

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

# Working Documents

1982-1983

---

15 October 1982

DOCUMENT 1-672/82

REPORT

drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture

on barriers to internal Community trade in  
agricultural products

Rapporteur: Mr K. KIRK



On 15 September 1981,

- (a) the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on the barriers raised by the United Kingdom to imports of poultry and milk products (Doc. 1-468/81) and
- (b) the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Romualdi and others pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on the export of Italian wine products to France (Doc. 1-473/81)

were referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

On 16 September 1981, the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr de La Malène and others pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on British protectionism in the poultrymeat sector (Doc. 1-492/81/rev.) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also on 16 September 1981, the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr d'Ormesson pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on the steps to be taken to safeguard application of the regulations on wine (Doc. 1-493/81) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and the Committee on External Economic Relations for their opinions.

On 18 September 1981, the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs De March and others pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on fruit and vegetables (Doc. 1-506/81) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on External Economic Relations for its opinion.

On 20 October 1981, the Committee on Agriculture appointed Mr Kirk rapporteur. At its meetings of 12/13 July 1982 and 30 September/1 October 1982, the committee considered a draft report and adopted this at the latter meeting by 15 votes to 1 with 5 abstentions.

The following took part in the vote : Mr Curry, chairman; Mr Früh and Mr Colleselli, vice-chairmen; Mr Kirk, rapporteur; Mr Blaney, Mr Cottrell (deputizing for Mr Battersby), Mr Dalsass, Mr Diana, Mr Eyraud, Mr Gautier, Mr Helms, Mr Hord, Mr Kaloyannis, Mr Marck, Mr Martin (deputizing for Mr Pranchère), Mr Nielsen, Mr Péry (deputizing for Mr Thareau), Mr Provan, Mr Tolman, Mr Vgenopoulos and Mr Woltjer.

By letter of 10 December 1981, the Committee on External Economic

Relations informed the Committee on Agriculture that it did not wish to deliver an opinion. By letter of 16 December 1981, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs also informed the Committee on Agriculture that it did not wish to deliver an opinion.

## C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION .....	6
B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	9
 ANNEX I	
Motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs LE ROUX and others pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on the barriers raised by the United Kingdom to imports of poultry and milk products (Doc. 1-468/81) .....	15
 ANNEX II	
Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr de La MALENE and others pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on British protectionism in the poultrymeat sector (Doc. 1-492/81/rev.) .....	16
 ANNEX III	
Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr ROMUALDI and others pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on the export of Italian wine products to France (Doc. 1-473/81) .....	18
 ANNEX IV	
Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr d'ORMESSON pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on the steps to be taken to safeguard application of the regulation on wine (Doc. 1-493/81) .....	20
 ANNEX V	
Motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs DE MARCH and others pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on fruit and vegetables (Doc. 1-506/81) .....	21



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 barriers to internal Community trade in agricultural products

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on the barriers raised by the United Kingdom to imports of poultry and milk products (Doc. 1-468/81),
  - having regard to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr de la Malène and others pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on British protectionism in the poultrymeat sector (Doc. 1-492/81/rev.),
  - having regard to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Romualdi and others pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on the export of Italian wine products to France (Doc. 1-473/81),
  - having regard to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr d'Ormesson pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on the steps to be taken to safeguard application of the regulations on wine (Doc. 1-493/81),
  - having regard to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs De March and others pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on fruit and vegetables (Doc. 1-506/81),
  - having regard to its resolutions of 17 September 1981 on the restoration of balance in the wine sector<sup>1</sup> and on the free movement of goods within the European Community<sup>2</sup>,
  - having regard to the decision of the European Council of 29 and 30 June 1981 in Luxembourg on the strengthening of the internal market,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-672/82),
- A aware of the fact that in times of economic hardship there is a great temptation to introduce unilateral protectionist measures,
- B fearing that such measures will provoke counter measures which could lead to the collapse of the free movement of goods within the Community (Article 30 et seq. of the EEC Treaty) and in particular to the renunciation of the goals of the common agricultural policy (Article 39 of the EEC Treaty),

<sup>1</sup> OJ No. C 260 of 12 October 1981, page 85

<sup>2</sup> OJ No. C 260 of 12 October 1981, page 87

- C convinced that the free movement of goods within the Community - also in the agricultural field - represents one of the mainstays of the Common Market and promotes the goals of the common agricultural policy,
- D aware of the fact that spectacular disruptions of the internal Community market give rise to considerable doubts amongst the public as to the balanced nature and capacity of the Common Market to deal with difficult market situations,
1. Cannot accept that even in times of economic stagnation the Member States should resort to import restrictions and prohibitions in internal Community trade in order to protect their own markets;
  2. Considers in particular that technical and public health regulations should not be artificially advanced as a blind for stopping internal Community trade;
  3. Is convinced that in the majority of cases trade restrictions constitute a violation of the provisions of the EEC Treaty (Article 30 et seq.);
  4. Calls on the Member States to seek joint solutions to difficulties which arise and to avoid unilateral protectionist measures;
  5. Draws the attention of the Council in particular to the fact that obstacles to internal Community trade can also be attributed to the lack of a common economic and monetary policy;
  6. Warns the Member states of the dangers which could arise for the free movement of goods within the Community through the creation of precedents for the introduction of protectionist measures and the greater dangers resulting from unjustified reprisals taken against justified health measures;
  7. Calls on the Council and the Commission to create a genuine internal market within the Common Market by removing all restrictions in internal Community trade;
  8. Further calls for the total abolition of national subsidies which have already severely distorted internal market conditions, and which have dramatically increased the likelihood of protectionist response;
  9. Regrets that certain Member States which most energetically call for free trade are also those which most energetically unfairly subsidize their own producers;
  10. Calls for the Commission to be given much greater powers in the investigation of suspected illegal and unfair national aids, and in the stopping of them;



11. Calls on the Commission, as a separate measure independent of the institution of proceedings for violation of the Treaty pursuant to Article 169 of the EEC Treaty, to introduce the immediate measures and sanctions which it is allowed to take under the treaty against those Member States which introduce import bans or restrictions without consulting the Commission;
12. Welcomes the Commission initiative set out in its Communication to the Council on the strengthening of the internal market (COM(81) 572 final), in which it proposes to the Council a series of simplifications to the customs formalities applicable to intra-Community trade;
13. Calls on the Council to transform the Commission's proposed simplifications into legal provisions without delay;
14. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Commission and Council of the European Communities.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENTI. GENERAL COMMENT

1. Recently an alarming number of barriers have arisen to internal Community trade. These barriers occur not only in fields where national provisions have not yet been harmonized but also within common organizations of the markets. In most cases the barriers erected by the Member States constitute infringements of Article 30 of the EEC Treaty prohibiting quantitative import restrictions and all measures with an equivalent effect.
2. The official reasons given by the Member States for erecting the last-mentioned barriers to trade refer for the most part to the violation of import formalities or national health and veterinary provisions. However, there is clearly a link between difficulties on the national markets concerned and the introduction of such barriers.  
  
One of the approaches adopted by the Member States is to adopt provisions in fields that have not yet been fully harmonized (e.g. the veterinary sector) which differ from those of the other Member States and therefore provide a justification for import bans or restrictions. However, the real motives are of a protectionist nature, the obvious aim being to find loopholes in the common organization of the agricultural market. Faced with a decline in the rate of economic growth and increasing unemployment the Member States for the most part see the introduction of trade barriers as the only way of safeguarding national production sectors and therefore employment. The danger that as a result there will be an increasing tendency on the part of all the Member States to introduce trade barriers is obviously taken into account. This development would, however, mean the end of the largely liberalized movement of goods - particularly within the common agricultural market, which hitherto has served as a model for other common market policies.
3. It is the Commission's task to safeguard unimpeded internal Community trade - particularly in agricultural products - and to employ the resources at its disposal (Article 169 of the EEC Treaty - Treaty violation procedure) in order to eliminate the trade obstacles concerned.

## II. SPECIFIC CASES

### 4. Ban on imports of poultry products - United Kingdom

4.1 Since 1 September 1981 the United Kingdom Government has imposed a total ban on imports of fresh, frozen and chilled poultrymeat and of eggs and egg products into England, Wales and Scotland from all other Member States except Denmark and Ireland.

The reason given for the measure is that in the Member States hit by the ban fowl pest (Newcastle disease) has not yet been eradicated and is being combatted not by slaughtering the affected animals but by vaccination. Denmark and Ireland alone are not included in the import ban, because they apply similar rules to the United Kingdom.

4.2 The British import ban principally concerns France, which previously exported large quantities of poultrymeat to the United Kingdom. The intention is presumably to protect British poultry producers from the growing volume of imports from France. British producers complain about the French state aids which enabled French producers to market their products in the United Kingdom at very low prices. This situation is blamed in England for the closure of a number of poultry farms and the resulting loss of jobs.

4.3 The situation on the European poultry market must be seen in relation to the fact that since 1977 there has been a sharp rise in the production of poultrymeat, particularly turkeys. Every year French producers place on the market around 204,000 tonnes and British producers around 195,000 tonnes of turkeymeat. Imports of poultry into the United Kingdom at present account for about 10% of British consumption and this figure is rising.

4.4 Pursuant to Article 169 of the EEC Treaty the Commission has instituted proceedings against the United Kingdom for violation of the Treaty and on 4 February 1982 filed an action before the European Court of Justice (Case 40/82). In its statement accompanying the action the Commission points out that the British import ban clearly constitutes a quantitative restriction within the meaning of Article 30 of the EEC Treaty and cannot under any circumstances be justified as a means of protecting the health of animals pursuant to Article 36 of the EEC Treaty.

In its decision of 15 July 1982<sup>1</sup> the Court of Justice ruled that these measures by the United Kingdom were in violation of the EEC Treaty.

5. Obstructions to the importation of UHT milk - United Kingdom

5.1 Under British regulations, UHT milk can only be sold in the United Kingdom if it has been specially treated. The effect of this in practice is that UHT milk from most of the other Member States cannot be sold in the United Kingdom because UHT milk is not treated in this way in these Member States. This therefore represents a concealed obstacle to imports of UHT milk from other Member States.

5.2 Pursuant to Article 169 of the EEC Treaty, the Commission has instituted proceedings against the United Kingdom for violation of Article 30 of the EEC Treaty and filed an action before the European Court of Justice on 22 May 1981.

6. Ban on imports of poultry products - Ireland

6.1 Since 1958 Ireland has banned imports of poultry from countries which combat fowl pest (Newcastle disease) by means of vaccination and not by systematically slaughtering the affected animals. None of the Member States has as yet protested against this measure, since Ireland is an exporter of poultry and the import ban has thus had no effect on intra-Community trade.

6.2 The EEC Commission has also brought proceedings against Ireland in the European Court of Justice for violation of Articles 30 and 36 of the EEC Treaty. The main reason for doing so was to prevent the United Kingdom from lodging an appeal on the grounds of failure to comply with the principle of equality of treatment. As in the action against the United Kingdom the Commission takes the view that Directive 71/118/EEC on health problems affecting trade in fresh poultrymeat, which leaves health controls to the Member States, does not authorize any deviation from the principle of the free movement of goods, which is firmly based in the EEC Treaty, since there is no danger of infection and thus no threat to health protection. It regards the import ban rather as an obstacle to the free movement of goods designed to protect national producers.

7. Levying of fees for controls by health inspectors - Luxembourg

7.1 Luxembourg used in the past to charge fees for the requisite controls by health inspectors of imports of fresh and processed meat and meat

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ No. C 209 of 12 August 1982, p. 4

products from the other Member States. This procedure also infringed the principle of free trade within the Community.

- 7.2 However, the Commission was able to withdraw the proceedings already instituted before the European Court of Justice for violation of the treaty, since at the end of 1979 the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, by amending its legislation, ceased to contravene the principle of free trade within the Community.

## 8. Obstructions to the importation of Italian wine - France

- 8.1 Since autumn 1981 Italy and France have been waging a 'wine war'. France has introduced restrictions on imports of Italian wine, stating as one of the reasons that the import documents are incorrectly drawn up and that the origin of the wine cannot be proved.

After bilateral negotiations between Italy and France at first seemed to have settled the dispute, at the beginning of 1982 France suspended the customs clearance of a large quantity of Italian wine for three weeks, which amounted to an import ban. The Commission was not given prior notification of this measure.

- 8.2 The principal cause of the 'wine war' is the two successive record harvests in both Italy and France. This, together with difficulties in distilling of an admissible quantity of around 15% of lower quality wine in Italy led to imports of large quantities of this Italian wine into France, particularly the south of France, where producers are also having to contend with surpluses. The quantities involved averaged around 300,000 hl a month over the last five months of 1981 and even reached 800,000 hl in January 1982. The situation was complicated by the fact that the wine was apparently marketed at prices which were 20% lower than the corresponding price for French wines and even lower than the intervention price for distillation.

Finally the French producers concerned wantonly destroyed wine in the French ports of importation before the French Government introduced the import restrictions referred to above.

- 8.3 In September 1981, pursuant to Article 169 of the EEC Treaty the Commission instituted proceedings against the French Government for violation of the Treaty and in February 1982 it brought an action before the European Court of Justice, while at the same time applying for interim measures pursuant to Article 186 of the EEC Treaty.

By order of 4 March 1982<sup>1</sup> the Court of Justice imposed certain conditions on the French Republic pending judgment in the main application. The frequency of analyses of consignments of Italian wine presented at the frontier for import may not exceed 15% of the consignments; customs clearance may not exceed twenty-one days; clearance may be refused only if there are substantial irregularities in the accompanying documents; the Italian authorities must be informed without delay if clearance is refused on account of substantial irregularities in the accompanying documents; the Commission must be informed if the maximum period of twenty-one days allowed for clearance is exceeded.

9. Obstructions to the importation of horsemeat - France

9.1 Horsemeat can only be imported into France from other Member States if the importers buy a certain amount of horsemeat of French origin. This measure represents an obstacle to free trade in horsemeat in the Community.

9.2 Pursuant to Article 169 of the EEC Treaty, the Commission has instituted proceedings against France for violation of Article 5 of the EEC Treaty.

10. Obstructions to the importation of UHT milk - Denmark

10.1 Health regulations in Denmark specify that UHT milk can only be transported in refrigerated containers (refrigerated lorries etc.). Danish dairies on the other hand are allowed to store UHT milk in unrefrigerated stores provided it is for export.

Refrigeration during transport is unnecessary for UHT milk. The Danish regulations create an obstacle to imports of UHT milk from other Member States where refrigeration during transport, including transfrontier transport, is not standard practice.

10.2 Pursuant to Article 169 of the EEC Treaty the Commission has instituted proceedings against Denmark for violation of Article 30 of the EEC Treaty.

11. Obstructions to road transport of live animals - Italy

11.1 Special national regulations in Italy require live animals being carried by road from the Member States through Italy, e.g. to Greece or for export to Yugoslavia (transit), to be transferred from road to rail. Once the animals leave Italian territory they usually have to be transferred back from rail to road transport.

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ No. C 90, 8.4.1982, page 7

By contrast, the Italian regulations do not require animals from other Member states to be transferred from road to rail when their final destination is in Italy.

These Italian regulations represent an obstacle to free trade by producers and exporters of livestock in the Member States.

11.2 Pursuant to Article 169 of the EEC Treaty, the Commission has instituted proceedings against Italy for violation of Article 30 of the EEC Treaty.

### III. FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERNAL MARKET

12. The Commission has for some time been registering and taking action against many other infringements (over 400) of the principle of free trade, mostly involving agricultural products. The investigations concern nearly all the Member States and have revealed that there is a growing danger of the introduction of specific national counter measures and, linked to this, the gradual collapse of the free movement of goods within the Community.

In this connection it is, for example, significant in the case of the wine war between France and Italy that France exports 45% of its agricultural production and that Italy is its best customer. It is not difficult to imagine what might happen if Italy introduced counter measures.

13. Moreover, the objectives of the Common Market cannot be achieved without drastic simplification of the controls and formalities at internal frontiers. Customs clearance at internal frontiers is still more complicated and time-consuming than for example in trade between the Scandinavian countries. Customs clearance procedures applicable within the Community differ very little from those applied to trade with third countries. The expenditure involved increases the cost of goods in intra-Community trade by around 5-10% (Commission estimate). Positive moves towards the formation of an internal market can be seen only in trade between the Benelux countries.

At its meeting of 29 and 30 June 1981 in Luxembourg the European Council expressed concern at this discouraging situation and emphasized that it is essential to give priority to strengthening and developing the internal market, in view of the many threats to it.

Following this, in its Communication to the Council of 14 October 1981 on the strengthening of the internal market (COM(81) 572 final), the Commission submitted a motion for a resolution to the Council calling for a long list of improvements to the customs formalities at internal frontiers.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

DOCUMENT 1-468/81

tabled by Mrs LE ROUX, Mr PRANCHERE, Mr DENIS, Mrs POIRIER and Mr FERNANDEZ

pursuant to Rule 47 of the rules of Procedure

on the barriers raised by the United Kingdom to imports of poultry and milk products

The European Parliament,

- whereas there is no evidence of an increase in fowl pest in the Community,
  - whereas the vaccination of fowl has no repercussions on the quality of products for human consumption,
  - whereas the United Kingdom has misused the right to impose restrictions on the grounds of health in order to prohibit certain imports of poultry and eggs, having used the same pretext to prevent the importation of UHT milk,
  - whereas this decision is totally unjustified and represents a violation of Community preference which is damaging to the interests of the French producers and intended solely to benefit the British agri-foodstuffs company, Matthews,
1. Calls on the Commission to enforce the Treaty, which stipulates (Article 36) that 'Such prohibitions or restrictions (of imports) shall not constitute a means of arbitrary discrimination or a disguised restriction on trade between Member States', to ensure that these barriers to imports of poultry and milk products;
  2. Requests the Commission to propose measures to strengthen Community preference within the framework of the 'Mandate of 30 May 1980';
  3. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

DOCUMENT 1-492/81/rev.

tabled by Mr de la MALENE, Mr ANSQUER, Mr CLEMENT, Mr COUSTE, Mr DELEAU, Mr FANTON, Mrs FOURCADE, Mr GERONIMI, Mr ISRAEL, Mr JUNOT, Mr de LIPKOWSKI, Mr REMILLY, Mr TURCAT, Mr VIE and Mrs WEISS

pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure  
on British protectionism in the poultrymeat sector

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the aims of the Treaty establishing the EEC and in particular Articles 39 and 43 thereof,
  - having regard to the recent unilateral decision by the British Government to amend the health regulations in the poultrymeat sector,
  - having regard to the fact that the majority of fowl in the Community have been free of Newcastle disease for many years,
  - having regard to the disastrous repercussions that such measures, if they were adopted and applied, would have on the production of poultrymeat, particularly in France and the Netherlands, the leading EEC producers,
  - whereas the Commission has declared the accusation made by the United Kingdom that French poultry producers were receiving illegal aids to be unfounded,
  - whereas the only aids they receive are aids granted within the framework of Community regional development which are totally compatible with EEC regulations,
  - whereas total imports of poultrymeat into the United Kingdom in 1980 accounted for only 4.5% of the market, while 97% of French exports in this sector go to markets outside the EEC,
  - having regard to the decision of the Standing Veterinary Committee, namely that the British action is an infringement of the EEC Treaties,
1. Condemns the British Government for this further example of unilateral protectionism which violates the spirit of the EEC Treaties;
  2. Endorses the Commission's decision to initiate legal proceedings against the United Kingdom;
  3. Calls on the Commission to take immediate steps to prevent the British Government from implementing such measures;

4. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission of the European Communities.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

DOCUMENT 1-473/81

tabled by Mr ROMUALDI, Mr ALMIRANTE, Mr BUTTAFUOCO and Mr PETRONIO

pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure  
on the export of Italian wine products to France

The European Parliament,

- whereas, following the bumper production of wine in 1979, the wine-growing sector has been hit for the second year running by a serious imbalance between the amount of wine produced and the extent to which the market can absorb it,
- whereas Community intervention, despite making use of all the measures provided for, has not succeeded in effectively reducing the surpluses nor in guaranteeing producers adequate earnings,
- furthermore, whereas, despite there being an abundance of wine available,
  - which even has failed to reduce distillation (perhaps because it was carried out in piecemeal fashion at the wrong time) - in certain Community countries permission to add saccharose to the must has been blatantly extended resulting in an artificially created increase in production,
- whereas this sector is affected by the controversy which has arisen in France where Italian wine exports have been blocked, first by the aggressive actions of the wine growers and, second, by the 'protectionist' measures supported by the French Government which, by seizing upon the pretext of technical and formal inconsistencies, has in fact flouted the rules governing free movement of goods within the Community,
- whereas the immediate damage caused by this controversy and these measures are extremely serious for Italian producers already hard hit by having to deal with grave difficulties in their country such as, primarily, the struggle against product adulteration, the fall in demand, and the credit squeeze, the last of which is due to the running down of these commercial operations,
- whereas this situation - in addition to support for and updating of the guidelines already made for the short- and long-term measures aimed at restructuring this sector and eliminating the grave imbalances in it - calls for the urgent adoption of special measures to eradicate the most serious causes of the present crisis;

1. Calls upon the Commission and the Council of Ministers to adopt the following urgent measures :
  - (a) exceptional authorization of the permanent distillation of the wine stored since last year so that this year's wine can be stored in the tanks and with the surpluses disposed of, market forces can again regulate trade relations;
  - (b) revocation of authorization to add saccharose to the must, thereby ensuring that lower grade wines are only enriched with 'grape sugar', i.e. with vine-based products;
  - (c) implementation of measures to promote a recovery, alongside quality control, of the levels of demand which are at present constantly declining and to establish contacts with third world countries in order to locate and organize new export markets;
  - (d) adoption of measures designed to revoke the safeguard clauses for table grapes and raising of the price for alcohol produced from these grapes to 80% of the guide price for wine;
  - (e) control of the alcohol sector before the market becomes saturated.
2. Instructs its President to forward this motion for a resolution to the Council of Ministers and the Commission of the European Communities.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

DOCUMENT 1-493/81

tabled by Mr Olivier d'ORMESSON

pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure

on the steps to be taken to safeguard application of the regulations on wine

The European Parliament,

- considering that improvement of the Community market in wine depends on the regulations on wine laid down in Regulation No. 24 of 24 April 1962, amended by Regulations 816 and 817 of 28 April 1970 being adhered to, the possibility of monitoring their application, the encouragement of high-quality products and their exportation and respect for uniformity of prices and equal excise duties,
- recalling that any Member State producing wine is required to submit a viticultural land register,

proposes :

1. That any Member State of the EEC that has fulfilled this obligation should be temporarily authorized to fix an annual quota for imports of wine from another Member State which has not met this requirement;
2. That the harvest declarations shall include rosé wines as well as red wines and white wines; this measure would entail applying to rosé wines the rules common to white and red wines;
3. The setting-up of a Community anti-fraud department entitled to impose penalties for illegal coupage or enrichment, false declarations, the production of blended wines, etc.;
4. An increase in the alcoholic strength of wine to 9,5;
5. The promotion of exports of wine to third countries by a policy of refunds encouraging the conclusion of contracts between dealers and growers;
6. The abolition of national aids which prejudice uniformity of prices;
7. Equality of excise duties between the Member States of the Community;
8. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

DOCUMENT 1-506/81

tabled by Mrs DE MARCH, Mr MAFFRE-BAUGÉ, Mr MARTIN, Mrs POIRIER, Mrs LE ROUX  
and Mr PRANCHERE

pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure

on fruit and vegetables

The European Parliament,

- whereas imports of fruit from third countries have upset the French market and made the situation for producers more difficult,
  - whereas northern products do not receive, within the context of the CAP, the same guarantees as other products,
  - whereas there are defects in the Community's management of the market in fruit and vegetables,
  - whereas there can be no justification for destroying produce when important food requirements are still to be met in the Community and the world,
1. Calls on the Commission to make proposals as soon as possible to adjust Community rules so as to ensure that producers receive an adequate income and are given further protection against imports from third countries by :
    - closing the gap between the withdrawal price and the guide price
    - more automatic application of safeguard measures
    - more effective application of preventive withdrawals to avoid the creation of large surpluses
    - extension of the reference price mechanism to new products
    - establishment and observance of import timetables limiting access to the Community market to certain periods, on the basis of seasonal complementarity;
  2. Considers that intra-Community trade should be placed on a stricter ethncal basis by the observance of a minimum price return;
  3. Considers that technical and health regulations must not be used artificially as a pretext for limiting intra-Community trade;
  4. Calls for limits to be placed on the cultivation of Mediterranean-type products in greenhouses in northern Europe and for aid provided for this purpose to be abolished;
  5. Calls on Member States to make better use of the procedure allowing

agricultural products to be distributed to disadvantaged social groups;

6. Stresses the need to facilitate the disposal of products by :
  - refunds for exports to third countries
  - extending storage capacity
  - local processing in the production areas
  - using fruit and vegetables withdrawn from the market for animal feed;
7. Instructs its President to forward this motion for a resolution to the Council and Commission.

