

The European Parliament,

- whereas the import of an apple quota of over 370,000 cwt. from the southern hemisphere is disturbing the Community market,
  - whereas large stocks in various Member States are already a feature of this market,
  - whereas immediate application of the safeguard clause by the Community institutions is essential to prevent further deterioration of the situation,
1. Requests the Commission to take immediate safeguard measures pursuant to Article 29 of Regulation No. 1035/72 of 18 May 1972 on the common organization of the fruit and vegetable market<sup>1</sup>;
  2. Requests the Commission to check carefully whether the reference price for these imports is always applied;
  3. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and the Commission.

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ No. L 118, 20 May 1972

REASONS FOR THE REQUEST FOR URGENT DEBATE

The difficulties currently facing Community apple producers as a result of large unsold stocks (836,000 cwt. in Italy alone), are being exacerbated by the import of large quantities from countries in the southern hemisphere (South Africa, Argentina).

The quotas for these imports have been fixed at 371,000 cwt. for 1980 compared with 314,000 cwt. for 1979.

It is therefore essential for the European Parliament to request the Community institutions to take immediate action to prevent further deterioration of the situation.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

DOCUMENT 1-23/80

tabled by Mr PRANCHERE, Mrs BARBARELLA, Mr DE PASQUALE,  
Mr BUCHOU, Mr SUTRA, Mr ANSART, Mr CHAMBEIRON, Mrs DE MARCH,  
Mr DENIS, Mr DAMETTE, Mrs HOFFMANN, Mrs LE ROUX, Mr PIQUET,  
Mr WURTZ, Mr GREMETZ, Mr FERNANDEZ, Mr MAFFRE-BAUGE,  
Mrs POIRIER, Mr MARTIN, Mr FRISCHMANN, Mr BAILLOT and Mr VERGES  
with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of  
the Rules of Procedure  
on disturbance of the Community apple market

The European Parliament,

- whereas the import of an apple quota of over 37,000 tonnes from the southern hemisphere is disturbing the Community market,
  - whereas large stocks in various Member States are already a feature of this market,
  - whereas immediate application of the safeguard clause by the Community institutions is essential to prevent further deterioration of the situation,
1. Requests the Commission to take immediate safeguard measures pursuant to Article 29 of Regulation No. 1035/72 of 18 May 1972 on the common organization of the fruit and vegetable market<sup>1</sup>;
  2. Requests the Commission to check carefully that the reference price for these imports is applied.
  3. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and the Commission.

REASONS FOR THE REQUEST FOR URGENT DEBATE

The difficulties currently facing Community apple producers as a result of large unsold stocks are being exacerbated by the import of large quantities from countries in the southern hemisphere (South Africa, Argentina).

The quotas for these imports have been fixed at 37,100 tonnes for 1980 compared with 31,400 for 1979.

It is therefore essential for the European Parliament to request the Community institutions to take immediate action to prevent further deterioration of the situation.

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ No. L 118, 20 May 1972

