



EUROPA-PARLAMENTET
EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT
ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΟ ΚΟΙΝΟΒΟΥΛΙΟ
EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT
PARLEMENT EUROPEEN
PARLAMENTO EUROPEO
EUROPEES PARLEMENT

Generalsekretariatet
Generalsekretariat
Γενική Γραμματεία
Secretariat
Secrétariat Général
Segretariato Generale
Secretariaat Generaal

Generaldirektoratet for Forskning og Dokumentation
Generaldirektion Wissenschaft und Dokumentation
Γενική Διεύθυνση Ερευνών και Τεκμηρίωσης
Directorate General for Research and Documentation
Direction Générale de la Recherche et de la Documentation
Direzione Generale della Ricerca e della Documentazione
Directoraat-generaal Onderzoek en Documentatie

UNDERSØGELSER OG DOKUMENTATION
SAMMLUNG WISSENSCHAFT UND DOKUMENTATION
ΣΕΙΡΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΕΚΜΗΡΙΩΣΗ
RESEARCH AND DOCUMENTATION PAPERS
DOSSIERS DE RECHERCHE ET DOCUMENTATION
DOSSIERS DI RICERCA E DOCUMENTAZIONE
DOSSIERS ONDERZOEK EN DOCUMENTATIE

Landbrugsserie nr.
Reihe Landwirtschaftsfragen Nr.
Αγροτική σειρά Αρ.
Agriculture Series No.
Série Agriculture n°
Serie Agricoltura n.
Landbouwsérie nr.

12



Europa-Parlamentet og markeds- og strukturpolitikken inden for landbruget
Das Europäische Parlament und die Agrarpolitik: Marktordnungen und Strukturen
Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και η γεωργική πολιτική σχετικά με τις αγορές και τις διαρθρώσεις
European Parliament and agricultural policy on markets and structures
Le Parlement européen et la politique agricole concernant les marchés et les structures
Il Parlamento europeo e la politica agricola relativa ai mercati ed alle strutture
Het Europees Parlement en het landbouwmarkt- en structuurbeleid

August
Αύγουστος

1984

Août
Agosto
Augustus

C O N T E N T S

Introduction	1
1. Parliament's attitude to the CAP	2
2. The European Parliament and the annual fixing of agricultural prices	4
3. Parliament and some principal sectors	6
(a) Dairy products	6
(b) Cereals	7
(c) Fruit and vegetables	9
(d) Wine	10
4. The problem of inflation	11
5. The Council and the CAP	12
6. The European Parliament and the policy on Agricultural structures	13
Concluding remarks	16

INTRODUCTION

The European Parliament, directly elected in 1979, has been much concerned with agriculture, not only because agriculture is the sector in which Community integration is most advanced and thus the sector to which the largest proportion of Community funds are allocated, but also because the impact of Community decisions on public opinion - producers and consumers - is greatest in this sector.

In January 1983 the Directorate General for Research and Documentation published Research and Documentation paper No. 9 on The European Parliament and the Objectives of the CAP. This document set out the position taken by Parliament in resolutions on various aspects of the CAP, with particular reference to a review of agricultural policy asked for by the Council in its mandate of May 1980 to the Commission.

An Annex contains all the references to resolutions concerning agriculture which are based on a report, adopted by the European Parliament in the 1979/84 legislature.

This present paper takes a closer look at two main aspects of the common agricultural policy, that is the attitude of Parliament towards policy on markets and prices and policy on structures.

1. Parliament's attitude to the CAP

Since the common organization of markets for various products was set up, the European Parliament has attributed particular importance to agricultural prices. This attitude was not changed by its members after direct elections.

It is in fact in the guarantee policy sector that concrete short-term results can be achieved. The situation of family farms, including small farms which are not able to achieve profitability, has always been a matter for concern.

According to Parliament, the instrument of agricultural prices, as well as influencing production, should allow the least developed farms to survive or at any rate to earn a minimum income. Milk production is particularly suitable for ensuring the survival of a large number of small farms. In fact 55% of Community milk is produced by small farms.

Parliament's approach to the agricultural policy expressed in its resolutions does not entirely coincide with the Commission's ideas, especially after a number of Commission proposals in response to the 30 May 1980 mandate. In a series of resolutions Parliament has expressed its desire for the whole common agricultural policy to be thoroughly reconsidered, asserting that both new guidelines for a global common agricultural policy and the relevant rules for carrying it out must be laid down.

A new conference was even proposed as a follow-up to the Stresa Conference.¹ This request was made both before and after the direct elections in 1979.

The European Parliament soon reached the conclusion that a reasonable income cannot be guaranteed for all producers in all the regions of the European Community with a single instrument, namely, support of certain

¹ Resolution of 11.5.1979, OJ No C 140, 1979

producer prices. Moreover, it expressed the need to set production targets in order to compensate for the effect of guarantee prices on the expansion of production.²

Parliament worked on the assumption that the market policy which must be carried out with the aid of guaranteed prices, although necessary to guarantee incomes, was too blunt an instrument to deal with regional disparities. Indeed, unlimited price guarantee has led to the creation of structural surpluses which could not be allowed to continue unchecked.

The newly elected Parliament, which was immediately faced with the problem of the adaptation of the agricultural policy, concerned itself to a great extent with the situation censured in the 'mandate of 30 May 1980' regarding the great increase in expenditure on the common agricultural policy, the problems of income disparities, the increase in surpluses and the imbalance on agricultural markets. Parliament indicated that it was in favour of improving the CAP and raising the ceiling for own resources. Once again it emphasized the need to protect the interests of small farmers.³

The European Parliament formulated its first basic opinion on the future of the CAP in June 1981. The EP expressly stated that it was in favour of a global Community quantum for each sector related to the targets established for Community agricultural production. It agreed with the introduction of a system of producer co-responsibility.

In its resolution⁴, the European Parliament set great store by a policy which would promote a long-term development of efficiency so that the common agricultural policy might gradually come to be based on the needs of farms with production units of economic size. Nevertheless it felt that special instruments were needed to guarantee a reasonable income to farmers with specific social needs. One of the possibilities considered was direct compensatory aid. Parliament also stressed the need to respect a certain

² Resolution of 11.5.1979, OJ No C 140, 1979

³ Resolution of 17.6.1982, OJ No C 182, 1982

⁴ Resolution of 17.6.1981, OJ No C 172, 1981

hierarchy in prices as a suitable means of regulating production and establishing a balance between supply and demand in terms of both quantity and quality.

In 1984 the European Parliament accepted a limitation of price guarantee for products in structural surplus.

2. The European Parliament and the annual fixing of agricultural prices

Years before the first direct elections were held, the Commission aimed at pursuing a cautious price policy. The Council had increased prices by 2.1%, in 1978 and by 1.3% in 1979. In its first resolution on prices, the directly-elected Parliament considered the increase of 2.4%⁵ proposed for 1980/1981 as too low, without however proposing an alternative percentage. The following year Parliament called for an average increase of 12%⁶ and rejected the proposal to extend the principle of producers' co-responsibility to all sectors. After expressing its opinion on possible improvements to the Common Agricultural Policy,⁷ in March 1982 it called for a 14% increase in prices⁸, while the Commission had proposed no more than 9% for most products. Parliament was very sensitive to the problems faced by farmers in certain countries with especially high inflation rates. The Council finally decided on an average price increase of 10.4%. At the same time Parliament again rejected the proposal to extend co-responsibility to new production sectors, and was concerned over the threatened abolition of the intervention mechanisms.

In 1983⁹ it called for an increase in prices of at least 7% and continued to oppose the extension of co-responsibility to new production sectors. In this context, Parliament recalled that co-responsibility had

⁵ Resolution of 26.3.1980, OJ No C 97, 1980

⁶ Resolution of 26.3.1981, OJ No C 90, 1981

⁷ Resolution of 17.6.81, OJ No C 172, 1981

⁸ Resolution of 26.3.1982, OJ No C 104, 1982

⁹ Resolution of 10.3.1983, OJ No C 96, 1983

been introduced in return for the maintenance of guaranteed prices. It also rejected the alignment of Community cereal prices on those of the main producer countries¹⁰ That year the Council decided on price increases averaging 5.5%, this time largely going along with the Commission's proposals.

Over the years, the Council of Ministers has found a compromise which often lay some way between the Commission's proposals and the Parliament's wishes. In doing so the Council of Ministers went some distance towards meeting the demands and concerns of a large body of public opinion which was reflected in the European Parliament. The rise in world farm prices, resulting in expenditure lower than that forecast in the budget, seemed to justify decisions of this nature.

However, the markets were to change very significantly with plentiful harvests in 1982 which depressed prices and built up stocks and surpluses. In this reversal of the trend the Commission found confirmation of the ideas it had developed since outlining, under the 30 May 1980 mandate, a number of principles for the reform of the CAP. Prices for the 1984-5 season then had to be fixed in a climate of agricultural surpluses and budget deficits, which were very high in late 1983, and continued into 1984. When the Commission submitted radical proposals for ceilings on production and prices Parliament then demonstrated that it was fully aware of the seriousness of the situation.

An important factor emerging from the latest resolution¹¹ on agricultural prices and on related measures (1984/85) is the recognition of the need to avoid contradictions between structural policy, which can have only long-term results, and the measures to regulate markets, which have an immediate effect. Parliament therefore emphasized that measures to support the market need to be more in tune with structural aims, in order to ensure that a very favourable short-term market situation does not discourage producers from taking long-term initiatives and thus neglect structural policy aims. Parliament pointed out that the proposed price increase of 0.8% effectively meant a considerable reduction in price, when related measures were taken into consideration (such as the co-responsibility levy and guarantee thresholds - see also Concluding Remarks).

¹⁰ Resolution of 15.3.1984, OJ No C 104, 1984

¹¹ Resolution of 15.3.1984, OJ No C 104, 1984

3. Parliament and some principal sectors

All the Common organizations of the market have been carefully considered by the European Parliament. This document is confined, however, to an examination of the following sectors:¹² (a) dairy products (b) cereals, (c) fruit and vegetables and (d) wine.

(a) Dairy products

Even before direct elections, surpluses in this sector had led to specific Community programmes aimed at restoring balance on the market, such as the co-responsibility levy, incentives for the non-marketing of milk, for conversion and for cessation of activity, and the suspension of Community and national aid to dairy organizations. These schemes showed little result.

On 26.3.1980¹³ Parliament agreed with the Commission in thinking that in view of the general economic situation it was advisable to pursue a stringent agricultural prices policy. As far as the dairy products sector was concerned, Parliament felt that while the aim should be to stabilize milk production, account must be taken of the effect on small and medium sized producers and on less-favoured regions. Whilst emphasizing the appreciable negative aspects of the co-responsibility levy, Parliament accepted it provided that producers in mountain and other less-favoured areas were exempted. A year later it objected to co-responsibility becoming a general principle of the CAP, as the Commission wanted. However, Parliament admitted that milk producers had to accept economic responsibility for a certain volume of surplus production but thought that the basic flat-rate levy was not suited to safeguarding balance on the market and producers' income. Parliament thought it should preferably be abolished.¹⁴

In its opinion on the 'mandate', Parliament, true to its basic approach, supported the interests of small farmers (including milk producers)¹⁵ in

¹² Resolutions relating to other sectors are shown in Annex

¹³ Resolution of 26.3.1980, OJ No C 97, 1980

¹⁴ Resolution of 26.3.1981, OJ No C 90, 1981

¹⁵ Resolution of 17.6.1982, OJ No C 182, 1982

respect of whom it called for the immediate abolition of the flat-rate co-responsibility levy; continuing exemption for farmers in mountain and other deprived areas, but a supplementary levy to be imposed on milk producers producing more than 15,000 kilogrammes of milk per hectare of grazing land¹⁶.

Its disagreement on the co-responsibility of farmers was stressed once again in 1983¹⁷ when it declared that the levy had not yet helped to restore balance on the market in dairy products and totally rejected a supplementary levy in the form of a reduction in the intervention price. It had no objections, however, to an additional levy for the so-called 'milk factories'. For the first time in 1984 it called openly for a limitation on guarantees for products in this sector¹⁸.

Parliament concerned itself with the introduction of quotas in the COM for dairy products in connection with the Commission's proposals for a reform of the CAP. It agreed to the introduction of a system of quotas, provided that this was of limited duration and took into account the interests of small farmers and producers in mountain and other less-favoured areas; exemptions should however not lead to an increase in total Community production¹⁹. It felt able to accept a differentiated application of quotas by Member State and repeated its negative judgement on the functioning of the flat-rate co-responsibility levy.

(b) Cereals

The radical change in production and market relations over the past few years and the increase in surpluses of cereals did not yet play an important role in the first opinion of the directly-elected Parliament on agricultural prices in 1980²⁰, in which it however acknowledged that the question of manioc was causing disturbances in the feed-grain sector. Later on Parliament criticised to a greater degree increasing imports of substitutes.

¹⁶ Resolution of 26.3.1982, OJ No C 104, 1982

¹⁷ Resolution of 10.3.1983, OJ No C 96, 1983

¹⁸ Resolution of 15.3.1984, OJ No C 104, 1984

¹⁹ Resolution of 18.11.1983, OJ No C 342, 1983

²⁰ Resolution of 26.3.1980, OJ No C 97, 1980

In 1981 Parliament agreed in principle with a reduction in the intervention price for cereals above a specific production quantity²¹. This idea was picked up again in the resolution, adopted three months later, in which it acknowledged the fact that application of the basic principles of the CAP did not have solely positive consequences but also led to the creation of surpluses and caused disparities in income²².

The idea of aligning Community cereal prices with those of other major producers was rejected decisively. Cereal substitutes were given greater prominence in the opinion on agricultural prices (1982/83) and there was talk of a threat to Community preference. A reduction in imports of cereal substitutes to the 1981 level was thus called for.

However, in another opinion, Parliament took up a less well-defined position regarding the question of cereal substitutes, recommending voluntary restraint agreements with exporting countries as the main solution. In this case, Parliament was satisfied with the Commission's decision to bring Community cereal prices more into line with those of its main competitors, provided that different cost structures were taken into account²³. This position was reiterated in an opinion on an amendment to the COM for cereals²⁴ and in its opinion on agricultural prices (1983/84)²⁵. Parliament considered it was unacceptable to introduce co-responsibility into the cereals sector, as it did not see why farmers should bear the costs of market upset caused by imports of cereal substitutes by derogation from Community preference. It accepted a guarantee limit for durum wheat with reservations, while recognising that it was not a product in surplus.

Parliament acknowledged the need for a restrictive prices policy but warned against excessively severe restrictions.

²¹ Resolution of 26.3.1981, OJ No C 90, 1981

²² Resolution of 17.6.1981, OJ No C 172, 1981

²³ Resolution of 16.11.1982, OJ No C 334, 1982

²⁴ Resolution of 17.2.1984, OJ No C 77, 1984

²⁵ Resolution of 10.3.1983, OJ No C 96, 1983

(c) Fruit and vegetables

Fruit and vegetables account for nearly 11% of final agricultural production in the Community; over 800,000 producers are involved, leaving aside the entire processing sector.

From a Community point of view the fruit and vegetable sector occupies a special place because of its individual nature :

- (a) lower guarantees than for other products,
- (b) easily perishable produce,
- (c) strong competition from non-Community countries stemming from the preferential agreements between the Community and the Mediterranean countries.

In this situation the European Parliament has delivered its views on this sector either during the annual price fixing or in individual resolutions²⁶.

The European Parliament has consistently criticized the difference in guarantees offered for certain crops as compared with those offered for most fruit and vegetables, and to bridge this gap it has called for prices to be increased by more than the average for other produce, for improvements to certain intervention mechanisms, for strengthened producer organizations and for more products to be covered by common organizations of the market.

In its decisions on prices and on reviewing the common organizations of the market, the Council has to a certain extent taken up the European Parliament's ideas.

In its analysis of the sector the European Parliament went much further in calling for the principle of Community preference to be respected. In fact in this sector imports from certain countries, under agreements between the Community and the Mediterranean countries are having serious effects on market prices, with which the Community rules have been unable to cope.

²⁶ Resolution of 16.6.1982, OJ No C 182, 1982

The European Parliament has expressed similar fears over the threat to fruit and vegetable producers in the Community on its enlargement to include Spain and Portugal²⁷.

The Council has gone some way towards meeting the concern expressed by the European Parliament, in its decision to change the method of calculating reference and entry prices, entailing stricter rules for imports.

There is another aspect to which the European Parliament has always been sensitive, and that is the destruction of fruit and vegetables. This happens during the most serious crises after all other remedies have been exhausted. Up to 1982/83 only 1 or 2% of production was involved on average, but the European Parliament regards it as especially deplorable. It feels that no effort should be spared to avoid it.

The European Parliament proposes immediate improvements in the procedures for distribution to weaker sections of society and charitable organizations, in the absence of any more economic solution.

(d) Wine

The European Parliament has always taken a clear stance on prices for wine, calling for them to be increased to a level above the average in order to close the gap between the common organization of the market in wine and those for other products, such as dairy products and cereals.

The nature of the product - great variations in the crop, great sensitivity to the weather, together with over 100% self-sufficiency - has encouraged the European Parliament to concentrate on structural action to bring about the changes necessary for development in this sector.

In a number of resolutions²⁸ the European Parliament has stressed the need for a long-term policy in this sector with the aims of improving quality,

²⁷ Resolution of 18.11.1982, OJ No C 334, 1982

²⁸ Resolution of 9.4.1981, OJ No C 101, 1981
Resolution of 20.11.1981, OJ No C 327, 1981
Resolution of 9.7.82, OJ No C 238, 1982

increasing exports, controlling imports from outside the Community, reducing excise duties, improving quality control, strengthening the bodies responsible for stamping out fraud as well as prohibiting the enrichment of wine with sugar, and restricting new planting.

Despite the action the Council has taken, the increasingly difficult situation, with growing surpluses, forced the Commission and Council to conduct a general review of the common organization of the market in wine in June 1984.

One of the first tasks facing the new Members of the European Parliament will certainly be to give its opinion on this thorny problem.

4. The problem of inflation

Parliament's opinion on inflation and its repercussions on farm costs and incomes differs from the Commission's. The latter maintains that the differing rate of inflation in the various Member States does not have a decisive effect on agricultural incomes. Although there are great disparities in income, the Commission concludes that the most significant improvements in income levels are not to be found in countries with a low rate of inflation and that the greatest decrease was not found in countries where the rate of inflation was higher. Parliament, however, questions the Commission's conclusions on the consequences of inflation on agricultural incomes and has maintained that high rates of inflation have in fact contributed to a serious reduction in agricultural income in various Member States²⁹.

The Council agreed with Parliament to the extent of approving the devaluation of the green rates for certain countries with weak currencies.

As far as some countries with a high rate of inflation are concerned, special structural measures were also adopted and an extra increase was decided for Mediterranean products.

²⁹ Resolution of 9.6.1983, OJ No C 184, 1983

5. The Council and the CAP

In 1979 the Commission dissociated itself from the decisions adopted by the Council on prices and related measures in the milk sector. Indeed, in the past the Council had not adopted any of the measures proposed as part of the programme for the gradual restoration of balance on the market in dairy products (1977-1980). In 1976, Parliament³⁰ had come to the conclusion that rationalizing measures should be introduced, aimed at reducing structural surpluses by limiting production and increasing consumption. The Commission declared that regardless of the increase in the co-responsibility levy, further measures would be needed if the Community seriously wished to combat surpluses of dairy products.

In 1980 the Commission gave a warning that a lack of effective measures in the dairy sector would soon lead to an exhaustion of the Community's own resources. That year Parliament had rejected the draft budget for 1980/81, one of the reasons being the disproportionately high expenditure on agriculture.

In 1983 the Council approved the Commission's proposals practically without amendment, including the guarantee limits.

In 1984 the Council finally took the bull by the horns by freezing target prices and extending guarantee thresholds to a number of additional products.

The most radical changes applied to the milk sector. They were:

- the introduction of a system of quotas for milk production in order to limit to 99m tonnes the global quantity subject to guarantee;
- an increase in the co-responsibility levy to 3%. This levy will finance direct aid to small dairy farmers who meet certain criteria;
- intervention for skimmed-milk powder was not suspended since a new value for the fat/protein ratio was set at 50/50 (instead of 55/45);
- increase in the intervention price for skimmed-milk powder, but a decrease in the intervention price for butter.

³⁰ Resolution of 14.10.1976, OJ No C 259, 1976

6. The European Parliament and the Policy on Agricultural Structures³¹

There have been various resolutions on Community agricultural structure policy. Some of these resolutions, which were all adopted in plenary, were drawn up by the Committee on Agriculture, which is traditionally sensitive to the problems of farmers. Others were drawn up by other parliamentary committees, such as the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on Budgetary Control or the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, which are mainly concerned with interests other than those of farmers alone.

Despite the different approach of the various parliamentary committees, which is to be found in the resolutions tabled in plenary session, the position adopted by the European Parliament on the subject of agricultural structures showed a certain consistency, which has, to some extent, influenced the Commission on certain central themes under discussion.

One of the points arising in practically all the resolutions drawn up on structural policy is the lack of funds allotted to the EAGGF - Guidance Section, especially compared with the Guarantee Section and in view of the structural disparities within the Community.

Unfortunately this criticism, although it has also been voiced in reports on the budget, particularly as regards expenditure priorities, has not had a concrete expression in Parliament's exercise of budgetary power. In fact, during the last five years, the appropriations, both in the form of payments and commitments, for structural measures financed by the EAGGF - Guidance Section, have never been increased by Parliament, although some of these budget items were classified under non-compulsory expenditure, on which Parliament of course has the last word.

An examination of the Guidance Section's insufficient funds has led to an assessment of the impact of structural measures on European agriculture. In fact, one of the reasons why the European Parliament has not increased the funds for certain structural measures is that it was critical about the effectiveness of certain important measures, such as the directives of 1972, which were not sufficient to provide equal assistance to farms of different

³¹ Annex contains references to resolutions on structural policy since 1979

sizes with different operating conditions. The criteria for granting aid laid down in the socio-structural directives penalized small-scale agricultural concerns.

In many cases the application of structural measures had very modest results, with very small proportions of the appropriations being used. In 1979 for example only about 27% of the payment appropriations were used and only 50% of the commitment appropriations.

The European Parliament's criticism and the increasing number of direct aid measures which make it easier to apply for Community aid have meant that in 1982 81.5% of the commitment appropriations were used and 66% of the payment appropriations. Although a reasonable rate of use has now been achieved, the European Parliament is keeping a constant watch to see that procedures are adequate and the users of the funds are kept well-informed.

Moreover, the very presence of members of the European Parliament in the various states and regions has probably helped to make people more aware of the possibilities offered by the Community. The figures indicate a real improvement in the use of funds for agricultural structures between 1979 and the present day.

With a view to the renewal of certain structural measures, the Committee on Agriculture, followed by Parliament as a whole, started a debate on new structural policy guidelines, which concluded with the adoption of a resolution on 17 November 1983. This resolution takes into account the impact of structural policy and lays down certain guidelines for the future. It singles out research, training and the strengthening of family farms and cooperatives as matters of priority. According to this resolution traditional agriculture should be favoured rather than 'non-traditional' agriculture, which is characterized by a heavy use of capital, the use of inputs which are mostly imported, and a very high ratio of production per area utilized.

Parliament sees the future direction for the agricultural structures policy as lying in regionalization. This means greater flexibility in applying and carrying out integrated programmes under the Commission's control and involving the Member State concerned.

Moreover, the European Parliament confirmed what it had already stated in another resolution adopted on 13 March 1980 regarding the need to investigate the systems of holdings in the various Member States in order to be able to draw up plans offering concrete incentives for the reorganization of farm holdings.

Ideas suggested by the European Parliament to the Community institutions and Member States in order to improve the Community's structural policy include the creation of a 'reserve fund' to mitigate the effects of inflation and allow farmers to cope with the higher costs involved in modernization work when carrying out their development plans.

On 16 February 1982, when tackling the problem of the development of the most depressed regions in the Community, the European Parliament called for integrated development programmes to be set up, capable of using the development potential existing in the regions, by the creation of a 'Development Fund for the Mediterranean Regions of the Community and the Applicant Countries'.

A proposal for a regulation on improving the efficiency of agricultural structures is being examined by the Council to replace the socio-structural directives of 1972.

The draft regulation covers the following main areas for aid :

- a) investment in agricultural holdings,
- b) certain services including mutual aid, farm relief and farm management,
- c) young farmers,
- d) less-favoured areas,
- e) forestry, and
- f) vocational training and pilot schemes.

Member States are obliged to introduce investment aid for agricultural holdings (the other aspects are discretionary). Assistance may be granted either by way of investment aid in the form of capital contributions, interest rebates or deferred repayment of loans and by annual allowances to compensate for permanent natural handicaps.

In a series of Resolutions on 13 April 1984, Parliament generally endorsed the Commission's proposals, with some reservations mainly relating to the limitation of aid and the determination of surpluses.

In this analysis, albeit brief, we have tried to throw light on some of the main aspects of agricultural structures emphasized by the European Parliament. One can trace a consistent line maintained by Parliament during its first electoral term, although it made no concrete effort to increase expenditure on structural measures which it favoured.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

It is not easy to identify a clearly recognizable influence brought to bear by the Parliament on the Council's decisions in the sector of the common agricultural policy. Parliament's opinions are the result of many different factors, affected by party political and national interests, in which, in some cases, the various political groups cannot claim to have clearly defined policy. The result of votes on motions for resolutions and on the hundreds of amendments to them can only lead to an uncertain compromise.

On the other hand, the Council's decisions originate in a conflict of national, party political, budgetary, sectoral, regional and Community interests, and involve problems which are distinct from one another both inside and outside the agricultural sector. The habit of solving many-sided problems with a 'package of measures' does not help to achieve a clear-cut approach to the various questions. It is, therefore, not surprising that the compromises resulting from them contain tendencies which are not always consistent.

A constant element in Parliament's complex series of activities in the annual discussions on prices is its concern for the income and employment of farmers, the maintenance of Community preference and, as far as the calculation of agricultural prices is concerned, observance of the 'objective' method. In almost all Parliament's opinions - both before and after direct elections - there has been a demand for price and market policy to be accompanied by structural measures.

As far as the fixing of guaranteed prices is concerned, Parliament has in most cases demanded more than the Commission but less than the COPA (Producers Association). The price levels finally decided on by the Council generally turned out to be lower than those advocated by Parliament but higher than those proposed by the Commission. Before direct elections, the European Parliament once stated that it was in favour of the price level proposed by the Commission (in 1978); this was also the case in 1983.

In 1984, Parliament, faced with budgetary problems and an increase in surpluses, approved the Commission's proposals to increase prices by only 0.8% on average and reduce those of products in surplus within the framework of a review of the common agricultural policy.

The Council itself decided on a slight reduction in prices expressed in ECU (-0.5%) by comparison with the previous year. However, as in previous years, after agri-monetary measures had been taken into account, the end result differs from the ECU result. For 1984/85 the average increase is 3.3% expressed in national currencies, varying widely between -0.6% for Germany and the United Kingdom and +17.6% for Greece with variations from product to product. Increases for Mediterranean products are higher than the Community average expressed in national currencies.

The agricultural structure policy is, by definition, a medium or long-term policy and thus cannot often be changed. The last two years of this parliament have seen the expiry and then renewal for one year of the socio-structural directives for 1972. Regulation No. 355/77 on the processing and marketing of agricultural products has been amended and extended for ten years. This has made it possible, during parliamentary debates and, in particular, in the dialogue which has been established with the Commission, to explain better the development needs and potential which have been brought to the attention of the representatives of the peoples of Europe.

It is therefore difficult to assess exactly the impact and influence of these parliamentary debates on Community decisions because the Council has so far taken no far-reaching decisions as regards structures; an assessment can be made on the basis of the proposals put forward by the Commission.

Despite the institutional limits within which the European Parliament is confined, the battle fought on the field of agricultural structures will have had some positive results, because the Commission's proposals seem to favour a regionalisation of structural measures, a move which meets a number of suggestions put forward by the European Parliament. The Council has yet to accept the Commission's proposals with the amendments recommended by Parliament.

ANNEX

Agricultural reports adopted by the European Parliament during its first legislative period 1979-1984

This annex is divided by sector. Each reference includes the name of the rapporteur, the Working Document number and the number of the Official Journal in which the resolution appears.

Resolutions without a report are not given.

1. Agricultural prices

Delatte	1-37/80,	JO C	97/80	Mouchel	1-1325/82,	JO C	96/83
Ligos	1-50/81,	JO C	90/81	Woltjer	1-1508/83,	JO C	104/84
Curry	1-30/82,	JO C	104/82				

2. Structural Policy

Plumb	1-430/79,	JO C	289/79	Dalsass	1-184/82,	JO C	182/82
Barbarella	1-824/79,	JO C	85/80	Kaloyannis	1-411/82,	JO C	238/82
Früh	1-860/80,	JO C	101/81	Vitale	1-678/82,	JO C	304/82
Ligos	1-229/80,	JO C	175/80	Kaloyannis	1-770/82,	JO C	304/82
Cresson	1-489/80,	JO C	291/80	Provan	1-1177/82,	JO C	96/83
Barbarella	1-492/80,	JO C	291/80	Thareau	1-923/83,	JO C	342/83
Colleselli	1-524/80,	JO C	327/80	Davern	1-990/83,	JO C	342/83
Papaefstratiou	1-110/81,	JO C	144/81	Battersby	1-910/83,	JO C	10/84
Papaefstratiou	1-353/81,	JO C	234/81	Martin	1-922/83,	JO C	10/84
Plumb	1-393/81,	JO C	234/81	Bocklet	1-50/84,	JO C	127/84
Woltjer	1-551/81,	JO C	287/81	Vitale	1-70/84,	JO C	127/84
Martin	1-809/81,	JO C	11/82	Provan	1-113/84,	JO C	127/84

3. General aspects of the CAP

Früh	1-38/80,	JO C	97/80	Mouchel	1-837/82,	JO C	334/82
Plumb	1-250/81,	JO C	172/81	Curry	1-987/83,	JO C	342/83
Früh	1-344/81,	JO C	234/81	Marck	1-1139/83,	JO C	10/84
Sutra	1-785/82,	JO C	334/82	Marck	1-1370/83,	JO C	104/84

4. Dairy products

Maher	1-565/79,	JO C	4/80	Diana	1-1175/82,	JO C	96/83
Quin	1-594/80,	JO C	327/80	Curry	1-225/83,	JO C	184/83
Woltjer	1-697/81,	JO C	327/81	Woltjer	1-1470/83,	JO C	104/84

5. Beef

Provan	1-859/80,	JO C	101/81	Plumb	1-108/81,	JO C	101/81
--------	-----------	------	--------	-------	-----------	------	--------

6. Pigmeat

Cresson	1-571/79,	JO C	34/80	Buchou	1-252/80,	JO C	175/80
Cresson	1-620/79,	JO C	34/80	Ligos	1-446/80,	JO C	291/80
Ligos	1-626/79,	JO C	34/80	Tolman	1-1378/83,	JO C	77/84
Bocklet	1-41/80,	JO C	147/80	Eyraud	1-54/84,	JO C	127/84
Buchou	1-228/80,	JO C	175/80				

7. Sheepmeat

Maher	1-549/81,	JO C	287/81	Eyraud	1-58/84,	JO C	172/84
-------	-----------	------	--------	--------	----------	------	--------

8. Veterinary questions

Nielsen	1-840/80,	JO C	50/81	Hord	1-973/82,	JO C	13/83
Maher	1-930/81,	JO C	40/82	Hord	1-471/83,	JO C	242/83
Tolman	1-972/82,	JO C	13/83	Hord	1-1409/83,	JO C	127/84

9. Cereals

Colleselli	1-397/79,	JO C	289/79	Ligos	1-1373/83,	JO C	77/84
Jürgens	1-444/80,	JO C	291/80				
Sutra	1-71/81,	JO C	101/81				

10. Oils and fats

Jürgens	1-225/80,	JO C	175/80	Jürgens	1-1372/83,	JO C	77/84
Diana	1-566/81,	JO C	287/81	Goerens	1-1507/83,	JO C	104/84
Vgenopoulos	1-771/82,	JO C	304/82	Vitale	1-1514/83,	JO C	104/84
Vgenopoulos	1-964/82,	JO C	42/83				

11. Fruit and vegetables

Caillavet	1-468/79,	JO C 309/79	Colleselli	1-224/83,	JO C 184/83
Ligos	1-720/79,	JO C 85/80	Barbagli	1-422/83,	JO C 184/83
Caillavet	1-226/80,	JO C 175/80	Barbagli	1-1114/83,	JO C 46/84
Gatto	1-1068/81,	JO C 87/82	Stella	1-1515/83,	JO C 104/84
Maffre-Baugé	1-279/82,	JO C 182/82			

12. Wine

Buchou	1-143/80,	JO C 147/80	Delatte	1-92/83,	JO C 128/83
Sutra	1-142/80,	JO C 147/80	Dalsass	1-240/83,	JO C 184/83 ⁽¹⁾
Dalsass	1-227/80,	JO C 175/80	Dalsass	1-1371/83,	JO C 77/84
Colleselli	1-302/80,	JO C 197/80	Ligos	1-48/84,	JO C 127/84
Colleselli	1-680/80,	JO C 101/81	Martin	1-52/84,	JO C 127/84
Gatto	1-539/81,	JO C 287/81	Stella	1-61/84,	JO C 172/84
Colleselli	1-667/81,	JO C 327/81	Dalsass	1-64/84,	JO C 127/84
Dalsass	1-688/81,	JO C 11/82			
Colleselli	1-412/82,	JO C 238/82			

13. Other vegetable products

Dalsass	1-396/79,	JO C 289/79	(seeds)
Vernimmen	1-808/81,	JO C 11/82	(")
Diana	1-223/83,	JO C 184/83	(")
Jürgens	1-564/79,	JO C 4/80	(animal feed)
Plumb	1-595/79,	JO C 4/80	(potatoes)
Davern	1-251/80,	JO C 175/80	(hops)
Bocklet	1-392/81,	JO C 234/81	(")
Bocklet	1-413/82,	JO C 238/82	(")
Bocklet	1-711/83,	JO C 277/83	(")
Blaney	1-389/80,	JO C 265/80	(flax)
Curry	1-748/80,	JO C 50/81	(sugar)
Bocklet	1-839/80,	JO C 77/81	(")
Bocklet	1-57/81,	JO C 90/81	(")
Woltjer	1-1034/81,	JO C 66/82	(")
Délatte	1-792/80,	JO C 50/81	(isoglucose)
Curry	1-757/80,	JO C 77/81	(apples)

(1) Alcohol

Douro	1-807/81,	JO C	11/82	(flowers)
Newton-Dunn	1-1092/81,	JO C	125/82	(peas, horsebeans)
Eyraud	1-95/83,	JO C	128/83	(- " -)
Vernimmen	1-996/82,	JO C	68/83	(horticulture)
Hord	1-841/83,	JO C	322/83	(tobacco)

14. General

Buchou	1-553/79,	JO C	4/80	Tolman	1-95/82,	JO C	125/82
Buchou	1-731/79	JO C	85/80	Marck	1-528/82,	JO C	292/82
Clinton	1-443/80,	JO C	291/80	Kirk	1-672/82,	JO C	304/82
Woltjer	1-953/80,	JO C	101/81	Maher	1-1327/82,	JO C	184/83
Papaefstratiou	1-172/81,	JO C	144/81	Herklotz	1-229/83,	JO C	184/83
Dalsass	1-171/81,	JO C	172/81	Gautier	1-552/83,	JO C	242/83
Papaefstratiou	1-731/81,	JO C	327/81	Gatto	1-783/83,	JO C	307/83
Costanzo	1-931/81,	JO C	66/82	Colleselli	1-908/83,	JO C	10/84