

J.C.C. MEETING 6th DECEMBER, 1971.

J.E. Rennie was re-elected as Chairman and G.S. Grantham as Vice-Chairman - quorum to consist of 9 members. The usual four meetings for 1972 were arranged with provision for additional meetings as required.

Supply Situation. Stocks on Farms approximately 4.4 million tons at 31st October (including allowance for unlifted crops). Rate of consumption running at 190 lbs. per head i.e. approximately 3 lbs. per head higher than last year.

Processed Imports. 39,000 tons raw equivalent imported to end September - 57,000 tons to same period last year.

Surplus. Allowing 5% wastage surplus estimated at 1.1 million tons - this figure is supposed to be confidential since the Ministry have not agreed it is correct, they think it is lower.

Buying Programme

Offered 670,000 tons (offers quieter during last week).  
Inspected 422,000 tons (110 more than last year)  
Contracts issued  
for signature 320,000 tons (97,000 more than last year)  
Offers subject to  
dressing out seed 107,000 tons  
Stock Feed orders 68,000 tons (22,000 tons less than last year)  
Sales Back 3,000 tons (increase on last year)

Biggest movement Stock Feed came during week previous to meeting.

4.6% offered on Minimum Grade - twice last year's figure.

Some general discussion took place regarding Stock Feed and it was realised that due to cheaper prices of barley etc. the movement was likely to be somewhat down on last year. I suggested that a cheaper resale price to growers might help somewhat, but it was difficult to press the point due to the sales by this method already having increased.

This discussion naturally followed on to the overall surplus and the Board pointed out that the acreage had been reduced to 525,000 for 1972 - it was suggested by Mr. Fulton that even at that figure a considerable surplus could be anticipated. Reference was again made to Para 5 (2) of the Scheme for transfer of basic acreage and the Board stated that this was under active consideration at present.

Government Contribution. - In any dear year it is thought by the Government that/

that consumers pay far more than any guarantee support - this applies to both the present and previous administration and it appears that as long as the price is kept relatively stable at the consumer end the payments to the Board will be allowed to continue. There also appears at present to be less flexibility at the Ministry and the decisions taken have to be rectified right up the line and can even go as far as the P.M.

Grading and Labelling. A paper was put to the meeting for discussion by the various Trade Members. The proposals are as follows:-

- (a) There shall be two grades only, one similar to the current Minimum Ware Grade and the other a Recommended Grade between the present Standard and Table Grades.
- (b) Riddles to be altered to a  $1\frac{3}{4}$ " minimum and a  $3\frac{1}{4}$ " maximum (variations to be allowed for purchase by processors)
- (c) In the Recommended Grade individual tolerance limits of 2% would be applied to various group types of faults within an overall tolerance of 5%
  1. Disease (rots etc.)
  2. Environment/Growth (greening, growth cracks, frost etc.)
  3. Pest Damage (Worm, slug etc.)
  4. Physical Damage (mechanical or otherwise)
  5. Size
  6. Extraneous (soil, growth shoots etc.)
- (d) the Board should introduce a system of compulsory labelling.

In the preliminary discussions following this paper, I suggested that it might be better to keep the grades as they are at present and in a surplus year prohibit the sale of minimum grade specification other than to the Board.

As far as tolerances in the Recommended Grade were concerned, Mr. Fulton raised the point that scab was not included. They stated that this would be included in the final order.

Labelling. In the initial stages it was intended that only a Code Number would require to be given in order that the consignment could be traced back to the supplier. No doubt some consignors would wish to give more details.

During some general discussions the point was made that the acreage of King Edward was not high enough and some encouragement should be given to increasing/

increasing the acreage of this variety. Under the present scheme it was virtually impossible to do this.

Fishguard Appeal. It was reported that the Weights & Measures had decided not to go ahead with this case - i.e. that bags should be branded with the weight of 56 lbs.

A photostat copy of the Sunday Mail article was presented to each Member but the steam had gone out of the Board by this time.