# COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

SEC(74) 4852 final

Brussels, 6 December 1974

Report from the Commission to the Council on applying the premium system for the conversion of dairy cow herds to meat production

report from the Commission to the Council on applying the premium system for the conversion of dairy cow herds to meat production

#### I. The Community Regulations

The premium system dealt with in this report was set up by Regulation (EEC) No 1353/73 of 15 May 1973 introducing a premium system for the conversion of dairy cow herds to meat production (OJ No L 141, 23 May 1973).

The rules of application were set up by the Commission in Regulation (EEC) No 1821/73 of 5 July 1973 (OJ No L 184 of 6 July 1973). The authorization not to implement the premium system for the conversion of dairy wow herds to meat production was granted, pursuant to Article 5 of Regulation (EEC) No 1353/73, on the one hand, to the French Republic of Corsica (Commission Decision of 24 September 1973); OJ No L 283 of 10 October 1973), and on the other hand, to Italy for the whole of its territority (Commission Decision of 28 September 1973; OJ No L 286 of 13 October 1973).

These decisions furthermore authorize the two Member States in question to apply, in the Regions specified above, the premium for the specialized raising of cattle for meat production laid down in Article 6 of Regulation (EEC) No 1353/73.

Unfortunately, the Commission has only fragmentary information available on the application of this latter premium of which the effects, moreover, seem very limited.

This report will be confined to a study of the way in which the system of the conversion premium is applied by the Member States with the exception of Italy.

The Federal German Republic 1), the French Republic 2) and Ireland 3) have been authorized, in accordance with Article 2 of Regulation (EEC) No 1353/73 to grant this premium to producers keeping less than 11 but more than 4 cows in the regions referred to in that Article (50 % of the dairy cows in herds of less than 11 dairy cows). These regions are listed in Annex 1.

#### II. Results in the Community as a whole

The Community Regulation stipulates that applications for this premium may be submitted on or after 1 October 1973 (Article 1 of Regulation (EEC) No 1021/73). However, in certain Member States, first applications were made at a later date since a time limit for implementation of the premium system had to be respected.

The situation as regards the applications submitted in the Member States by 30 September 1974 and approved by the competent authority is set out in Table 1.

In only a very small number of cases is the reference date different from the one fixed as a general rule by each Member State 4).

The total number of livestock units (LSU) kept on the reference date corresponds, in each Member State (with the exception of Denmark and the Netherlands), to approximately twice the number of dairy cows kept on the same date.

3) 4)

<sup>1)</sup> Decision of 21 December 1973, OJ No L 34 of 8 February 1974

<sup>2)</sup> Decision of 21 December 1973, OJ No L 30 of 4 February 1974, completed by decision of 30 January 1974, OJ No L 59 of 1 March 1974

TABLE 1

# Breakdown by Member State of applications for premiums for conversion of dairy cow herds to meat production, to be approved by the competent authority over the period October 1973 to September 1974 2

	Member State	No of applic approved Absolute val	•		1 1		Total LSU on reference date of which LSU of ewes		Total of quantit milk and milk proceeded during the month period prothe reference data.  Absolute value	roducts" 12 ceding
	Germany	4.648	35,3	33	67.148	23,9	114.859;30	930,90	267.359.229,9	25,6
$   \sim $	Belgium	529	4,0	<b>-</b> -	10.750	3,8	20.597,75	5,55	28.516.971,1	2,8
	Denmark	505	3,8	-	12.168	4,3	17.173,0	-	46.659.077	4,5
	France	3.811	29,0	***	73.495	26,2	163.574,26	***	246.347.430	23,7
I	Ireland	331	2,5	1	6.855	2,4	13.163,5	335,70	17.994.388	1,7
	Luxembourg	34	0,2	4	635	0,2	1.031,0	~	2 <b>.19</b> 2.297	0,2
	Netherlands	362	2,8	•••	7.576	2,7	9.845,4	***	<b>32.341.</b> 984	3,1
	United Kingdom	2.935	22,4	7	102.672	36,5	239.173,0	52.152,0	398.841.774	38,4
	Total EEC	13 <b>.1</b> 55	100	45	281.299	100	579.417,21	53.424,15	1.040.243.154,0	100

Expressed in milk equivalent (in litres)

<sup>2</sup> Germany: January - August 1974; France : October 1973 - August 1974; Netherlands: November 1973 - Septemb.74
Belgium: February - September 1974; Ireland : February - September 1974 United Kingd.: December 1973 - Septemb.74
Denmark: January - September 1974; Luxembourg: November 1973 - August 1974

It should be pointed out that the number of LSU of sheep is extremely high in the United Kingdom (1/5 of total LSU).

No application has apponently been submitted via a producers association. Four Member States have transmitted to the Commission the situation as regards the very limited number of applications to be withdrawn (Germany : 28; Netherlands : 28; Ireland : 1; United Kingdom : 0).

Three Member States - Germany, France, and the United Kingdom - account for 86.7 % of applications, i.e. 86.6 % of the total number of dairy cows and 87.7% of the drop in production of milk and milk products.

German producers have submitted 35.3% of applications however, as regards the quantity by which supplies of milk have dropped, the major contribution is that of the United Kingdom with 38.4% of the Community total.

In the other Member States, the premium system had very limited results in absolute values; in relative values, Table 2 shows that this system covered, in the Community as a whole, 1.1 % of all dairy cows and 1.28 % of supplies; in the United Kingdom the figure was in the region of 3 %; for two Member States on the other hand, the results are well below average (Ireland and the Netherlands).

In the Member States not mentioned above, the relative impact of the premium system approximates the Community average.

Table 3 shows that the applicants have both herds which are bigger than average (EEC average: (10,4) cow/farm) and a yield per cow which is much higher (EEC average: 3200 litres/cow). Germany is a somewhat special case since it has made great use of the authorization to grant the premium to heads of 5 to 10 cows. In the United Kingdom the herds are very much larger than in other Member States.

#### TABLE 2

Relative impact of the premium system

(on the basis of applications approved for the period October 1973 to September 1974)

Member State	No of cows for which premium has been granted as compared to total number of dairy cows on 31 December 1973	centage of the deliveries to
GERMANY	1,25	1,42
BELGIUM	1,03	1,05
DENMARK	1,05	1,03
FRANCE	0,96	1,16
IRELAND	0,49	0,56
LUXEMBOURG	0,89	1,0
NETHERLANDS	0, 35	0, 36
UNITED KINGDOM	2,93	2,92
TOTAL EEC	Ly L	1,28

TABLE 3
Average number of cows per applicant and average yield per cow

i wamaar	Average number of dairy cows on the reference date	Average yield over the 12 months prior to the reference date (in litres)
GERMANY	14,5	3980
BELCIUM	20,4	2660
DENCIARK	24,1	3640
FRANCE	19,3	3370
IRELAND	20,7	2650
LUXEMBOURG	18,7	3440
NETHERLANDS	20,9	4270
UNITED KINGDOM	35,0	3890
TOTAL EEC	21,3	3700

TABLE 4

Breakdown, by size of herd, of applications for the premium for conversion of dairy cow herds to meat production, approved by the competent authority over the period October 1973 to September 1974

	Size: (No of livestock - dair, cows - kept by the applicant on the reference date)	No of applications approved  Absolute value		of which submited by producers for whom the reference date is that referred to in Article 14 a of Regulation (EEC) No 1821/73		erence	Total LSU of reference d which LSU o	ate of	Total of quantities of milk and milk products ceded during the 12 month period preceding the reference date  Absolue %	
9 i	5 to 9	1.710	13,0	20	11.751	". 4;1 <sub>.2</sub> .	23.610,56	188,35	42 <b>.</b> 267 <b>.</b> 592,4	4,1
	10 to 14	4.051	30,9	10	49.112	17.5	114.266,80	7.990,75	172.903.441,-	16,6
	15 to 19	2,455	18,6	6 ·	41.734	14,8	90,621,45	6.164,60	150.847.023,5	14,5
	20 to 20	2.535	19,2	3	59.021	21,0	122.695,55	9.243,10	215.821.912,1	20,6
	30 and more	2.404	18,4	6	119.681	42,6	<b>228</b> ,222,85	29 <b>.837,</b> 35	458.403.185,-	44,2
	TOTAL	13.155	100	45	281.299	100	579.417,21	53.42.1,15	1.040.243.154,-	100

Expressed in milk equivalent (in litres)

Germany : January - August 1974 Ireland : February - September 1974 Belgium : February - September 1974 : November 1973 - August Luxembourg Denmark : January - September 1974 Netherlands : November 1973 - September 1974 France : October 1973 - August United Kingdom: December 1973 - September 1974 1974

Table 4 shows that applications are fairly evenly spread according to size of herd, although the 10 to 14 bracket has clearly submitted more than the others; however, as regards the economic results (number of cows withdrawn), this lead disappears and is taken over by the 30+ bracket which contains 42.6 % of all cows and 44.2 % of the drop in production; impact is negligeable on very small herds (5 to 9).

I should also be noted that the LSU of ewes are mainly kept in 30+ herds.

Table 5 gives a breakdown in time of applications for premiums. The rate of submission increased regularly up until June 1974 and has decreased regularly thereafter. Various explanations can be put forward to this:

- The relative strength of the price of livestock on the Community market in September 1974 could well have led a larger number of producers to apply for the bonus during the month in question. Later on, the market situation had deteriorated and applications were fewer in number.
- Experience of the premium system if the non-delivery of the milk shows that there are more applications during the bad season.
- The potential applicants are ware that they have until 31 December 1974 to submit their applications and a certain number of them have perhaps decided to leave their application until the last minute.

TABLE 5

# Monthly communications to the Commission on the situation as regards successful applications for premiums

#### I. Number of applicants

Per:	iod	Ger- many	Bel- gium	Den- mark	France	Ire- land	1	Nether lands	U.K.	Total EEC
October	1973	_	-		149		_	-	••	149
November	1973	-	_	-	577	-	9	52	-	638
December	1973	***	-	-	686	<b>-</b>	4	26	15	731
January	1974	104	-	47	627	790	2	18	101	899
February	<b>1</b> 9 <b>7</b> 4	103	119	146	397	<b>2</b> 9	6	99	381	1.280
March	1974	400	30	102	399	29	2	5	378	1.345
April	1974	341	115	70	293	70	4	66	432	1.391
May	1974	1.094	129	22	207	35	1	36	520	2.044
June	1974	1.384	33	<b>2</b> 9	203	62	4	21	338	2.074
July	1974	1.020	8	23	141	50	1	17	281	1.541
August	1974	202	48	18	132	32	L	13	253	699
September	1974	***	47	48		24		9	236	364
October	<b>1</b> 974	•••	***			***		4	-	
November	1974	100.0	· ;=-	**		-			-	•
December	1974	-	) design	}-		4.0		***		**
				y V					·	
Total		4.648	529	505	3.811	331	34	362	2.935	13.155

II. Number of milk cows kept on reference date

Perio	d.	Ger- many	Bel- gium	Den- mark	France	Ire-	Luxem- bourg	1	1	Total EEC
						,				
October :	1973			-	3.092	-			-	3.092
November	1973	<b>≟</b>	-	_	11.717	_	165	1.017	-	12.899
December	1973	<b></b>	-	-	12.609	-	66	627	647	13.949
January	<b>1</b> 9 <b>7</b> 4	1.224	-	967	11.942	-	29	306	3.419	17.887
February :	1974	1.218	2.777	3.415	7.368	635	110	2.229	12.589	30.341
March	1974	4.150	654	2.387	7.198	552	28	129	13.163	28.261
April :	1974	4.150	2.337	1.569	5 <b>•57</b> 4	1.500	. 59	1.263	14.556	31.008
May :	1974	16.876	2.402	616	4.315	735	17	760	18.133	43.854
June	1974	19.608	510	717	4.183	1.130	87	441	11.681	38.357
July	1974	17.278	205	531	2.721	1.079	56	380	9.380	31.630
August	1974	2,644	741	424	2.776	707	18	213	8.765	16.288
September :	1974		1.124	1.542		517	-	211	10.339	13.733
October ,	1974	-	·		-		-	***	•••	_::*5
November :	1974				***	-	-	-		
December	1974	_		-			-	***	-	-
Total		67.148	10.750	12168	73-495	6.855	635	7.576	102672	281,299

James Barrell

a

2 Stanton ... 1852

In these conditions, a slight increase in the rate at which applications are submitted can be expected over the last weeks of 1974. Furthermore, in the United Kingdom and Ireland, in particular, many applications are still being examied (see pages 13 and 15).

The Commission therefore considers that the action which is planned, and which should last until 31 December 1974 at the latest, will cover

17 500 applications

400 000 cows.

In these conditions, the result achieved will be slightly lower than that estimated by the Commission when the proposal was put forward to the Council (450 000 cows).

#### III. Results by Member States

#### GERMANY

The majority of the applications come from areas of small and medium-sized farms. Thus the Länder concerned by this measure are the following:

- "Niedersachsen" (30 % of total applications)
- "Nordrhein-Westfalen" (27 % of total applications).

Bavaria, a Land which had the highest amount of livestock (dairy cows) in Federal Germany, only submitted 15 % of total applications : so, as was the cass in 1970/71, the relative impact of the premium system was very weak in this Land and this can be explained by the extent of the grassy regions and the relatively small average size of farms which makes the changeover from milk and meat somewhat difficult.

In Schleswig Holstein the impact of the system was also rather weak: 7 % of total applications. However, the figure for 1970/71 was 25 %. In fact, in this region, large farms, that is to say structures which favour the production of meat to the detriment of milk,

had already been set up and conversion had taken place before the present premium system was applied, particularly when the premium system for non-delivery of milk was introduced (1970 and 1971).

In the Federal Republic, consequently, interest was mainly shown by owners of small herds of whom a great percentage will leave agriculture in the medium-term; the suppression of milk production is a first step in this direction. The premium system has thus speeded up the process whereby farms will be made larger if they are to survive.

Table A 1 in annex shows the importance of owners of 5 to 14 cows; they constitute 2 / 3 of applicants (i.e. approximately 60 % of the total number of cows kept on the reference date).

The impact of this measure on milk production should be underlined. In fact, the quantities of milk and milk products taken off the market due to the premium represent 1.42 % of production in 1973 (Table 2).

#### BELGIUM

Four of the nine provinces - Western Flanders, Liege, Namur and Luxembourg - have submitted 60% of the county's applications.

Forty per cent of the applications were submitted by keepers of 10 to 14 cow herds (Table B I in annex) where yield per cow is low: 2650 litres on average. The majority are elderly farmers: in this case abandoning milk production is a first step towards closing the farm. The premium system has thus accelerated evolution of a structural nature. On the other hand, only 13 % of applicants kept herds of 30 + cows: these are also farms with a very small milk yield (2700 litres).

In the province of Namur, which was well in the lead at the time of the system of premiums for non-delivery of milk by reason of its

.../...

development as an area of specialized production (the existence of a breed specially adapted for this purpose), the current premium system has not had the anticipated results.

Thus, in Belgium, the situation of the market in meat and veal in 1974 has not warranted frequent recourse to the premium system; the breeders prefer to develop really specialized meat production in a lasting manner.

#### DENMARK

More than 90 % of the applications come from Jutland. This region, which contains 80 % of the total national number of dairy cows, contains 90 % of total cows for which the premium was granted.

In the other regions, where there was less interest in the premium, the decrease in the size of herds kept for milk production had already begun in the sixties (to the benefit of fruit and vegetable growing).

In Jutland, on the other hand, the milk potential had not been greatly touched. But the problem of lack of labour has now reached this region. Two categories of farmer are particularly interested in the premium:

- the 50 to 60 age group, and
- very young farmers.

The recipients are leaving dairy cows and specializing in breeding young cattle without the help of salaried labour.

The applications are fairly evenly spread throughout the different sizes of herds (see Table No Cl in annex).

However, as regards number of cows, the impact of the 30 + bracket is very high (45 % of the total of cows for which a premium was given); The recipients in question keep an average of 45 cows. Their farms whose capacity for milk production is unquestionable, the average yield per cow being 4 000 litres (as against 3 700 litres for the other classes - see Table No C l in Annex).

In this Member State, 80 % of the premiums awarded have already been paid (1st instalment).

#### FRANCE

The impact of the premium system has not been negligible: 0.96 % of livestock kept for milk production, and 16 % of the milk yield (Table 2). Most recipients keep large or medium-sized farms (30 or 50 ha or even more). Their average is quite low: approximately 35; very few of the applicants are more than 50 years old.

It can be seen that the premium in question was mainly used in areas where the farms were large: Normandie, Lorraine, Nord-Picardie in particular.

Out of the 3267 recipients from 20 regions (excluding the Nord) for whom the applications were officially received between 1 October 1973 and 31 May 1974 their intentions are as follows:

- to raise nursing cows	( <u>71,1 L</u> )
- tm produce store animals	( <u>41,4 %</u> )
- to produce young bulls	( <u>45,6 %</u> )
- to produce steers	( <u>61,5 %</u> )
- to raise sheep	( <u>13,6 %</u> )

- to raise other types of animals (fattening calves, cows for the slaughter, etc.): (7.2%)

In the light of the premium system, in each Member State a certain amount of specialization is being developed - regional (e.g. in Champagne, herds of dairy cows are being created) or interregional (Brittany fattens 8 day old cows bought in neighbouring areas; cereal farms in the north of the Paris basin buy store animals in the producing areas of the Massif central).

The premium has had very little effect on 5 to 9 cow herds (5.1 % of applicants representing 1.4 % of cows for which a premium was given). On the other hand, the impact has been fairly homogenous on herds of other sizes (see Table D 1 in annex).

In France, the premium system makes an effective contribution to the development of herds of nursing cows and thus brings an element of solution to the problems of absorbing the excess milk while maintaining of the potential of the calves. It is useful to remember that, between 1970 and 1972, the increase in the numbers of these cows was similar to the decrease in the number of milk cows and corresponded to the total number of cows for which the effect of the premium for non-marketing of milk had been obtained (120 000 cows approximately).

In conclusion, the balance is positive both from the point of view of the milk market (absorption of the excess), of beef and veal (retaining 50 % of the number of cows on the recipient's farm which could otherwise have stopped functioning without the premium by putting their animals onto an already flooded market), and the structural improvement to farms side by side with regional specialization.

#### IRELAND

Most of the applications come from regions which specialize in milk production (in the south of the country). For the majority of the

.../...

. .

recipients, the premium system brought forward the decision to ... abandon milk production.

Although the applications are evenly spread over the various sizes of herd (see Table E 1 in annex), in fact, the average applicant holds more than 20 cows per farm, i.e. twice the national average. The 30 + herd account for 45 % of the quantity of milk withdrawn from the yield.

Although the premium system has not had a great impact in Ireland, one of the main reasons for this is that the farmers are not, in general, willing to devote a period as long as four years to a type of farming which involves abandoning milk production given the bad state of the market in beef and veal in that Member State. Nevertheless, for the recipient, the commitment to maintain an equivalent number of LSU during the given period raises no major difficulties on a technical level (crossing is a frequently used technique) nor on the level of administrative verification.

The relevant authority expects 600 applications, corresponding to 12 000 cows, to be submitted for the period 1 February 1974 to 31 December 1974 and this includes applications still being considered.

#### LUXEMBOURG

Applications are mainly from small herds with a low milk yield (in the 10 to 14 category the average yield is 2550 litres per cow); 73.7% of applications come from holders of herds of 10 to 20 cows (see Table F 1 in annex). Most of the recipients have decided to make the change. They are very often elderly farmers for whom abandoning milk production is the first step towards retirement.

#### NETHERLANDS

The rate at which applications have been submitted has dropped regularly since April 1974 (see Table 5).

Interest in the premium system has not been very great; this is due mainly to the bad state of the beef and veal market. To this must be added that it is compulsory to keep the ISU replacements for milk cows for four years. This period seems long to potential applicants. Table No G1 in annex clearly shows the impact of the premium on average Netherlands herds (between 15 and 20 cows).

A survey, based on 300 applications, has been carried out in this Member State. The results can be seen in Table G2 in Annex:

- half the recipients are running farms of between 5 and 15 ha;
- very few large farms are concerned with the measure;
- a third of the applications are from farmers of 50 to 60 for whom abandoning milk production is a first step towards leaving farming.

Consequently, in this Member State, the premium system contributes to speeding the rate at which the structure of farming changes by specializing production and bringing about the departure of the older farmers.

The breakdown by province shows that the impact of the premium has above all been noticeable in the provinces of Noord Brabant, Gelderland and Limburg which are regions where milk production is less important and where substitutes already exist (cereals, vegetable, crops, pigmeat, poultry, mushrooms etc.).

In this Member State 90 % of the premiums awarded have already been paid (first instalment).

#### UNITED KINGDOM

In this Member State, the premium system has had a considerable effect. At the present time, the monthly rate of submission of applications is still high (236 applications for 10.339 cows in September as against 253 requests for 8,765 cows in August). At the end of the year, there should be a total of more than 5,000 applications corresponding to 200,000 cows i.e. 5.7 % of national livestock and of deliveries to dairies.

Table HI in amnex shows that the applications are mainly from large farms; in fact, holders of 30+ herds account for 43.5% of the applications and 72.3% of cows in respect of which a premium has been given. In this category, the average herd is 55 cows and average yield per cow 4,000 litres approximately. Thus, in the United Kingdom, large farms are beginning specialized production of beef and veal to the detriment of milk production. The premium is not at the origin of this; however it does appear to have accelerated the process which is resulting in a decrease in the number of dairy cows (-1.3% between June 1973 and June 1974).

It should be noted (see Table No H2 in annex) that there is a noticeable increase in the average size of herds in applications submitted on or after July 1974. This confirms the considerable impact of the premium system on large farms. They, in fact, in order to satisfy their commitment to keep the LSU replacements for dairy cows, can at the present time obtain young animals at very low prices (less than L 10 e.g. for a new born heifer of a milk producing breed). Thus the constitution of a beef and veal production workshop, thanks to the premium and counting on a improvement in the beef and veal market over the next two years, can be envisaged with minimum risk and every likelihood of a reasonable profit.

The anti-cyclic role of the premium system should be emphasized in this particular case.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

1. The yield of milk and milk products over the 12 months prior to implementation of the premium system from cows in respect of which the premium had been made represents the equivalent of 1.040 million litres of milk, i.e. 1.2 % of the estimated yield for 1974 in the Community.

It is interesting to note that the increase in the 1974 yield as compared to the 1973 yield is estimated at 1.7 %; in 1973 this increase was of 2.3 % as compared to 1972. The premium system thus helps to slow down the progress of milk yield between 1973 and 1974.

Total cost to the EAGGF of expenditure involved in implementing the premium system in 1973/74 will be less than 60 million u.a. This expenditure, spread over several years, is of the same order as the supplementary expenditure that the EAGGF would have had to provide from the 1974 budget alone in the sector of milk products, in the absence of this premium system, for the absorbtion of the excess milk which would have been put on the market.

Given the balance of the milk market, the premium system thus has a positive impact which justifies its maintenance after 31 December 1974.

2. Maintenance of the premium system can also be justified from the point of view of the forseeable evolution of the beef and veal market; the rate of increase in the cattle population must be slowed down as in the following table:

#### Table 6

Community	cattle po	pulation - Annual	l rate of	variation in /
72/71	73/72	74/73	75/74	/c0
+ 4,4	+ 5,1	+ 1,2	+ 1	73/68 (+ 1,6)

The large increase in the cattle population which was apparent in 1972 and 1973 led to a large increase in production in 1974. However, it can be considered that the annual rate of increase of the home production of meat from livestock, which for 1974 should be of the order of 14 %, will only be from +2 to +3 % in 1975. The very high rate at which livestock has been slaughtered since Autumn 1973 is partly due to the beginning of running down the numbers of female breeding animals, the consequence of which, in the medium term, will be an appreciable reduction in the rate of increase of beef and veal production. Given that, moreover, the annual increase in consumption of beef and veal in 1975 and 1976 should be of the order of 300,000 tons, continuing the action should not in itself lead to the creation of excess beef and veal.

#### that

3. It is clear/the premium system has only covered a very small number of breeders; this was anticipated by the Commission which, when the draft Regulation was drawn up, estimated that the impact of the measure would not be on more than 500,000 dairy cows during the period 1 October to 31 December 1974.

It is clear that the premium was mainly useful for breeders in certain production structures and particularly in farms which are too small to be able to make milk production profitable and in certain large farms where such production is faced with a serious problem of trained labour.

In farms of this type, the premium system has undeniably led to a speeding up of evolution towards a structure which is better adapted to conditions of cattle breeding.

The need to improve production structures is continually being felt in the Community; the premium system contributes to it, and it should therefore be maintained after 31 December 1974.

4. The fact that at the present time a slowing down of the rate at which applications are being submitted is apparent, is in favour of the maintenance of the premium system after 31 December 1974. No disturbance is to be feared in the short-term on the beef and veal market through a massive number of dairy cows being put on the market as a result of implementation of the premium system. On the contrary, the beneficial effects of maintaining ISU other than dairy cows on the farm for a four year period will mean that effects are felt in the medium term when the market has improved.

It would thus be suitable to keep open the possibility offered to farmers to benefit from the bonus system from which more of them can benefit once certain conditions are fulfilled.

In conclusion it is proposed that the Council postpone until 31 December 1975, the period during which the applications for premiums can be submitted.

#### ANNEXE I

# Autorisations prevues à l'article 2 du Règlement (CFE) No 1353 / 73

Ireland: Comtés de Carlow, Cavan, Clare, Cork, Donegal, Galway, Kerry, Kildare, Kilkenny, Laois, Leitrim, Longford, Louth, Mayo, Meath, Monaghan, Offaly, Roscommon, Sligo, Westmeath, Wexford, Wicklow.

#### Deutschland:

- 1) Länder: Hessen, Rheinland-Pfalz, Saarland, Baden-Württemberg, Bayern.
- 2) Dans les Länder Nordrhein-Westfalen et Niedersachsen les Landkreise et Städte suivants:

Lkr. Schleiden, Stadt Bottrop, Lkr. Steinfurt, Lkr. Tecklenburg, Stadt Bielefeld, Lkr. Büren, Lkr. Herford, Lkr. Lübbecke, Lkr. Minden, Lkr. Paderborn, Lkr. Warburg, Lkr. Wiedenbrück, Stadt Iserlohn, Lkr. Brilon, Lkr. Olpe, Lkr. Siegen, Lkr. Unna, Lkr. Wittgenstein, Hameln, Grafschaft Diepholz, Grafschaft Hoya, Grafschaft Schaumburg, Lkr. Nienburg (Weser), Lkr. Schaumburg-Lippe, Lkr. Duderstadt, Lkr. Münden, Lkr. Osterode am Harz, Stadt Osnabrück, Aschendorf-Hümmling, Lkr. Bersenbrück, Lkr. Lingen, Lkr. Melle, Lkr. Neppen, Lkr. Osnabrück, Lkr. Wittlage, Stadt Goslar, Stadt Delmenherst, Lkr. Cloppenburg, Lkr. Vechta.

- France: 1) régions de programme: Alsace, Aquitain, Bourgogne, Limousin, Rhône-Alpes.
  - 2) Départements : Allier, Ariège, Indre, Lozère, Vendée. Haute Provence et Hautes Alpes.

#### Tabelle A 1

Gliederung der Prämienanträge zur Umstellung von Milchkuhbeständen (je nach Größe der Herden), denen im Zeitraum Januar bis August 1974 von den zuständigen Stelle stattgegeben worden ist

(in Alder in vom An	bhängigkeit von m Bezugszeitpunkt ntragsteller ge- nen Anzahl der	kt benen Antiäge:		ger eingereicht, für die der Be-	Zahl der zum Be- zugszeitpunkt gehaltenen Milchkühe		Gesamtzahl der zum Bezugszeit- punkt gehalte- nen Stückzahl- Einheiten an ausgewachsenen Rindern:	zahl Einhei-	Gesamtmenge von Milch und Milcherzeugnissen (1), die in den 12 Mo- naten vor dem Bezugs- zeitpunkt abgegeben worden ist	
		Anzahl	g.		Anzahl	9%	de constituent de con	-	Menge	<b>%</b>
		:								1
5 b	is 9	1496	32,0	20	10272	15,2	19533,55	165,30	37697795,4	14,0
10 b	is 14	1568	34,0	5	18295	27,3	33702,45	72,00	74418230,5	27,9
15 b	is 19	725	15,6	6	13034	19,4	21183,50	66,15	52922824,0	19,8
20 b	is 29	569	12,2	1	13188	19,7	21573,85	235,95	54273305,3	20,3
30 u	nd mehr	ر 29	6,2	1	12359	18,43	18865,95	391,50	48047075,0	18,0
insg	esamt	4648	1(0	33	67148	100	114859,30	930,90	267359229,9	100

<sup>(1)</sup> in Milchmange umgerechnet (in Liter)

Tabelle A 2

DEUTSCHLAND

Glieleren der Prämienanträge zur Umstellung von Milchbuhbeständen, aufgeteilt nach ländern, denen im Zeitraum. Jamuar bis August 1974 von der zuständigen Stelle stattgegeben worden ist

Größen- klasse	Nieder- sachsen	Nordrhein- Westfalen	Bayern	Hessen	Baden. Württemberg	Schleswig- Holstein	Rheinland- Pfalz	Saarland	Bremen
5 à 9 10 à 14 15 à 19 20 à 29	354 521 218	273 510 245 179	327 181 103 59	133 89 23 26	203 91 29 16	- 73 77 121	121 39 20 3	15 4 4 1	5 - 2
30 et plu Total II.	1.367	1.276 Bezugszeitp	681 mkt gehalt	340 enen Milchkühe	347	337	240	25	7
5 à 9 10 à 14 15 à 19 20 à 29 30 et plu	2.491 6.162 4.613 3.706 us 4.704	5.990 4.110 4.103 2.881	2.307 2.161 1.701 1.399 373	1.299 1.025 386 605 664	1.341 1.047 481 382 319	903 1.302 2.843 3,036	810 852 343 67 300	97 52 67 20 32	59 43
Total	21.676	18.954	7.941	3.979	3.570	8.134	2.372	268	102

Hamburg und Berlin : 0

Spartition en fonction de la taille des troupeaux des demandes de primes à la reconversion vers la production y viande agréées parel'autorité compétente au cours de la période Février - Septembre 1974

	3986		agré	ées:	dont prisenties par des produc- teurs pour les quels la date de riffirence lest celle visie à l'article 14bis du règlement (CEE) nol321/73	'à la date	de ré	Total des U G B ditenues & la date de rifi- rènce :	dont U.G.B. au titre des ovins femelles	tités de lai et de produi tiers (1) cé pendant la p de 12 mois p cédant la de de référence valeur absol	its lai- édés période pré- ate a :
	5 a 9		_	•			**************************************				
	10 à 14	2	13	40,2	٠.	2962	27;7	5176-	0,75	7683271,5	27,0
	15 a 19	1	17	22;2		1960	13,2.	4052,9	0,90	5231204,5	18,3
1	20 a 29	1	21	22,9		2776	25,3	5673.3	0,30	7533553,1	26,4
	30 et plus		78	14,7		3052	23,3	5695,55	3,60	8068942,-	28,3
	Total	5	29	100	-	10750	100	20597,75	5,55	28516971,1	100

<sup>(1)</sup> Exprimésén équivalent lait (en titres).

Répartition par province des demandes de primes à la reconversion vers la production de viande agréées par l'autorité compétente au cours de la période février - septembre 1974.

		2	
	agréées		retirées
Antwerpen	31		÷ .
Limburg	23	•	1
Oost-Vlaanderen	43		-
West-Vlaanderen	95		2
Vlaams Brabant	26	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	<u> </u>
Total	218	:	4,
Luik	<b>7</b> 2		6
Namen	<b>7</b> 5		***
Luxemburg	86		4
Henegouven	53		. 4
Waals Brabant	25		entire.companie
Total	311	•	14
•	weeps ganta	· <del>-</del>	water-statistics
Total général	529		18

DENMARK

T1/45"0714

#### Table Cl

Inalysis by size of herds in respect of applications made for premium for the conversion of dairy herds to meat production approved by the competent authority during the period

January - September 1974

	Class: (defined by the size of the herd of dairy cows kept by the applicant on the reference date	Number of application approved:	lS	of which presented by producers for whom the reference date is the one foreseen in article 14bis of Regulation (EEC) no 1821/73	dairy cows		Total of the units of adult bovine animals kept on the reference date	female animals	Total quantities of milk products(1) supplied during the 12 months period preceding the re- ference date:	
	S. T.	Number	%		Number	%			quantities	1/2
	<b>5</b> to 9			-			-		_	
	10 to 14	113	22,3	-	1.400	11,5	2.116,45	-	5.182,899	11,1
ľ	15 to 19	151	29,9	_	2.494	20,6	3.521,65	***	9.178,316	19,7
	20 to 29	118	23,4	-	2.749	22,6	4.087,85		10.257,452	21,9
	30 and more	123	24.4		5.525	45,3	7.447.05		22.040,410	47.3
	505 100		100	_	12.168	100	17.173,—	-	46.659,077	100

<sup>(1)</sup> expressed in milk equivalent

Table C 2

## 1. Examination of 329 approved applications

part of the country	number of appli- cants	pc <b>t</b> of appl <b>i-</b> cants	number of milk- cows	pet of milk- cows	Liters of milk (1000 liters)	pot of milk
jylland	300	91,2	5,802	90,4	26.229	90,3
sjaelland) lolland ) falster )	<b>1</b> 5	4,6	418	5,6	1.727	6,0
fyn ) langeland)	12	3,6	255	3,4	903	3,1
bornholm	2	0,6	47	0,6	176	0,6
Denmark	329	100,0	7.522	100,0	29.035	100,0

#### 2. Goneral statistics

Cows (census of June 1972)

		in 1900	pct.
jylland		898,5	80,5
sjaelland lolland falster	}	112,5	10,1
fyn langeland	}	101,0	9,0
bornholm		4,5	0,4
		1.116,5	100,0

Tableau D 1

FFANCE

Répartition en fonction de la taille des troupeaux des demandes de primes à la reconversion vers la production le viande agréées par l'autorité compétente au cours de la période Octobre 1973 - Août 1974

Classe :	Nombie d	e deman	dont prisenties	Nombre de	<i>r</i> aches	T tal des U.G.B.	donal UdGsB.	Total des	quan
(fonction de l'ir	des egr	ភes : เ	par des produc	laitières (	l-tenues	d tenues à la ,	au titre	tités de	lait et
portance du cheptel			teurs pour les	à la date d	le rsfs	date de réfé	des ovins	de produi	ts lai ·
de vaches laitières			quels la date derence :		rence:	femelles	tiers (1)	cédés	
détenues par le	étenues par le		référence est		,	ŷ	pendant 1	a pério	
demandeur à la date	•		celle visée à					de de 12	mois
de référence)	-		l'article 14bis	is				précédant	la date
			du règlement				,	de référe	nce :
	valeur absolue	%	(CEE) n <sup>0</sup> 1 121/73	valeur absolue	K		·•	valeur absolue	4.
5 à 9 10 à 14 15 à 19 20 à 29 30 et plus	154 1429 818 892 518	4,1 37,5 21,4 23,4 13,6		1060 17423 13351 20517 21139	1,4 23,6 13,2 28,0 23,3	313 \ 01 42049 \ 30 31 \ 5 \ \ , 15 44905 \ 90 41622 \ , 90		3642505 53724092 44336649 70425452 74218732	1,4 21,8 18,0 28,6 30,2
Total	3811	100		73495	100	163574, 26		246347430	100

<sup>(1)</sup> Exprimés en équivalent lait (en litres).

Tableau D 2 FRANCE

Répartition, par région-programme, des demandes de primes à la reconversion vers la production de viande agrééespar l'autorité compétente au cours de la période 1/10/73 - 31/8/74

	na. S. Addiction. Most distribution and an art and an artist of the contract o			
	Nombre de	Nombre de	Litres de lait	U.G.B. détenues
REGIONS	demandes	vaches	cédés	par les
	agréées	laitières	en un an	bénéficiaires
11 - REGION				
PARISTENNE	23	567	1.785.473	1.058,50
21 - CHAMPAGNE	264	5.509	19.349.487	14.392,50
22 - PICARDIE	274	6.340	23.674.760	14.081,15
23 - H.W.TE				
NORMANDIE	292	5•949	21.138.094	16,126,10
24 - CENTRE	170	3.073	10.592.720	6.519,50
25 - BASSE	-	• "		
NORMANDIE	241	5.372	18.103.752	12.414,60
26 - BOURGOGNE	185	2.740	8.746.162	7.249,45
31 - NORD	251	4.722	16.632.370	10.596,05
41 - LORRAINE	298	7.223	24.339.094	18.007,70
42 - ALSAGE ·	35	579	1.968.530	1.267,25
43 - FRANCHE				
COMTE	127	2.477	8.974.41.4	5.175,60
52 - PAYS DE				
LOIRE	293	4.663	14.493.846	11.676,41
53 - BRETAGNE	586	11.187	36.941.330	20.608,95
54 - POITOU				
CHARENTE	281	4.664	14.609.344	10,112,95
72 - AQUITAINE	113	1:819	6.140.538	2.758,85
73 - MIDI				
PYREMEES	108	1.758	4.745.822	2.568,75
74 - LIMOUSIN	21	440	1.119.769	921,40
82 - RHONE ALPES	, ,	3.386	11.756.332	6.236,80
83 - AUVERGNE	82	2.177	5.762.018	4.003,50
91 - LANGUEDOC-	1 0	/3	00 5/0	770
ROUSSILLON 92 - PROVENCE	2	41	87.567	119,—
COTE d'AZUR	6	דיידי	231.888	27.2
COIE d'AZUN	U U	77	231.000	21.3,
momat momar	3066	74.763	057 702 270	166 109 CB
TOTAL FRANCE	3866	74.763	251,193,310	166.108,01
	<u> </u>			

Analysis by size of herds in respect of applications made for premium for the conversion of dairy herds to meat production approved by the competent authority during the period

February - September 1974

Class: (defined by the size of the herd of dairy cows kept by the applicant on the reference cate		of which presented by producers for when the reference date is the one foreseen in article 14bis of Regulation (DEC) no 1821/73	cows kept on		Total of the of which units of anult ovine bovins animals female kept on the animals reference date		Total quantities of milk products (1) supplied during the 12 months period preceding the reference date:		
	Number	R	(PHO) II IVEI/15	Number	1 %			guantities	%
5 to 9	60	18,1	•	419	6,1	.939	23,05	927.292	5,1
10 to 14	77	23,3	1	935	13,7	2.145.5	39,—	2,330,203	13,1
15 to 19	60 -	18,1	-	989	14,4	1.783,—	21,55	2.457.919	13,6
20 to 29	71	21,5	_	1.649	24,1	3.401,-	124,85	4.184.811	23,2
30 and more	63	19,0		2.863	41,7	4.895,-	127,25	8.094.163	45,0
Total	331	100	1	6.855	100	13.163,5	335,70%	17.994.388	

apressed in milk equivalent.

Table E 2

#### IRELAND

Break down by counties of applications for premiums for conversion of dairy herds to meat production approved by the competent authority during the period

February-October 1974 No. of No. of dairy COUNTY Approvals to cows thereon Total Units of 31st Oct.1974 on the reference Adult Cattle date Carlow Cavan Clare 1.1054 Cork Donegal Dublin Galway . Kerry Kildare Kilkenny Laois Leitrim 21. Limerick Longford Louth 34. Mayo Meath 2/1 Monaghan Offaly Roscommon Sligo Tipperary . Waterford Westmeath Wexford Wicklow TOTAL 

Tabelle F 1

#### LUXEMBURG

Glieferung der Prämienanträge zur Umstellung von Milchkubbeständen (je nach Griße der Herden), denen im Zet naum November 1973 bis August 1974 von der zuständigen Stelle stattgegeben worden ist

der im Bezugszeit vom Antragstellei	(in Abhängigkeit von der im Bezugszeitpunkt vom Antragsteller ge- haltenen Anzahl der		r ge nträge:	ger eingereicht, für die der Be- zugszeitpunkt der in Artikel 14 a der VO (EWG) Nr. 1821/73 genannte	zugszeitpunkt gehaltenen Milchkühe		zum Bezugszeit- punkt gehalte- nen Stückzahl-		und Milcher	zeugnissen den 12 Mo- em Bezugs-
		Anzahl	%	ist	Anzahl	B		-L	Menge	. %
5 bis 9		;	·	<b>-</b>	_		_	-	_	
to bis 14		12	35,5	4	176	27,8	259,5	<b>-</b> -	452592	20,6
, 15 bis 19	,	13	38,2	-	248	39,1	388,	<del>-</del>	730813	33,6
1 20 bis 29	' '	6	17,5	,	90	14,1	233,5	-	523293 ·	24,0
30 und mehr		3	8,8	<del>-</del> ,	121	19,0	150,-	3	475599	21,8
insgesamt		34	100	4	635	100	1031,0	_	2182297	100

<sup>(1)</sup> in Milchmenge umgerechnet (in Liter)

.../...

≖ 3<sup>3</sup> **=** 

#### Tabelle G1

#### NIEDERLANDE .

Gliederung der Primienanträge zur Umstellung von Milchkuhbeständen (je nach Größe der Herden), denen im Zeitraum November 1973 bis September 1974 von der zuständigen Stelle stattgegeben worden ist

Größenklasse: (in Abhängigkeit von der im Bezugszeitpunkt vom Antragsteller ge- haltenen Anzahl der Milchkühe)	Zahl der stattgege- benen Anträge	ger eingereicht. z träge: für die der Be- g		gehaltenen Milchkühe		Gesamtsahl der zum Bezugszeit- punkt gehalte- nen Stückzahl- Einheiten an ausgewachsenen Rindern:		erzeugnissen (1	
	Anzahl	%		Anzehl	%			Menge	%
5 - 9			-	_		* object	_		
10 - 14	98	27,0	-	1.208	16,0	1.640,6	-	4.981.124	15,5
15 - 19	107	29,6	<b>-</b> .	1.846	24,4	2,409,25	-	7.401.649	22,8
20 – 29	105	29,0	-	2.380	31,4	3.090,15	-	10.417.074	32,3
30 - 49	43	11,9		1.486	19,6	1.945,4	-	6.498.889	20,0
50 - 99	8	2,2	-	535	7,0	618,-	-	2.438.732	7,5
100 und mohr	1	0,3	-	121	1,6	142,-	-	664.516	1,9
insgesemt	362	100		7 • 57 <u>,</u> 6	100	9.845,4	g. 75 14	32.341.984	100

<sup>(1)</sup> in Milchmerge umgerechnet (in Liter)

#### Tableau G 2

#### PAYS-BAS

I. Situation au 31.8,1974 des demandes dépasées, des engaggeents souscrits et des acomptes payés de la Prime pour la reconversion de la production de viande boying

	déposées		non acceptées/ retirées	Engage. nombre	ments souscrits montant	Acomptoi (50 % de nombre	s payés la prime) montant
7roningen	<b>21</b>	4	2	15	393.672	15	196,83
Triesland	22	1	9	12	456.660	12	228,330
<b>Prentha</b>	25	4	2	19	393,252	18	181.632
<b>verijssel</b>	46	12	2	32	692.788	19	183.702
(jaselmeerp.	13	4	~ 3	6	169.520	6	84.760
lelderland	80	32	10	38	767.530	32	309.83
trecht	u	_	3	8	223.840	6	97.474
N. Holland	17	3	7	7	227.576	·· 6 ·	105,026
Holland	27	11	4	12	304.496	10	125.078
Zeeland	9			9	167.316	9	83.658
N. Brabant	123	8	u	104	2.291.428	45	451.534
indurg	58`	13	3	42	729.312	39	\$314cT
tal -	452	92	56	304	6.817.390	217	2.362

II. Pour 296 demandas agréces. la répartition par surface d'entreprise et par Ese du demandaur est la suivante s

a) Surface de l'entreprise en ha :

	0 🕻 5	5 (10	10 <15	15(20	20425	25 <b>(3</b> 0	30 (40	40(50	50 <b>(6</b> 0	60 et	Total
roningen		-	2	3	1	1	2	2	3	1	25
Priesland	•••	2	3	3	-	_	2	-	2	-	12
Drenthe	-	3	2	5	5	1	2	2	-	_	20
werijssel		8	9	7	5	1	1	1	2444		32
ijaselmaerp,	_		3.	1	1	3	3	-	-		6
lalderland	-	8	12	6	5	1	1 .	2	-	1	3:
-trecht			1	4	3	-	-	·	٠		8
.Holland	1	1	2	3			1,	-	1.	-	9 -
%Holland	<b></b>	1	6	1	1	1 4 - y	2	***	-	7	11
eeland	. 🕶	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	-		10
Brabant	<b>3</b>	21	40	11	9	3	4	1		1	93
imburg	6	19	7	5	3	1	1	1	-		43
*a1	11	64	85	50	36	10	21	10	6	3	296

## b) Age du demandeur

	20 <b>4</b> 30	30440	40 < 50	50 (55	55 <b>(</b> 60	60(65	65 <b>(7</b> 0	70 et plus	Total
Groningen	1	5	5	-	3	1	-	-	15
riesland	-	2	4	2	3	1		-	12
Drenthe		7	5	4	2	2	***	-	20
verijssel	3	6	8	5	4	4	1	1	32
ljsselmeerp.	-	_	2	1	3	-	-	-	6
elderland	1	9	9	7	6	3	2		37
Jtrecht 1	-	4	1	: 1 ·	2	<b>-</b>	-		8
A.Holland	-	1	3	4		1		-	9
Z.Holland	-	3	-	2	4	1	1	-	11
Zee <b>land</b>	-	1	4	4	-	1	-	<del></del>	10
N.Brabant	4	22	22	13	19	10	2	1	93
imburg	3	9	12	7	3	7	2		43
Total	12	69	75	50	49	31	8	2	296

Total	T) 3 T)	A-+ 5	maniaa	-AMAILE	náo a	
TOTAL	CAT.	Carre	<b>ボヘエ・エロ</b> ロ	KIOUI	Jees	ă

12 69 75 99 39 2 296											
	e.voj	12	69	75	99	39	2	296			

### Table H1

Analysis by size of herds in respect of applications made for premium for the conversion of dairy herds to meat production approved by the competent authority during the period

October 1973 - September 1974

Class: (defined by the size of the herd of dairy cows kept by the applicant on the reference date  Number of applications approved:		of which presented by producers for whom the reference date is the one foreseen in article 14bis of Regulation (EEC) no 1821/73		cows kept on		Total of the of which units of adult ovine bovine animals kept on the reference date		Total quantities of milk products (1) supplied during the 12 months period preceding the reference date:	
	Number	%		Number	%			quantities	76
5 - 9	Nil		Nil	Nil		Nil	Nil	Nil	
10 - 14	541	18,5	Nil	6 <b>.70</b> 8	6,4	27.177	7.879	24.131.029	6,0
15 <b>-</b> 19	464	15,8	Nil	7.812	7,5	25.425	6.076	28.537.649	7,2
20 - 29	653	22,2	2	15.672	15,1	39•730	8.882	58.206.972	14,5
30 and more	1.277	43,5	5	72.480	71,0	146.841	29•315	287.916.127	72,3
Total	2.935	100	7	102.672	100	239•173	52.152	398.841.774	100
:	Nil		Nil	Nil		Nil	Nil	Nil	

<sup>(1)</sup> expressed in milk equivalent.

Break down of applications for premiums for conversion of dairy herds to meat production approved by the competent milwaity write the ratio 29 October 1973 - 31 August 1974. Datails are of the number of applications approved and the number of dairy days thereon on the reference data

Centure of Administration	No.	Dairy Cows	Centers of Administration	No.	Dairy Cows
Bury St Edmunds	19	1,136	Caernarvon	51	971
Chaineford	22	1,056	Cardiff	73	1,782
Huntingdon	6	290	Carmarthen	190	4,795
Feron	5	151	Llandrindod Wells	43	1,019
lerwich -	10	.473	Ruthin	88	1,756
Lincoln	36	1,171		•	± 1 ( ) 0
Northampton	77	2,921	<b>WALES</b>	445	10,323
Mottingham	110	3,591		772	10,525
Alnwick	37	951	Argyll	8	287
Carlisle	177	5,402	Borders	7	286
Turham	83	2,030	Central	7	595
Rerthallerton	. 82	1,781	Clyde	35	1,706
Cuildford	71	3,573	Eastern	13	478
liaiûstone	20	.929	Highland	7.3	173
Cxford	62	3,174	Lothians	2	
Minchester	41	2,084	N. Eastern	20	135
Exeter	141	4,170	Northern	2.	1,113
Gloucester	128	5,549	S. Western	55	27
Taunton	143	6,107	Southern	28	3,089
Truro	124	3,336	# 0 4 4 1 0 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	20	1,261
Crewo	126	5,341	SCOTLAND	170	. 0 150
Shrewsbury	84	3,084		178	9,150
Worcester	82	3,002	NORTHERN IRELAND	160	2.000
Eeverley	30	1,310	THE PARTY THE PARTY OF THE PART	167	3,822
Harregate	. 99	3,148	;		
Preston	94	3,279	•		
<b>ENGLAND</b>	1,909	69,038	UNITED KINGDOM	2,699	92,333

Table H 3

UNITED KINGDOM

Break down by months of application and approved applications for the conversion of dairy hers to meat production

Month	Number of Applications	Number of	no. Suggania sang ap terepasyang	Number of Approvals	Number of Lairy Cows	
		D	b/a	C Am market	d	d/o
November '73	1,313	46;513	35;5	-		-
December '73	756	24;603	32;5	15	647	43,1
January '74	793	28,875	35;1	101	3,419	33,9
February 174	544	19,674	36,2	381	12,589	33,0
March 174	502	18,013	35,8	378	13,163	34,8
April '74	361	12,619	34,8	432	14,556	33;7
May •74	295	10,572	35,8	520	13,133	34;8
June 174	237	8,410	35,5	338	11,681	34,7
July 174	238	9,844	41,3	281	9;380	33,5
August '74	2/5	10,524	43,0	253	8,765	34,9
Total to date	5,289	189,652	35,8	2,699	92,333	34,2
September 174	(1)	(1)		236	10,334	43,7

<sup>(1)</sup> not available