1. The extension to imported products of a prohibition on the sale of pasta made from common wheat or from a mixture of common wheat and durum wheat, effected by national legislation on pasta products, is incompatible with Articles 30 and 36 of the Treaty.

   Such an obstacle cannot be justified by the requirement of protecting consumers, since that requirement can be satisfied by less restrictive means such as the compulsory indication of the precise composition of the products marketed or the introduction of a special description confined to pasta made exclusively from durum wheat. The same considerations apply to the need to ensure fair trading.

   Similarly, such an obstacle cannot be justified on the grounds of the protection of public health unless there is evidence to show that pasta products made from common wheat contain chemical additives or colorants. In any event, such a general marketing prohibition is contrary to the principle of proportionality.

2. Once the Community has established a common market organization in a particular sector, the Member States must refrain from taking any unilateral measure even if that measure is likely to support the common policy of the Community. Consequently, if problems arise in finding market outlets for a product covered by such a common organization — and this cannot be argued when the statistics show that the product in question benefits from competition based on quality — it is for the Community and not for a Member State to seek a solution in the context of the common agricultural policy.

REPORT FOR THE HEARING
in Case 407/85 *

I — Facts and procedure

A — *Procedure before the national court*

A German manufacturer, 3 Glocken GmbH, which exported to Italy pasta products made from a mixture of durum wheat and common wheat, and an Italian retailer, Gertraud Kritzinger, who resold them, were each summoned to pay an administrative penalty of LIT 1 million for breach of Article 29 of the law on pasta products of 29 July 1967 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1967 law') which provides that only durum wheat shall be used for the manufacture of pasta products.

They challenged that summons before the Pretura di Bolzano, pleading that the

* Language of the Case: Italian.

provision in question was incompatible with Article 30 of the EEC Treaty. By an order dated 31 October 1985, the Italian court thereupon referred the following two questions to the Court of Justice for a preliminary ruling:

'1. Is the prohibition of measures having an effect equivalent to quantitative restrictions on imports contained in Article 30 of the EEC Treaty to be interpreted as preventing, in regard to the importation of pasta products, application of the provisions of Italian law concerning foodstuffs which prohibit the use of common wheat flour in the production of pasta products where those products have been lawfully produced and marketed in another Member State of the European Community?

2. Is the prohibition of arbitrary discrimination or disguised restrictions on trade between the Member States contained in the second sentence of Article 36 of the EEC Treaty to be interpreted as preventing the application of the abovementioned national provisions?'

B — *The relevant Italian and Community provisions*

1. *The law on pasta products: its wording and aims*

(a) The wording of the law

Until 4 July 1967 the law in force in Italy was Law No 874 of 22 June 1933. That law contained a single rule regarding product-description. It permitted the use of either durum wheat flour or common wheat flour for the manufacture of pasta.

That law was replaced by Law No 580 on pasta products, which originated in a parliamentary initiative known as the 'Bartole draft'.

Law No 580 contains provisions governing both the manufacture and the marketing of pasta. Some of the marketing provisions are concerned with the description of pasta products, whereas others are concerned with the labelling displayed on the packaging.

In addition, the first paragraph of Article 36 of the 1967 law provides: 'It is prohibited to sell or to stock for the purpose of sale pasta products whose characteristics differ from those laid down herein'. The second paragraph of Article 50 of the same law provides: 'The importation of . . . pasta products whose qualities differ from the qualities prescribed herein . . . is prohibited'.

(i) Rules on the manufacture of pasta

The 1967 law draws a distinction between the industrial manufacture of dry pasta, intended for storage, and the small-scale preparation of fresh (moist) pasta intended for immediate consumption.

Dry pasta must be manufactured exclusively from durum wheat meal. That is clear from the provisions of Article 29, read together with Article 28.

Article 28 provides: ' "Pasta di semola di grano duro" (pasta made from durum wheat meal) and "pasta di semolato di grano duro" (pasta made from fine durum wheat meal) shall mean the products obtained by extruding, rolling and drying pasta which is prepared, exclusively, either (a) with durum wheat meal and water, or (b) with fine durum wheat meal and water'.

Article 29 provides: 'The production of pasta intended for marketing is permitted only for those types of pasta having the following characteristics:

Type and description	Maximim moisture content %	As a percentage of dry matter					Maximum acidity (in degress) [1]
		Ash		Fibre		Nitrogenous substances (nitrogen × 5.7 min.)	
		Min.	Max.	Min.	Max.		
Pasta made from durum wheat meal	12.50	0.70	0.85	0.20	0.45	10.50	4
Pasta made from fine durum wheat meal	12.50	0.90	1.20	—	0.85	11.50	5

[1] The degree of acidity is expressed by the number of cubic centimetres of normal alkaline solution required to neutralize 100 g of dry matter.

Pasta will not reach the minimum percentage ash-content laid down by Article 29 unless it is made exlusively from durum wheat, because the latter has a higher ash-content than common wheat.

The rule concerning the exclusive use of durum wheat in the manufacture of pasta is subject to two exceptions.

Under Article 33, 'the preparation of fresh pasta products is permitted' and 'the use of common wheat flour is permitted' in their preparation.

Under the first paragraph of Article 50, 'the manufacture of . . . pasta products whose qualities differ from those laid down by the provisions of this law is permitted provided that the products concerned are intended for exportation and are not harmful to human health, following authorization in accordance with the detailed rules to be laid down by regulation'.

(ii) Rules on the description of pasta products

Article 28 of the 1967 law, mentioned above, has the effect of confining the description 'pasta made from durum wheat

meal' to pasta manufactured exclusively from durum wheat meal and water. It follows from the aforesaid Article 29 that such pasta is required to carry that description.

(iii) Rules on the labelling of pasta products

In accordance with Article 35 of the 1967 law, the packaging must show, in Italian, the manufacturer's name or company name, his registered office, the location of the factory, the description and type of the pasta and the net weight.

(b) The aims of the 1967 law

The account of the parliamentary debate discloses that two kinds of considerations prompted the Italian legislature to adopt the 1967 law.

First, the legislature sought to guarantee the quality of pasta; pasta which contains only durum wheat cooks much better.

Secondly, the legislature sought to encourage the growing of durum wheat. The market in pasta products is the only outlet in the Community for farmers growing durum wheat, and those growers have no real option of changing over to other crops in the southerly regions of the Community in which they are established. In those circumstances the aim of the legislature was to guarantee their one and only outlet by compelling pasta manufacturers to use exclusively durum wheat.

2. *The 1962 law*

Under Article 5 (a) of the 1962 law, Law No 283 on foodstuffs in general 'it is prohibited in the preparation of food to use . . . foodstuffs . . . which are mixed with inferior foodstuffs or treated in such a way as to alter their natural composition . . . '.

The relationship between the 1967 law and the 1962 law is as follows.

On the one hand, whilst prohibiting the treatment of pasta with chemical agents or other additives, Article 34 of the 1967 law defers to the powers vested in the Minister for Health by the 1962 law, namely to permit the use of chemical colorants or additives in certain conditions (Article 5 (f) and (g)).

On the other hand, the first paragraph of Article 8 of the Ministerial Decree implementing the 1967 law provides that the ingredients used in the preparation of special dry pasta and fresh pasta products must meet the standards of hygiene and purity laid down by the provisions in force, and in particular by Article 5 of the 1962 law.

3. *Council Directive 79/112/EEC*

On 18 December 1978 the Council adopted a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the

labelling and presentation of foodstuffs (Official Journal 1979, L 33, p. 1). Under Article 6 (5) (a) of the directive, 'The list of ingredients shall include all the ingredients of the foodstuff, in descending order of weight, as recorded at the time of their use in the manufacture of the foodstuff'.

The application of Article 6 (5) (a) to mixed pasta products containing, for example (as in the present case), 60% common wheat and 40% durum wheat, requires the common wheat to be mentioned first, but without any specification of their proportions.

Council Directive 79/112/EEC was implemented in Italian law by Decree No 322 of the President of the Republic dated 18 May 1982.

4. *The common organization of the market in cereals*

Inasmuch as the law on pasta products is designed to encourage the growing of durum wheat, it pursues an objective which the Community has upheld since 1967 as part of the common organization of the market in cereals.

Community action is twofold: first, an intervention price is established for durum wheat at an appreciably higher level than that of common wheat and, secondly, direct aid is granted for the production of durum wheat; see Article 10 of Regulation No 120/67/EEC of the Council of 13 June 1967 (Official Journal, English Special Edition 1967, p. 33) and Article 10 of Regulation No 2727/75 of the Council of 29 October 1975 (Official Journal 1975, L 281, p. 1).

Since 1967 the production of durum wheat has been steadily increasing in Italy, as it has in France and Greece, and has even extended northwards, in particular into Germany, Denmark and the United Kingdom. Production in Italy accounts for some three-quarters of the Community total.

In view of those developments the Community, from 1976 onwards, restricted the conditions for granting the aid. The first step was to fix the amount of the aid by reference to the area under cultivation and not, as previously, to the quantities produced. Secondly, it became possible to limit the aid to certain regions. Lastly, the aid was confined to durum wheat having qualitative and technical characteristics to be determined; see Article 5 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 1143/76 (Official Journal 1976, L 130, p. 1).

The standards regarding 'qualitative and technical characteristics' mean *inter alia* that the durum wheat flour must be suitable for use by the durum meal industry and for the manufacture of pasta products; see Article 3 of the Council Regulation (EEC) No 3103/76 of 16 December 1976 (Official Journal 1976, L 351, p. 1). In an implementing regulation the Commission stipulated that the durum wheat must 'have qualitative and technical characteristics establishing that pasta made therefrom is not sticky when cooked'; see Article 2 of Commission Regulation (EEC) No 2835/77 of 19 December 1977 (Official Journal 1977, L 327, p. 9).

As regards the regions qualifying for the aid, the basic legislation now provides that aid is granted only in areas of the Community in which the production of durum wheat constitutes a traditional and important part of agricultural production;

see Article 1 of Commission Regulation (EEC) No 1451/82 of 18 May 1982 (Official Journal 1982, L 164, p. 1).

Community production of durum wheat nonetheless continued to expand. Today, part of that production no longer finds outlets even on the Community market. In view of that situation, the Community envisages a further modification to its policy in that sector. In particular, it proposes to lower the intervention price for durum wheat and thus bring it closer to the intervention price for common wheat.

In any case, the buying-in by Community intervention agencies of large quantities of durum wheat is accounted for not only by the expansion in Community production but also by the importation of durum wheat from North America.

II — Written observations submitted to the Court

Written observations were submitted by 3 Glocken GmbH and Mrs Kritzinger, the applicants in the main proceedings, by the Provincia Autonoma di Bolzano, the defendant in the main proceedings, by the Italian, French and Netherlands Governments, and by the Commission.

A — *The existence of a restriction on imports within the meaning of Article 30 of the EEC Treaty*

3 Glocken GmbH observes that the question whether the Italian 1967 law is compatible with Article 30 of the EEC Treaty should be viewed essentially in terms of the *Cassis de Dijon* judgment of 20 February 1979 (Case 120/78 *REWE-Zentral* [1979] ECR 649). The prohibition on the sale in Italy of pasta containing common wheat is, in the absence of Community legislation on the marketing of pasta, an obstacle to trade in so far as it excludes from the Italian market all the pasta products traditionally produced in the Member States of northern Europe.

Furthermore, that obstacle gives rise to major distortions in competition between Community producers. In particular, it allows the establishment of one-way trade flows, running from south to north. Whereas the Italian law in question obstructs the importation of pasta containing common wheat from the Member States of northern Europe, Italian pasta can be marketed without hindrance in those States.

Mrs Kritzinger argues that the fact of the Italian law's subjecting imported and domestic products to the same treatment does not preclude a contravention of Article 30 of the EEC Treaty, since the law constitutes an absolute bar to imports.

Moreover, she regards the prohibition on the manufacture and sale of pasta containing common wheat as discriminatory, inasmuch as it applies neither to fresh pasta nor — and this makes the discrimination all the more marked and blatant — to pasta intended for exportation.

The discriminatory legislation is in fact the outcome of a policy favouring Italian growers of durum wheat and Italian pasta manufacturers.

The Provincia autonoma di Bolzano denies that the 1967 law is contrary to the provisions of Article 30 and the second sentence of Article 36 of the EEC Treaty. It contends essentially that, at the present stage of Community integration, every Member State has retained the power to establish such rules regarding the production of foodstuffs as it deems suitable for its own domestic requirements.

The 1967 law is not discriminatory, because it subjects domestic and imported products to the same treatment; the fact that it permits the use of common wheat in the manufacture of pasta for exportation makes no difference.

The 1967 law is not a protectionist measure, either in respect of Italian durum wheat growers or of Italian pasta manufacturers. Considerable quantities of durum wheat are imported despite large domestic supplies. In any case, Italian-made pasta is so well known and so highly regarded throughout the world as a typically Italian product that it needs no protectionist measures.

The Italian Government also argues that the 1967 law was not prompted by protectionist motives.

The legislature had not sought to protect Italian durum wheat growers against foreign common wheat growers. If it did favour the former category at all, it did so principally at the expense of their domestic competitors who grew common wheat. Growers of common wheat had, incidentally, been in the majority at that time.

Nor had the legislature sought to protect Italian pasta manufacturers from their foreign competitors, because the latter were not exporting pasta to Italy in 1967.

The Italian Government further claims that the 1967 law is not discriminatory in its effects. Here, it explains that the authorization to use common wheat in the manufacture of pasta products intended for exportation is designed merely to extend to Italian manufacturers an option available to all manufacturers in countries where the exclusive use of durum wheat is not compulsory. The 1967 law thereby seeks to avoid any discrimination against Italian manufacturers in favour of foreign manufacturers.

The French Government takes the view that the Italian law applies equally to domestic and imported products and that the *Cassis de Dijon* judgment, confirmed by the judgment in the *Souvenirs of Ireland* case of 17 June 1981 (Case 113/80 *Commission* v *Ireland* [1981] ECR 1625, at p. 1637), is therefore applicable to this case.

According to the Netherlands Government the 1967 law entails a disguised discrimination, in that it prohibits the use of common wheat in the manufacture of dry pasta intended for the Italian market, whereas it allows it in the preparation of fresh 'moist' pasta or of pasta for exportation.

The Commission observes that the question whether the Italian law is compatible with Community law must be viewed in the terms of the *Cassis de Dijon* judgment. Accordingly, the law is not compatible with Article 30 of the EEC Treaty unless it may be considered necessary to satisfy one of the

'mandatory requirements' referred to in that judgment.

B — *The existence of 'mandatory requirements' within the meaning of the* Cassis de Dijon *judgment*

1. *Consumer protection*

3 Glocken GmbH denies in the first place that pasta made from durum wheat is of superior quality. By virtue of modern drying techniques, which have recently been perfected, pasta can be made from common wheat which cooks just as well as pasta containing only durum wheat.

It goes on to observe that the Italian law should never, in any event, be able to dictate which product the consumer must choose. Consumers should have the possibility of judging for themselves the quality of products from other Member States of the Community on the basis of appropriate information.

Labelling in accordance with the requirements of Council Directive 79/112/EEC, as implemented in Italian law, ensures that consumers are properly informed as to the composition of the pasta.

Mrs Kritzinger also takes the view that the consumer cannot be misled as to the quality of either of the types of pasta. Proper labelling is sufficient to eliminate any risk of confusion in the consumer's mind.

The Italian Government observes that consumers might in any case, that is, even if they noticed the appropriate labelling, be misled as to the 'right' price to be charged. In the first place it is impossible, with the present methods of analysis, to determine the exact quantity of common wheat in mixed pasta products. In the second place, common wheat costs considerably less than durum wheat. It would therefore be easy to deceive the consumer by charging him a higher price than would be justified by the actual durum-wheat content of the pasta. The 1967 law affords the only means of ensuring that consumers pay the right price.

The French Government states that the presentation of pasta made from common wheat under the description 'pasta' is bound to create confusion in the mind of consumers, who associate that term with the exclusive use of durum wheat.

It further argues that, if pasta were to be manufactured from a mixture of durum and common wheat, even modern methods of analysis could not establish whether the ingredients were listed on the labelling in descending order of weight, as is required by Article 6 of Council Directive 79/112/EEC.

The Netherlands Government, on the other hand, takes the view that in general the consumer is adequately protected by the obligation imposed on pasta manufacturers by Council Directive 79/112/EEC to state the ingredients on the label of the package. The consumer is thereby informed of the composition of the pasta products.

It adds that the 1967 law deprives the Italian consumer of any choice between varieties of pasta and compels him to eat only pasta made exclusively from durum wheat.

The Commission, cites the *Jongeneel Kaas* judgment (Case 237/82 [1984] ECR 483, at paragraph 20) and points out that in the absence of Community rules Member States are entitled to pursue a policy of quality controls over their national production on condition that it does not obstruct the free movement of imported products.

In connection with the argument concerning the attitude of the Italian consumer, the Commission cites the judgment in the *Wine vinegar* case of 9 December 1981 (Case 193/80 *Commission* v *Italy* [1981] ECR 3019, at paragraph 23), according to which the interests of the consumer, even if he is accustomed to the commercial use of a particular term, may be safeguarded by proper labelling to show the nature of the product sold. The Commission also points out that the Italian consumer is already given an indication of the composition of the pasta offered to him for sale by the name, without even needing to study the list of ingredients.

2. *Fair trading*

3 Glocken GmbH, arguing on the basis of the judgment in the *Gin* case of 26 November 1985 (Case 182/84 *Miro* [1985] ECR 3731), concludes that the 1967 law cannot be justified by an imperative requirement relating to fair trade.

It observes that the law excludes imported mixed pasta from the Italian market because such pasta is cheaper. However, in so far as there is a price advantage, it is due to the way in which prices are fixed pursuant to the common agricultural policy. As in the *Gin* case, in which the price advantage was attributable to taxation, the price advantage may therefore be explained in terms of intervention by the public authorities and not any unfair competitive practice. In those circumstances the very fact of allowing consumers to make their choice in accordance with the quality and price of the product satisfies the requirement that there must be fair competition within the Community.

According to Mrs Kritzinger there was no risk of unfair competition in this instance, since the packaging of '3 Glocken GmbH' pasta clearly states that the pasta contains both durum and common wheat. She further points out that Italian exporters often present their pasta on foreign markets in packaging which contains no reference to the ingredients, without there having been any complaints of unfair competition on account of that practice.

As stated above, the Italian Government maintains that the compulsory use of durum wheat alone is the only means whereby consumers may be sure of paying a price exactly matching the quality of the product.

The Netherlands Government takes the view that the 1967 law disregards the principle set out in the *Gin* judgment, namely that interests such as fair trading must be guaranteed with regard on all sides for the fair and traditional practices observed in the various Member States. In this case, foreign manufacturers are deprived of the possibility of making use of

the commercial advantages attaching to the use of common wheat, whereas Italian manufacturers are entirely at liberty to use common wheat in the manufacture of pasta intended for exportation. In point of fact it is that undertakings established in Italy are engaging in unfair competition with undertakings established abroad.

The Commission points out that pasta made from durum wheat has to be described as such and is thus already distinguished from pasta containing common wheat. From that point of view the *Gin* judgment, delivered in a case in which Netherlands gin and Belgian gin were not distinguished from one another by their name, is applicable *a fortiori*.

3. *Public health*

3 Glocken GmbH confines itself to noting that the pretura di Bolzano recorded in its order referring the matter to the Court that the laboratory analysis showed that the pasta products in question were not harmful to health.

Mrs Kritzinger refers to the same passage in the order of the national court. She further points out that the 1967 law permits the use of common wheat in the preparation of fresh pasta and pasta for exportation. Lastly, she notes that, during the parliamentary debate at the time of the adoption of the 1967 law, the Italian Ministry of Health itself submitted an amendment to allow the use of common wheat; she therefore considers that it would be very hard to assert that pasta made from common wheat is harmful to health.

The Provincia autonoma di Bolzano, on the other hand, claims that the 1967 law is designed to safeguard food hygiene and health.

The Italian Government contends that the most delicate issue is that of the use of additives and colorants. Additives and colorants are often used to give pasta products containing common wheat the organoleptic characteristics which, by contrast, are naturally inherent in pasta made solely from durum wheat. Thus it is necessary to use chemical additives, such as tetrazine, in order to obtain the amber colour which is peculiar to durum wheat pasta. However, the large-scale absorption of additives and colorants can have deleterious effects on human health. Such a danger is very real in a country such as Italy, where the consumption of pasta reaches extremely high levels.

Furthermore, it would not be possible to ensure proper consumer information, because the additives in question do not belong to the ingredients which must be shown on the labelling pursuant to Directive 79/112/EEC.

The Netherlands Government takes the view that the argument based on the need to protect public health is not relevant in the present case, since both the German and the Italian laboratories concluded that the pasta in question contained no dangerous substances and was therefore not harmful to health.

Similarly, the Commission points out that it was established by the pretura di Bolzano that, in this instance, the imported pasta products were in no way harmful to health.

4. *The protection of an agricultural sector in accordance with the common organization of the market*

The Italian Government maintains that the 1967 law is designed to promote the production of durum wheat, and thereby contributes to the attainment of a basic goal which the Community itself adopted when organizing the market in cereals. In conformity with Article 39 (2) (a) of the EEC Treaty, the policy takes account of 'the particular nature of agricultural activity, which results from the social structure of agriculture and from structural and natural disparities between the various agricultural regions', and therefore meets an imperative requirement.

The 1967 law on pasta products is, furthermore, a means proportionate to the goal which it pursues. That point is demonstrated by the very fact that it meets a general imperative requirement which the Community legal system has adopted and endorsed. Nor should the fact be overlooked that, in the areas where it is traditionally grown, durum wheat could not really be replaced by other forms of agriculture because of the climate and soil. Finally, account must be taken of the fact that pasta producers in other Member States do not in practice incur any loss on account of the 1967 law, since virtually no pasta was imported into Italy either before or after its adoption.

According to the French Government, the repeal of the 1967 law would call in question the common agricultural policy in so far as durum wheat is concerned. The Community had encouraged the production of durum wheat so as to ensure a fair standard of living for its producers (see Article 39 (1) (b)) and to guarantee adequate supplies for the pasta-making industry (see Article 39 (1) (d)). However, competition from common wheat would threaten the one and only outlet for durum wheat and hence the development of durum wheat production which was encouraged by the Community.

The Netherlands Government limits itself to pointing out that the Italian provision is contrary to Article 18 (2) of Regulation No 2727/75, under which 'Save as otherwise provided in this Regulation or where derogation therefrom is decided by the Council . . . the application of any quantitative restriction or measure having equivalent effect' is prohibited.

According to the Commission, the protection of a given sector of the economy, including agriculture, cannot constitute an imperative requirement justifying an exception to the basic principle of the free movement of goods, because that would be tantamount to accepting the very principle of protectionism.

The Commission also maintains that national protective measures are, in any case, no longer warranted if the common agricultural policy already affords protection for a given sector.

Finally, it observes that it is for the Community alone to adopt appropriate measures should the repeal of the 1967 law endanger the only outlet for durum wheat and necessitate the buying-in of even larger durum wheat surpluses through the intervention machinery.

III — Replies to the questions put by the Court

In reply to a question from the Court, the Italian Government explained that the rule requiring the exclusive use of durum wheat does not apply to the preparation of fresh (moist) pasta essentially for three reasons:

the very marginal importance of such products;

deference to local customs and traditions, according to which special pasta is prepared by mixing fresh pasta with other ingredients such as meat and vegetables;

the multiplicity of premises used in the small-scale preparation of fresh pasta which makes it impossible to carry out health checks to detect the presence of common wheat in the pasta.

Asked whether pasta made from common wheat contains additives the use of which is prohibited by Article 5 (a) of the 1962 law on foodstuffs in general, the Italian Government explains that, although in its written observations it pointed out the problem of additives used in the manufacture of such pasta in order to give it the organoleptic characteristics of pasta made from durum wheat, it did not mean to suggest that all common wheat pasta contains such additives or colorants. It admits that it has no evidence to support such a suggestion.

Turning to the aims of the 1967 law, and in particular the aim of promoting the growing of durum wheat, the Italian Government explained that Italian durum wheat production would have been jeopardized if that law had not required pasta manufacturers to use only durum wheat. It points out that it would not have been difficult to envisage a veritable invasion of common wheat for the manufacture of pasta, since it is appreciably cheaper.

Questioned as to why Italian pasta manufacturers import durum wheat from North America in spite of the surpluses of that product on the Community market, the Commission qualified its observations that such imports are essentially attributable to the superior quality of American durum wheat. It explained that this superior quality does not relate to the non-sticky characteristics of durum wheat pasta when cooked but rather to its colour. Italian pasta manufacturers mix domestic durum wheat with durum wheat imported from North America solely in order to obtain pasta displaying certain characteristics (especially as regards colour) which are expected by the Italian consumer and cannot be achieved by the use of additives and colorants, since these are prohibited by law.

R. Joliet
Judge-Rapporteur