

REPORT on a MEETING of the  
JOINT SEED TRADE COMMITTEE  
at 8 Manor Place, EDINBURGH  
at 10.30 a.m. on Wednesday,  
28th OCTOBER, 1981

PRESENT: N.F.U.S. - Messrs. J. Hay and J. McLaren, with P.J.Tait in attendance.  
S.P.T.A. - Messrs. D.H. Lindsay and J.R. McArthur, with D. Blackmore  
in attendance.  
S.S.P.A. - Messrs. J.E. Cook and R.A. Smith  
V.T.S.C.G.A. - Messrs. I. McKenzie and H.A.C. Davie  
Mr. D. Hendry Lindsay occupied the Chair.

Welcoming those present the Chairman affirmed the purpose of this meeting was to prepare for a Meeting of the Seed Potato Consultative Panel on 30th October, 1981. Of the two sets of DAFS' proposals then to be discussed, he suggested the Committee first give paragraph by paragraph consideration to proposed changes in the SEED POTATO REGULATIONS 1978.

A.I VTSC (a) - (c) were agreed without comment; (d) Mr. Davie urged the addition of "may be planted"; (e) Mr. McKenzie urged the use of "should be" (not "must be", as used last April) - it was agreed D.A.F.S. be asked to clarify this and to accept on a "recommended" basis only; (f) brought no comment.

A.II Other Basic Classes - (a) and (b) were agreed without comment; (c) was agreed to be dependant upon how implemented; (d) brought no comment.

A.III Tuber Standards - (a) - (c) agreed, it being noted that (b) also had NASPM'S agreement.

After reversion of discussion to A.II (c) (Burning off of F.S. from 1982), in which Mr. Hay felt this extension from VTSC in 1981 (4% of total crop) to all F.S. in 1982 (60% of total crop) must create tremendous problems (even although exemptions criteria be clarified in DAFS' Spring Letter to growers), it was agreed to seek a staged introduction. If DAFS could not be persuaded to Mr. McLaren's view, to extend burning off in the first (1982) year to early varieties of F.S. only, it would be urged to adopt Mr. Cook's proposal to restrict it to F.S.1 only, and to extend it to all F.S. stocks thereafter only after proof that burning off is (a) working in practice and (b) actually achieving its intended ends (proposed by Mr. McArthur).

#### (B) Matters for discussion by the Panel

I. VTSC tuber surface tolerances - The Committee agreed to oppose reduction of surface area affected from one-third to one-eighth.

II. Removal of Labels - While agreeing on the principle involved the Committee felt this paragraph was badly worded and could not be accepted until DAFS was completely specific.

III. "Super Elite" (SE) and "Elite" (E) Classes - The Committee agreed it was not essential to equate Scots and Dutch classifications. To avoid such attempts (and confusion) it was agreed to abandon SE and E in favour of the originally proposed Super A and AA classes.

IV Schedule 5 Group changes - It was agreed that only the change in respect of frost damage was acceptable.

V Reduction of Tuber Tolerances and VI Powdery Scab - It was agreed these paragraphs must be taken together and that acceptance of the latter would render the former irrelevant. It was felt that DAFS must clarify the proposals/

proposals to ensure they are practically workable, before they can be considered for acceptance. It was also agreed to press for a DAFS/MAFF undertaking to ensure that ADAS abides by and applies any eventually agreed standards and does not fly in the face of them.

Proceeding to discussion of DAFS proposals paper on POTATO CYST NEMATODES (PCN), the Committee noted the introductory paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 without comment. Under Para. 4 there was unanimous agreement that the present minimum 2 hectare part-field area entered for sampling must be retained. Mr. McArthur also explained his objections to the proposed non-clearance resulting from the finding of non-viable cyst(s). The Committee agreed to oppose non-clearance in respect of a single non-viable cyst.

Para. 5. Was adjudged to be completely unworkable and unacceptable. After consideration of illustrative diagrams, NFUS representatives proposed retention of the status quo. Mr. McArthur felt that an exclusion on one side of a sampled area and parallel to the intended direction of drilling should be allowed, irrespective of the area of that exclusion and that as well as retaining the two-hectare minimum sample area, all samples should also be taken parallel to the intended direction of drilling. If exclusion was sought on two sides both parallel to the intended direction of drilling, only one of them should be subject to a two hectares minimum.

The Committee also agreed that all test applications should be accompanied by a simple diagram to include indication of the intended direction of drilling and agreed that no fencing should be required if two exclusions were both parallel to the intended direction of drilling. It was further agreed that all exclusions across the intended direction of drilling must be fenced, irrespective of their area and that all required fences should be in place at planting and remain in place until completion of harvesting of the crop. Finding of one viable cyst should not require automatic scheduling of the land, but should instead prohibit planting, with an automatic re-test requirement. Finding a single non-viable cyst should be the end of the matter, although the Committee accepted it may be necessary in this event to concede to a re-test requirement.

The Committee unanimously supported the concept embodied in the last sentence of paragraph 5 and urged retention of discretion in revised arrangements. For practical reasons, however, paragraph 6 was found to be unacceptable.

In respect of the third part of the proposals paper, EXPORTERS AND RENTERS OF LAND, the Committee's discussions centred on the practical aspects involved. In the export context, Mr. McArthur's view that elimination of in-bag soil provided the most effective solution to PCN problems was strongly supported. The NFUS representatives also supported the earlier stated SPTA policy of total opposition to below-grader soil sampling for PCN.

On APPLICATION OF PROPOSALS the Committee took particular note of the last sentence of paragraph 8 for full discussion with DAFS on 30th October, 1981 at which meeting it was also agreed to be essential for DAFS to provide complete clarification of paragraph 9.

The Meeting then concluded with a Vote of Thanks to the Chair.