

European Communities

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Working Documents

1982-1983

15 December 1982

DOCUMENT 1-1003/82

REPORT

drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control

on the budgetary control aspects of the 1980 embargo on deliveries of agricultural products to the USSR

Rapporteur: Mr Robert BATTERSBY

OR:EN

1.2.4

English Edition

PE 80.669/fin.

At its meeting on 12 October 1982, the Bureau of the European Parliament authorised the Committee on Budgetary Control to prepare a report on the budgetary control aspects of the 1980 embargo on deliveries of agricultural products to the USSR.

On 3 November 1982, the Committee on Budgetary Control confirmed Mr. Battersby as rapporteur.

It considered the draft report at its meeting on 3 December 1982 and adopted the motion for a resolution by 13 votes for, 6 against and 2 abstentions.

Participated in the vote:- Mr. Aigner, chairman; Mr. Cluskey, vice-chairman; Mrs. Boserup, vice-chairman; Mr. Battersby, rapporteur; Mr. Arndt (deputising for Mr. Wettig); Mr. Boyes (deputising for Mr. Key); Mr. Gabert; Mr. Hord (deputising for Mr. Patterson); Mr. Irmer; Mr. Kellett-Bowman; Mr. Marck; Mr. Mart; Mrs. Nickolaou (deputising for Mr. Orlandi); Mr. Nielsen (deputising for Mr. Jürgens); Mr. Notenboom; Mr. Rinsche (deputising for Mr. Filippi); Mr. Ryan; Mr. Saby; Mr. Konrad Schön; Mrs. Van Hemeldonck; Mr. Wawrzik (deputising for Mr. Früh).

C O N T E N T S

	Page
MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	7
TABLE 1	19
TABLE 2	20
TABLE 3	21

The Committee on Budgetary Control hereby submits to the European Parliament the following motion for a resolution together with explanatory statement

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on budgetary control aspects of the 1980 embargo on deliveries of agricultural products to the USSR.

- A noting that it proved impossible for the Commission to render the 1980 embargo on deliveries of food products to the USSR effective despite the clearly expressed political will of Parliament, the Council and the Commission
- B finding that, far from holding deliveries in 1980 at a level equivalent to the average for the three preceding years, there was a massive increase in such deliveries;
- C observing that, during the course of 1980, the Commission made statements in Parliament, in relation to the operation of the embargo, that did not fully reveal the situation as regards the extent to which deliveries to the USSR in 1980 exceeded the average for the three preceding years;
- D recalling its resolutions of 15 February 1980¹, 8 March 1982² and 20 April 1982³;
- E considering that the cost to the USSR of the embargo - even though only partially effective - was US \$1,000 million and that the embargo would have caused the USSR far greater inconvenience had it led to a situation where the political intention of Parliament and the Council had been made fully effective from the outset and the search for alternative supplies had had to be conducted in a hurried manner;
- F having regard to the report of the Committee on Budgetary Control (Doc. 1-1003/82);
1. Finds that the Commission was unable to control and regulate the flow of agricultural products to the USSR in 1980 and could not meet the responsibility laid on it by Parliament and Council and believes that this inadequacy contributed to the failure of the Commission to communicate, in good time, adequate information on the pattern of deliveries;
 2. Considers that the Commission should have (a) made known to both arms of the budgetary authority, early in 1980, that its instruments were inadequate to meet the task entrusted to it, (b) kept Parliament more

¹ OJ no. C59, 10.3.1980, p.56

² OJ no. C87, 5.4.1982, p.19

³ OJ no. C125, 17.5.1982, p.28

fully informed of the pattern of deliveries and (c), put forward proposals that would enable the Commission to monitor deliveries and to make the embargo operate as was intended;

3. Approves, however, of the measures taken by the Commission during the first months of the operation of the embargo to reinforce the system of controls but regrets that zero rates were not fixed much earlier; asks the Commission to take any further necessary measures that will enable it in future to ensure that declarations of destination are respected;

4. Recognises that, because of legal and commercial problems, the pre-fixation system made it virtually impossible for the Commission to stop export certificates that had already been issued as valid for all destinations; and asks that these problems be examined in depth by the Commission in order to find practical and operable solutions;

5. Notes that 455,067 tonnes of milling industry products were delivered to the USSR in 1980 as against 60,861 tonnes on average for the years 1977-1979; and asks the Commission to provide detailed information on this substantial change in trading pattern, because of the significant logistic effort that these exceptional transactions involved;

6. Urges the Council to enable the tender system to be permanently extended to the milk products sector, so that conditions more advantageous to the Community may be secured,

7. Welcomes the facts that the Commission now (a), recognises the advantages that would result from improved programming and longer-term agreements with third countries regarding trade; (b), accepts the idea of greater coordination of export policies with other major supplying countries; and (c), is prepared to strengthen the department concerned with the administration of trade and the preparation of medium-term programmes; and asks the Commission to keep Parliament fully informed on these reforms;

8. Reminds the Commission that, for political and budgetary control reasons, it is essential that every effort be made to ensure that statements made in Parliament are at all times scrupulously accurate, unambiguous and trustworthy so that the Commission's responsibility vis-à-vis the elected representatives may be fully met;

9. Instructs its President to transmit this resolution and the report of its Committee to the Council and the Commission.

Explanatory Statement

Background to the embargo

1. Early in 1980, the European Community decided that Community deliveries of all agricultural products should not replace, directly or indirectly, US deliveries on the USSR market.
2. The main factors leading to this Community measure were the invasion of Afghanistan by the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the treatment suffered by a Nobel peace prize winner - Mr Andrei Sakharov - at the hands of the Soviet authorities. Therefore, the spirit of the embargo was a reflection of the political wish to make the authorities in the Soviet dictatorship aware of Western Europe's democracies' abhorrence (i) of the Soviet Union's disregard for the rights of individuals and (ii) of the use of Soviet military force against a small virtually defenceless independent neighbouring country. That this political act might lead to some cost being incurred by the Community was an element which was readily accepted. The adverse economic effect of the embargo on the Community which, the Commission claims, can be quantified, was a price that Western Europe was prepared to pay for this political decision. The essential element was that this political instrument should work. If the embargo cost nothing, had no effect, was easily breached, and achieved nothing, it would have been a pointless gesture and quite out of harmony with the intentions of the EC member states, of the European Parliament and the Council.
3. In Mr. Aigner's report (Doc. 1-846/81) the background to this embargo was further explained and some disturbing management aspects were examined.

Deliveries

4. It is to be noted that the Council referred to 'deliveries' in the statement made after its meeting on 15 January 1980. It is unfortunate that this expression of political will was thwarted by the inability of the Commission - of which it must have been fully aware - to control deliveries, the embargo being seriously weakened by the carryover effect of export certificates issued in 1979. This is according to the Commission's own statement - and this inability was not made clear to Parliament at the appropriate time. Before the success of the embargo can be measured, it is necessary to have precise figures for the total deliveries shipped to the Soviet Union; the tables annexed to this memorandum show the embargo on deliveries to have been basically ineffective in 1980, and, therefore, these tables call into question the effectiveness of the Commission's action.

Embargo breaking

5. The further point made by the Commission that at least one major exporter - Argentina - did not participate in this partial action surprised nobody. The reaction on the part of the US and of Western Europe to the expansionist military policy of the USSR abroad and to its internal hard line towards those seeking freedom and liberty, was not an attitude likely to be shared by other countries such as Argentina not famed for their respect for human rights or for the rule of law. Indeed, it could be said that the measure adopted by the Community came after the US decision due to fortuitous and parallel considerations. Even if the US had not applied its embargo, it is still highly likely that the EC would have imposed its own embargo. Furthermore, the degree of pressure resulting from the Western European embargo, or its political impact, should not, necessarily, be gauged by the quote by the Commission from a letter from ex-Secretary of State, Mr. Alexander Haig, sent before full details of the 1980 EEC agricultural sales to the USSR were known.

Differences between the Council and Parliamentary approaches

6. As the Commission has pointed out, the Council statement on the embargo 'laid down the principle that Community deliveries must not replace, directly or indirectly, US deliveries to the USSR market'. However, the Commission does not equally stress the fact that the Council statement also 'requested the Commission...to propose other possible measures for other agricultural products equally respecting the traditional patterns of trade'.

7. The Committee is surprised that the Commission has omitted quoting the highly relevant resolution, put forward by Mr. Hord and 27 other members of Parliament and adopted on 15 February 1980, which called on the Commission to impose an immediate trade embargo on all sales of surplus commodities involving subsidies to the USSR.

8. To sum up, the purpose underlying the Western European approach was to make the Soviets aware of the potential hardship that could be inflicted on the Soviet consumers if the USSR persisted in its expansionist policies. Therefore, the view could be maintained that the Commission interpreted the situation in a limited and restricted fashion.

Further measures taken by the Commission

9. Although it is encouraging to note that a major feature of the operation of the embargo in its first months was the way in which the Commission took further action to reinforce the system of controls, it must be pointed out that the Commission vacillated between the world rate of export refund, a low rate of 100, and, finally, in 1981 a zero rate. It is to be regretted that the zero rate was not established much earlier in the operation.

Quantification of cost

10. As regards the Commission's earlier references to the adverse economic effect of the embargo on the Community and, in particular, its comment that its cost to Community farmers can be quantified, the Committee on Budgetary Control recognises that this effect was an unavoidable consequence of the embargo, as is pointed out at paragraph 2 above. Of course the inconvenience did not affect the farmers alone.

Commission's incapacity to cancel certificates

11. The Committee recognises that the Commission had not adequate powers to stop export certificates which had already been issued as valid for all destinations. It would be highly desirable, for the future, however, that the Commission should be granted adequate powers so as to avoid a regrettable situation such as that shown in the tables annexed to this memorandum. However, the Committee recognises that there are legal and commercial problems involved in this matter, which will have to be examined - in depth- by the Commission and this Committee in order to find a practical and operable solution.

The 'carryover effect'

12. The Commission had insisted that the carryover effect of 1979 licences giving rise to actual exports on 1980 was not relevant to the operation of the embargo. However, it is now claimed that this carryover effect operated to reduce the immediate impact of the embargo and made it possible for the USSR to search for alternative supplies at rather longer notice than would have been the case had the embargo resulted in an immediate cut-off of supplies. Once again, it is recalled that 'deliveries' was the key word in the Council statement, and in the intention expressed by Parliament.

Possible misuse of certificates

13. In its reply to written question 263/80, the Commission states that 'it has no knowledge of any instance of a licence issued after mid-January (1980) - which in any case would not be valid for the USSR - being nevertheless used for exports to that country'. This reply was made on 9 July 1980. As more information has doubtless become available to the Commission since then, this statement should now be confirmed for the year as a whole, since the current system is susceptible to misuse - especially in view of COM (82) 461 final, penultimate paragraph on page 8, where the Commission admits that 'a certain amount probably went out under licences issued before the embargo, and some traders deliberately evaded controls by using authorisations issued for other destinations, until the Commission put a stop to this'. The Committee calls on the Commission to state forthwith what action it has taken or intends to take against these traders.

Flour etc. deliveries

14. The average annual delivery of products of the milling industry to the USSR for the years 1977-1979 was 60,861 tonnes. In 1980, 455,067 tonnes were delivered. No wheat flour appears to have been delivered to the USSR in the years 1977-1979. In 1980, 330,131 tonnes of wheat flour were delivered to the USSR. The Committee considers that detailed information on the milling sector transactions must be provided, if only because of the unprecedented logistic effort these exceptional transactions involved. (Source of statistics: Eurostat NIMEXE Microfiches)

Butter and butter oil

15. As regards butter and butter oil, the Commission has stated that the embargo did not, *stricto sensu*, apply to butter. However, the Commission, taking account of the sensitivity of Parliamentary and public opinion in many Member States, made clear that it would apply limits for butter similar to those applied for cereals. However, the Committee notes, that, whereas the annual average of butter exports to the Soviet Union for the three years 1977-1979 amounted to 68,219 tonnes, the level for 1980 was 100,314 tonnes. Furthermore, whereas it would appear that no butter oil was exported to the Soviet Union in the years 1977 and 1979, and only 48 tonnes in 1978, 41,823 tonnes were exported to the Soviet Union in 1980.

16. This situation contrasts with the remarks made by the then President of the Commission, at the July 1980 session of Parliament:

'The Council position is that we should not exceed traditional export levels, which average 75,000 tonnes for the last 3 years.

...and we have every intention of ensuring that the average for the traditional exports in the last three years, which I may say, is less than half of the sales in 1979, will not be exceeded. That is the Commission's policy in a difficult position, as has (been) made absolutely clear to this House in a number of debates and in replies to questions, and it is the policy to which the Commission will stick'.¹

The Committee finds it difficult to accept the validity of this statement in the context in which it was made.

¹ page 24 of the Debates of - 11 -
Parliament for the July 1980 session

17. Later during the November 1980 session, the then Vice-President of the Commission responsible for agriculture, stated that:

'All this talk of huge sales of butter to Russia is simply a newspaper story, and it is beneath the dignity of this House to carry on a solemn debate on the basis of pure rumours which have been denied again and again by the Commission over the last two or three weeks, where the Commission's policy was clearly established months ago that we were not going to tolerate it and were going to use weapons which we had clawed to us from the Council in order to pursue this policy.

...There have been sales to Russia, but only the quantity worked out in the position taken by the Council and discussed in the European Parliament - some 70,000 tonnes. No more'.¹

Here the Commission, in the Committee's opinion, gave misleading information and did not fully inform the Parliament. (See Table 1)

18. The Commission has pointed out that, if a buyer is prepared to pay a price which reflects a zero refund, then it does not have the instruments to selectively block such trade. It would be desirable to have the views of the Commission as to whether such reserve powers should be provided so that, in the event of a future embargo, the Commission would be able to arrange for the blocking of such exports.

Extending the tender system to the milk products sector

19. The Commission also pointed out that it has proposed to the Council - so far unsuccessfully - to extend the tender system into the milk products sector. The Committee would be glad to learn the reasons offered by the Council for this delay in the extension of the tender system.

¹ Page 314 of the debates of Parliament for the November session 1980

Strengthening of the Commission's power during 1980

20. The Committee welcomes the fact that the Commission had its powers strengthened appreciably during the course of 1980, as a result of the texts of the following regulations:-

- Regulation (EEC) no. 203/80 (strengthening of délai de réflexion)
- Regulation (EEC) no. 245/80 (differentiation of export refund)
- Regulation (EEC) no. 400/80 (sale by tender)
- Regulation (EEC) no. 1446/80 (reduction of export refund)
- Regulation (EEC) no. 3218/80 (abolition of export refund)
- Regulation (EEC) no. 1305/80 (proof of arrival)
- Regulation (EEC) no. 2969/80 (strengthening of proof of arrival rule).

It is to be regretted that this strengthening was not effected immediately on the then existing Regulations being found to be inadequate to the task entrusted to the Commission.

The Commission is called on to explain the role played by the management committees of its institution in the preparation of the above regulations, and to advise the committee of the composition of the separate management committees involved in each regulation.

Sugar

21. When considering the embargo on cereals and other foods, sugar exports must be taken into account. The Commission pointed out that the export levy on sugar was a source of finance to the Community budget. However, this consideration would not have swayed the Parliament towards endorsing the situation which ensued whereby the following pattern developed:

Export of sugar and sugar confectionery to the USSR

1977	255,878
1978	44,014
1979	225,056
average	
1977-79	174,983
1980	832,991

(in tonnes)

Soya and soya cake

22. As regards the exports of soya and soya cake which shot up from an average of 10,015 tonnes for the years 1977-1979 to 378,823 tonnes in 1980, it is noted that the Commission drew the attention of the US authorities to the risks of development of this trade and that it had envisaged the possibility of the establishment of controls of exports from the US. It would be interesting to learn (i) whether or not the Commission informed one of the specialised committees of Parliament of this matter during 1980, (ii) at what point in time was the responsible US authorities contacted, (iii) whether there was US agreement to these transshipments, and (iv) what was the EC value-added element in the transactions.

Control over destination

23. As regards the strengthening of control over the destination and patterns of Community agricultural exports, it is noted that the Commission has set up a series of new measures for certain products, a) the *délai de réflexion* under which a request for an export certificate with prefixed export refund cannot be accepted until a specified number of days after the request; and b) the mechanism for notification by the Member States of the volume of demands for export certificates with prefixed export refund. This in turn has made necessary further measures to ensure that the declarations of destination are respected.

Trade with state-trading countries

24. The Committee welcomes the fact that the Commission is ready to take a positive attitude, in co-operation with the Parliament, to ways of improving the operation of agricultural trade with state-trading countries. The Committee appreciates the fact that the Commission attaches high importance to ensuring that any changes may reasonably be expected to reduce budget expenditure, rather than to increase it, and that they should lead to greater stability of trade and improved outlets for the production of the Community's farmers.

Longer-term arrangements

25. The Committee also appreciates the fact that the Commission now recognises the logic of the Committee on Budgetary Control's position regarding the advantages for the Community's trade that would result from improved planning and possible longer-term agreements with third countries. These, of course, would be entered into only if the terms were considered to be more satisfactory for the Community than the existing arrangements.

Greater coordination of export policies

26. The Committee also appreciates the fact that the Commission accepts the idea of greater coordination of export policies with other major supplying countries - as urged by the Committee on Budgetary Control. The Committee also welcomes the recognition by the Commission that better longer-term arrangements with the state-trading countries could give rise to benefits in the medium-term.

Greater differentiation

27. The Commission points out that the greater the differentiation of export refunds by destination, the greater are the administrative loads, the inconvenience, and the possible financial losses imposed on Community exporters to all destinations, because it could be necessary to require a proof of arrival in the country of destination before final settlement of the export refund payable. In the interest of the taxpayers and for political reasons, the Committee nevertheless believes that greater differentiation is justified.

Specific service unit in the Commission

28. The Committee also welcomes the fact that the Commission is prepared to strengthen the department concerned with the administration of trade and with the preparation of medium-term programmes.

Information on contracts.

29. The Commission states that it does not have information on individual contracts made by individual traders. The Committee would be glad to learn whether the Commission could, if asked to do so, compile and make available such information from the agencies in the Member States to the Committee on Budgetary Control, and, if not, what powers it would require so to do.

The Committee rejects the contention that the identity of those in receipt of Community funds, or the amounts paid to them, should be kept secret. Transparency in such transactions is essential to avoid any suspicion of malpractice.

Basic discrepancies still to be explained

30. As the carryover effect is cited as a major factor in swelling the 1980 deliveries of food and food products to the USSR, the Committee considers that it is virtually indispensable to control work to have particulars - by dates, quantities and commodities, with names of agencies, ports of shipment or border crossing points - of the verifiable elements of EC trade on an up-to-date basis.

31. Speaking in Parliament on 19 February 1982, the member of the Commission responsible for agriculture, stated:

'...in the various discussions that took place in organs of the Community, it was the general concensus that the average of the three years preceding the period of the so-called embargo should be taken as the reference basis for traditional patterns of trade'.¹

32. The validity of this statement can be judged by the following table, which shows the huge increases in 1980 deliveries from the EC to the USSR as compared with the average for the years 1977-1979.

	Average 1977-79	1980	% increase
Cereals	263,566	861,605	226.9
Butter and butter oil	68,225	142,137	108.3
Milling industry products	60,861	455,067	647.7
Sugar etc.	174,983	832,991	376.0
Soya cake etc.	10,015	378,823	3,682.6

(tonnes)

¹ Page 300 of the debates of Parliament for the 1982 February session

Conclusions

33. A political decision was made by the EC in early 1980 to the effect that Community deliveries of agricultural products should not replace, directly or indirectly, US deliveries to the USSR market. The background to this decision is set out in paragraph 2 above. The Community was prepared to pay the price for this political decision which should have been reflected in lower deliveries of food to the USSR in 1980 than in preceding years.

34. The figures show, however, in 1980, that there were startling increases in the deliveries of food to the USSR (see paragraph 32 and table 1 attached). The intention of the embargo was to make the USSR authorities aware of the potential hardship that could be inflicted on the Soviet consumers if the USSR persisted in its repressive and aggressive policies. This intention was thwarted by the actual pattern of deliveries in 1980.

35. Far from informing Parliament of the failure of the embargo, the Commission was still giving the impression as late as November 1980 that all was in order, see paragraph 13 and the quotations in paras. 16 and 17. The sweeping nature of the statements made to Parliament at the July and November 1980 sessions by the then President and Vice-President of the Commission, respectively, could be taken as efforts to keep Parliament in the dark, whether wittingly or unwittingly. Action was taken by the Commission on 12/13 June 1980 and after November 1980 to make the embargo more effective: therefore, it can be surmised that more information was available to the Commission than it was prepared to pass on to Parliament.

36. At paragraphs 20 and 23 to 28 above, certain positive aspects are noted. However, the inability of the Commission to make the embargo work effectively and the fact that it did not keep Parliament fully informed of the disturbing pattern of deliveries reflect fundamental issues which, in the opinion of the Committee, must be clarified and resolved as a matter of urgency. The institutions must learn from the lessons of this first embargo operation and must strengthen the powers of the Commission to implement the political will of the institutions in the future. There is also an urgent need for the establishment

of closer and more effective cooperation between the institutions. Accordingly the appropriate paragraphs will need to be drafted for the comments accompanying the 1980 discharge decision. Account must also be taken of the recommendations in the Aigner report (Doc 1-846/81) of 8 January 1982 on exports of Community agricultural products to the USSR and the state-trading countries.

TABLE 1

European Community agricultural exports to the Soviet Union
(1977-1980; in tonnes)

Products	Quantity (t)					1980 in comparison to average 1977-1979
	1977	1978	1979	average 1977-1979	1980	
Live animals	2,407	1,424	4,121	2,651	1,651	x 0.6
Meat & offals of which	65,068	6,220	103,959	58,416	164,653	x 2.8
- bovine animals	3,354	3	22,132	8,496	97,225	x 11.4
- poultry	61,712	6,217	77,106	48,345	67,405	x 1.4
Dairy products eggs, honey of which	57,118	20,916	143,538	73,857	177,248	x 2.4
- skimmed milk powder	-	-	-	-	-	-
- whole milk powder	7,958	9	8,888	5,618	35,108	x 6.2
- butter	49,131	20,876	134,649	68,219	100,314	x 1.5
- butteroil	-	18	-	6	41,823	-
Cereals of which	21,214	522,324	247,160	263,566	861,605	x 3.3
- wheat	-	1	5,050	1,684	576,204	x 342
- barley	151	404,869	215,023	206,681	222,416	x 1.1
- rice	10,818	110,004	23,890	48,274	98,874	x 1.2
- oats	-	490	1,191	560	841	x 1.5
Products of the milling industry of which	31,017	45,026	106,541	60,861	455,067	x 7.5
- wheat flour	-	-	-	-	330,131	-
- malt	31,017	45,026	106,541	60,861	124,886	x 2.1
Sugar and sugar confectionery of which	255,878	44,014	225,056	174,983	832,991	x 4.8
- white sugar	252,872	1,503	225,053	159,809	648,623	x 4.1
- raw sugar	600	40,144	-	13,581	183,734	x 13.5
Beverages, spirits and vinegar of which	13,242	29,131	69,720	37,364	153,955	x 4.1
- wine	179	10,673	49,620	20,157	132,461	x 6.6
- alcoholic beverages	10,747	16,325	16,536	14,536	16,005	x 1.1
Residues & wastes from the food industries and prepared animal fodder of which	5,037	416	25,061	10,171	449,629	x 44.2
- soya cake	4,984	-	25,061	10,015	378,823	x 37.8

Source : Eurostat NIMEXE Microfiches.

TABLE 2

European Community agricultural exports to the Soviet Union
(1977-1980; in 1,000 Ecu)

Products	Value (1,000 Ecu)					1980 in comparison to average 1977-1979
	1977	1978	1979	Average 1977-1979	1980	
Live animals	4,857	3,866	11,102	6,608	3,464	x 0.5
Meat & offals of which	64,135	4,315	82,186	50,212	177,567	x 3.5
- bovine animals	2,582	7	19,041	7,210	114,183	x 15.8
- poultry	61,551	4,305	58,465	41,440	61,384	x 1.5
Dairy products eggs, honey of which	40,579	17,977	126,168	61,575	206,366	x 3.4
- skimmed milk powder	-	-	-	-	-	-
- whole milk powder	4,930	15	5,725	3,557	31,163	x 8.8
- butter	35,631	17,935	120,440	58,002	123,003	x 2.1
- butteroil	-	18	-	6	52,189	-
Cereals of which	12,449	74,521	25,093	37,354	125,496	x 3.4
- wheat	-	-	852	284	79,564	x 280
- barley	50	40,112	15,423	18,528	26,536	x 1.4
- rice	3,382	33,625	6,665	14,557	16,098	x 1.1
- oats	-	176	372	183	286	x 1.6
Products of the milling industry of which	5,462	7,230	15,315	9,336	98,667	x 10.6
- wheat flour	-	-	-	-	75,649	-
- malt	5,462	7,230	15,315	9,336	23,005	x 2.5
Sugar and sugar confectionery of which	65,814	11,919	48,135	41,956	307,855	x 7.3
- white sugar	64,919	718	48,130	37,922	239,008	x 6.3
- raw sugar	103	10,737	-	3,613	68,641	x 19.0
Beverages, spirits and vinegar of which	10,085	13,361	19,972	14,473	26,519	x 1.8
- wine	225	1,756	6,927	2,969	12,849	x 4.3
- alcoholic beverages	8,778	11,310	11,799	10,629	12,478	x 1.2
Residues & wastes from the food industries and prepared animal fodder of which	2,300	125	5,036	2,487	83,872	x 33.7
- soya cake	2,211	-	4,949	2,387	70,279	x 29.4
Other products	51,181	41,952	88,504	60,546	72,252	x 1.2
Total :	256,862	175,266	421,511	284,546	1,102,058	x 3.9

Source : Eurostat NIMEXE Microfiches.

TABLE 3

Evolution of the European Community agricultural exports
(in tonnes) to the Soviet Union

percentage changes

Products	1980 in comparison to	
	average 1977-1979	1979
Live animals	- 37.7	- 59.9
Meat & offals	+ 181.9	+ 58.4
of which		
- bovine animals	+ 1,044.4	+ 339.3
- poultry	+ 39.4	- 12.6
Dairy products	+ 140.0	+ 23.5
eggs, honey		
of which		
- skimmed milk powder	-	-
- whole milk powder	+ 524.9	+ 295.0
- butter and butteroil	+ 108.3	+ 5.6
Cereals	+ 226.9	+ 248.6
of which		
- wheat	+ 34,116.4	+ 11,310.0
- barley	+ 7.6	+ 3.4
- rice	+ 22.0	+ 146.4
- oats	+ 50.5	- 29.2
Products of the milling	+ 647.7	+ 327.1
industry		
of which		
- wheat flour	-	-
- malt	+ 105.2	+ 17.2
Sugar and sugar	+ 376.0	+ 270.1
confectionery		
of which		
- white sugar	+ 305.9	+ 188.2
- raw sugar	+ 1,252.9	-
Beverages, spirits and	+ 312.0	+ 120.8
vinegar		
of which		
- wine	+ 557.1	+ 167.0
- alcoholic beverages	+ 10.1	- 3.2
Residues & wastes from	+ 4,320.7	+ 1,694.1
the food industries		
and prepared animal		
fodder		
of which		
- soya cake	+ 3,682.6	+ 1,411.6

