

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

GREEN EUROPE NEWSLETTER

IN BRIEF

Common agricultural prices for 1980/81

— The negotiations

April 1980

€

Published by the Agricultural Information Service of the Directorate-General for Agriculture
European Community Commission — 200, rue de la Loi, 1049 Bruxelles
Supplement to the Documentation Bulletin - D/AGR./EN

10

The need for an immediate and courageous decision

The Council at present has before it a coherent package of Commission proposals to adjust the common agricultural policy and fix common agricultural prices for 1980/81. These Commission proposals have three complementary objectives :

1. To safeguard and improve farm incomes
2. To re-establish market balance, in the milk sector in particular
3. To contribute to better control of budgetary expenditure.

The Commission feels that decisions on this matter must now be taken.

- a) the relative fall in farm incomes in 1979 and current pressure on farm production costs make a reasonable increase in common agricultural prices absolutely vital;
- b) the growing imbalance on the market for milk makes it vital to introduce effective measures to stem the never-ending flood of milk for which there is no commercial outlet either inside or outside the Community;
- c) expenditure on agriculture is growing twice as fast as the Community's own resources, and it is therefore vital to adjust the common agricultural policy in such a way as to rationalize expenditure.

The Commission feels that a courageous decision is now necessary along the lines set out below. These guidelines are part of the Community's long standing political approach and are essential to safeguard and develop the common agricultural policy.

In the milk sector, the cost of disposing of the quantities of milk produced in 1980 and subsequently in excess of the 1979 production figure (- 1 %) should be borne entirely by those who have produced them.

As regards sugar, the producers should themselves be responsible for all expenditure (except for the quantity covered by the ACP Agreement) - the common organizations of the market in other sectors (beef and veal, cereals,

fruit and vegetables) should be adjusted to achieve a better balance between the interests of producers, consumers and taxpayers.

Under the prudent price policy followed during the last few years, an increase in prices making allowance for farmers' needs, the requirements of balance on the markets and the budgetary resources available should be adopted for 1980/81; this increase should be accompanied by an appropriate reduction in monetary compensatory amounts.

The poorest farmers and the least-developed regions should have priority as regards socio-structural policy measures.

*

*

*

To sum up

This year the package under discussion contains, in addition to the agricultural prices, two other issues of major importance for the common agricultural policy. One is a series of measures proposed by the Commission for restoring market balance and controlling agricultural expenditure. The sectors in question are milk, sugar, beef and veal, cereals and fruit and vegetables (1).

The other contains basic proposals relating to structural policy (2). These proposals aim to make the existing socio-structural Directives more flexible and to concentrate available funds on the poorest farmers and the least developed regions.

(1) COM(79)710 of 29 November 1979, the main points of which are reproduced in "Green Europe - Newsletter in Brief" N° 8 : Agricultural market difficulties - Proposals to overcome them.

(2) COM(79)122 of 19.3.1979.

In presenting its price proposals the Commission faced the problem of having to reconcile three fundamental constraints. The deterioration of agricultural incomes militates in favour of a substantial price increase, while the growing imbalance on certain markets - notably the market in milk - and the uncontrolled growth of budgetary expenditure leave little room for any price rise (see extracts from Mr. Finn Gundelach's speech to the European Parliament on 24 March 1980 - Annex I).

The Commission attempted to reconcile the irreconcilable and proposed price rises ranging from 1.5 to 3.5 % depending on the product.

The farmers are calling for a price increase of over 7 %. The consumers appear to be somewhat divided : some of them would prefer a price freeze to the modest increase proposed by the Commission.

Meanwhile the negotiations have begun in the various Community institutions.

The object of this "Newsletter - In Brief" is to bring readers up to date on these negotiations on the eve of the meeting of the Council of Ministers of Agriculture on 21 and 22 April.

The European Parliament has been called upon to give its opinion on the agricultural price proposals for the first time since its election by universal suffrage. At its special session from 24 to 26 March Parliament did not follow the line proposed by its Committee on Agriculture (which called for a 7.9 % price increase). After a long and difficult debate it acknowledged the constraints which the Commission had aimed to reconcile but at the same time considered that the price increase proposed was insufficient, and failed to deliver an opinion either on the figures or the terms (see extracts from the opinion of the European Parliament - Annex II).

At its meeting on 27 and 28 March 1980 the Economic and Social Committee adopted a similar opinion, but put forward concrete alternatives for the application of the additional co-responsibility levy in the milk sector (see extracts from the ESC's opinion - Annex III).

The Economic and Finance Council commenced its negotiations on the matter on 11 February. It stressed, in accordance with the wishes of the European Council, the need to make substantial savings and to practise a prudent prices policy (see extract from the Council decisions - Annex IV).

The Agricultural Council has not so far adopted any decisions on the matter. It decided to extend the marketing years for milk and milk products and beef and veal until the end of April 1980 and it will devote most of its meeting on 21 and 22 April to this extremely complicated and difficult issue.

*

* . *

Attention to the budget

The budgetary aspects of the current negotiations are of particular importance this year. For the first time in its existence the Community is working on the system of "provisional twelfths" (1). Unless it can control expenditure in the milk sector in particular, the Community is in danger of exhausting its own resources in 1980 (see extracts from the document "The Trend in agricultural expenditure and its effect on the Community Budget" - Annex V).

(1) As long as the 1980 budget has not been approved, the Commission may spend a monthly amount corresponding to one twelfth of the total 1979 budget in order to continue functioning.

Extracts from the speech given by Vice-President F.O. Gundelach
before the European Parliament on 24 March 1980

"... This is the first time that you - members of the first directly elected European Parliament - participate in the decision on common agricultural prices. The decision we are called on to make is both difficult and dangerous. Our Common Agricultural Policy may collapse if we do not make the right decisions."

"... The CAP constraints"

"... What I want to do now is to put before you the basic political issues which face not only this house but the whole Community. We are subject to major constraints."

"... Like you, I consider that "in order to maintain the continuity and credibility of the Common Agricultural Policy, it is essential to solve the problem of surplus production".

Like you I am worried about the income situation of many farmers especially that of small milk producers."

"... The CAP's budget"

"... In these circumstances, I cannot understand why your Agriculture Committee makes no other reference to budgetary constraints other than to "deplore the fact that the Commission based its proposals primarily on budgetary considerations, occasionally neglecting the social repercussions of the measures planned on producers incomes". If we had done that, we

would have proposed extra exemptions to the co-responsibility levy or a costly income-support measure in the beef sector.

Nor can I understand how your Agriculture Committee can propose to this house a price package which would cost up to 2 billion units of account more in 1981 than the Commission's proposals."

"... Farm incomes"

"... But we must be careful not to be swept along by an indiscriminate income argument. Not all farm incomes have deteriorated and not all non-agricultural income have improved. Income figures for the total economy do not take account of unemployment. Today we have about 6 million people unemployed - Why ?

When rising wages, higher production costs and more intensive competition squeeze other industries, the results are higher unemployment and bankruptcies.

This squeeze is becoming worse and by the end of the year another half million people could be jobless. Can an industrial wage round where, to some extent, higher wages are offset by redundancies really be compared in all its aspects to the bargaining on agricultural prices ? Do we really believe that a farmer with some security from his own farm, the stability of rural life and the guaranteed markets provided by our policy is to be compared to an industrial worker ?

Let us also be careful when we interpret the evolution of agricultural incomes. The objective method is sound within the limits set by its own assumptions. These assumptions are arbitrary. For example, the method does not take account of increases in the volume of production, although this has been a major feature of our agriculture recently and has influenced incomes. In addition, the agri-monetary development has affected the result of the method. It certainly cannot now, and never has been, used as the only indicator.

Furthermore, there are, of course, wide variations in agricultural incomes.

In 1979, incomes rose in France and Italy not only in money but also in real terms and more than half of the Community farmers are in these two Member States.

Price rises are not an effective way to solve the income problems of small farmers. Across-the-board increases do not reduce income disparities. On the contrary, they help the big farmer more than they help the small farmer. Increasing the prices for cereals, sugar beet and pigmeat, for example, is not an effective way to help poor dairy farmers raise their incomes. If we want to help small farmers we must have significant alternatives to price increases. For this reason the Commission is proposing a series of major initiatives providing substantial community aid for poorer regions and farmers.

We have launched proposals which represents a major new direction in structural policy, so that it concentrates its aid on poorer farmers and poorer regions. The first step was the adoption last year of the measures in favour of mediterranean agriculture. The second phase was endorsed by this house at its last session. But has not yet been adopted by the Council.

- We are extending schemes to help dairy farmers convert to other types of enterprise (the non-delivery premium and the beef conversion premium).
- We are proposing a new aid scheme to boost incomes of specialist beef producers.
- We propose to exempt more small farmers in less-favoured areas from the basic co-responsibility levy.

But the extent to which the Community can go in this direction - either through agricultural or regional development actions - is governed by the financial resources it can make available. How can we make more money

available to help poorer farmers while dairy surpluses swallow a quarter of the Community's total own resources ?"

"... Milk"

"... Your Agriculture Committee stresses the urgent need to take every available opportunity to expand exports of milk products. That is what the Commission has been doing over the last three years. Last year your exports reached record levels. Take cheese. Last year we exported a quarter of a million tonnes - 30.000 tonnes more than in 1978. We have scoured the world for markets and we took them wherever we could find them. And because we have done so, we have been in trouble with part of this house. Well over 100.000 tonnes of butter went to Russia.

The truth is that our butter exports have reached their physical limit. We could only export more by practically giving it away and paying the transport costs."

"... This continuous stream of extra milk is what is draining our financial resources. It means that every year we have an extra 2 million tonnes of milk which the dairies hand to the Commission as 100.000 tonnes of butter and 200.000 tonnes of skimmed milk powder. They expect us to do the impossible and to sell it."

"... Not going ahead with an additional milk levy would add 600 or 700 million EUA's to the 1.2 billion extra already proposed by the Agriculture Committee. I do not imagine that this can be the intention of the budget authority. I have dwelt on the question of the co-responsibility levy since tough measures have to be taken in the milk sector. It is this sector that lies at the root of our problems. We cannot conclude this year's price round without effective measures to break the back of the milk surplus."

"... Agricultural prices"

"... There is no doubt that, if we take efficient measures in the milk sector, a compromise can be reached on the price issue. I have explained the

constraints. I am not inflexible. But let us not raise false expectations in our farming Community. A 7.9 % price increase is, however, for the reasons I have given, divorced from reality. The Commission remains convinced of the necessity to abolish MCA's - we have not done badly in the past year.

I restate my faith in our agricultural industry. A prosperous agricultural sector is vital for the future of our Community. Our common agricultural policy safeguards the interests of our agricultural sector. It provides security of food supply to our 260 million people - and the present oil crisis has shown us what shortages mean. But it does more than that :

- it provides raw materials for our food industry, one of the fastest growing sectors of our economy;
- it safeguards employment;
- it is already an important element in our trade, and our agricultural exports are growing by 12 1/2 % a year;
- it provides a framework for the stable development of our exports in the interest of our total economy and of our place in world trade.

This policy is worth fighting for and it is worth paying for. In 1979 we paid over 10 billion EUA for agriculture. This must be seen as an insurance premium and, seen in relation to our gross national product, the premium is not high - only 0.4 % of total output.

What is the problem ? It is the way we spend the money and the uncontrolled increase in expenditure for surplus products. While this continues, the Community will have neither the credibility nor the money to develop new policies nor tackle the income problems of poor farmers."

"... After giving the Council and the Commission a very clear signal by your refusal to adopt the 1980 budget, it is necessary for you too to reconcile the different restraints. In pursuing your rigorous efforts on

the budget, you cannot ignore the fact that your choices and your opinion will weigh heavily on the living standards of the Community's working farmers and their families."

Extracts from the Resolution of the European Parliament
(26 March 1980 - PE 64.448)

"... - Recognizes that the Commission's proposals on new agricultural prices and measures to restore balance on the markets in surplus show its willingness to tackle some of the major problem areas of the common agricultural policy;

- Shares the view that the general economic situation justifies a stringent agricultural prices policy;

- Considers that such a policy accords with the positions recently adopted by Parliament on the need to curtail agricultural expenditure in cases where there are structural surpluses;

- Considers that the legitimate objectives of preventing increases in production costs from being passed on to agricultural producers alone could primarily be attained by means of a more adequate structural policy designed to encourage efficiency and modernization of farms, while respecting budgetary constraints;"

"... - Considers, therefore, that while account must be taken of the need of producers and individual Member States to see the more immediate problems resolved satisfactorily, the current negotiations on agricultural prices and measures to restore balance on the markets must be used as an opportunity to work out a strategy for the reform of the production aspects and structures of European agriculture;

- Calls on the Commission and the Council therefore to propose and adopt, as a matter of urgency, agricultural policy measures to prevent the creation of structural surpluses in the various production sectors;"

"... - Considers that the coresponsibility levy is a useful way to reducing budget expenditure but stresses its serious disadvantages;

- Points out that the levy overpenalizes :

- . small producers who have no alternative to milk production,
- . regions in which economic and social progress depends on the development of milk production;

- Considers that the coresponsibility levy should :

- . allow those who so desire to arrive at a proper, or at any rate, a high enough production level to maintain the income earned by a family farm at an acceptable figure,
- . bring milk production under control without depriving specialized producers who are turning to products for which there is an outlet on internal and external markets of the opportunity to continue expanding, and without impending structural change;

- Stresses the importance of the exemptions provided for by the Commission in its proposals, in particular

- a) the franchise of 60,000 litres for producers in less-favoured areas;
- b) the exemption of mountain areas from any levy;"

"... - Asserts that the Community should join the International Sugar Agreement as soon as possible with a status reflecting its position in the world market and its own particular situation;"

"... - Deplores the fact that in fixing the agricultural prices for the 1980/81 marketing year, the Commission has not taken adequate account of the results of the objectives method which the Commission itself has calculated at over 7 %;

- Considers that the Commission's proposal for an average increase of 2.4 % is unacceptable and in complete contradiction with the latter's frequently reaffirmed intentions;

- Considers that the following factors must be fully taken into account when fixing agricultural prices for the next marketing year :

- a) the need to guarantee farmers a fair income;
- b) the need to assess what savings can be achieved by the measures to bring markets back into equilibrium;
- c) the need to contain the increase in expenditure within limits compatible with a sound balanced budget and complying with the criteria underlying the Commission proposals;

- Takes the view that an increase on this scale would make it easier to reduce the positive MCAs."

Annex III

Extracts from the opinion of the Economic and Social Committee
(AGRI/136 - 27.3.1980)

"... - The Commission felt it had to submit proposals based primarily on a political compromise which takes account of various factors and, in particular, the Community's budgetary difficulties and the economic and social situation.

- The Committee certainly recognizes that there is a budgetary problem and that it must be resolved as a matter of urgency. But this problem is not in itself sufficient reason for not implementing economically and socially justified farm price increases until it is resolved."

"... - Despite the large volume of production, the Commission's figures show that there was an average decrease in incomes in real terms as defined by Net Value Added of between 1.5 % and 2 % owing to rising costs. However, Net Value Added, the only basis of assessment which is easy to quantify, gives an incomplete picture of the farmers' available income, the deterioration of which may be much greater. It must be noted in this connection that farm incomes vary greatly."

"... - The Committee therefore feels that the Commission's proposals are too neglectful of farmers' income needs. Consequently, it advocates an average rise in prices higher than that proposed by the Commission, provided that this is possible in the present budgetary situation. It believes that the guidelines proposed below, those for the dairy sector in particular, could make this possible. The Committee would also ask the Commission to study how the problem of the very great differences in incomes in farming can be solved in a more adequate manner."

"... the Milk Sector

- The Commission starts out from the principle that the choice of whether or not to produce additional quantities must be left to the producers themselves. A special supplementary co-responsibility levy of 18 ECU per 100 kg of 84 % of the target price for milk, which switches the cost of disposing of surpluses to those producers who increase their production, is one means of dissuading producers from supplying more milk to the dairies than in 1979."

"... - The Committee would point out that the new guidelines recommended above, particularly those concerning the policy to be followed in the milk sector, could bring about much greater budgetary savings than would be obtained by a strict application of the measures proposed by the Commission. It should therefore be possible, in the Committee's view, to raise the prices proposed by the Commission and thus get closer to the figures which would come about through applying the objective method, insofar as the budgetary situation of the Community permits this."

Extracts from the conclusions of the Council (Economie and
Finance) of 11 February 1980

"The financial consequences of the common agricultural policy

- I. The Council, bearing in mind the conclusions of the European Council in Dublin, took note of the proposals made by the Commission on 4 December 1979 for improving the common agricultural policy with a view to helping to balance the markets and streamlining expenditure. It approved the Commission's objective of resolving the specific problems arising, in the interest of safeguards the common agricultural policy and its economic and social merits, while respecting its principles and taking account of current budgetary difficulties. This goal presupposed substantial savings and a prudent price policy.
- II. The Council considered it to be desirable that the discussions on the Commission's proposals should be guided by the following principles :
 1. An improvement of the common agricultural policy with the aim of considerably reducing the growth rate of agricultural expenditure was absolutely essential also in order to ensure that the 1 % own resources limit was not exceeded, having regard to the resources required for other policies.
 2. Subject to the examination of the assessment announced by the Commission of the foreseeable development of market organization expenditure in the event of its proposals being implemented and taking growth in expenditure over the last few years as a basis, it would be necessary to take measures leading to substantial savings, reaching the order of magnitude proposed by the Commission.

3. In this connection, the Council was of the opinion that the measures should be directed particularly at surplus products; it requested the Commission to see whether further savings might be achieved by means of the more efficient use of the market organization instruments.

III. The Council requested the Permanent Representatives Committee and the AGRI/FIN Working Party to continue examining the financial aspects of the improvement of the common agricultural policy and the report back to the Council at the very earliest opportunity, in preparation for further discussions."

The trend in agricultural expenditure and its effect
on the Community Budget

(Extracts from the Commission Working Paper SEC(80)419 of 21.3.1980)

"... Agricultural expenditure (EAGGF Guarantee Section), which accounts for some 70 % of the Community Budget, increased from 4,522 million EUA in 1975 to 10,384 million in 1979, that is, at an average annual rate of 23 %.

Over the same period, revenue (customs duties, levies and VAT) increased at an annual rate of only 12.5 %, payment of the maximum VAT portion (1 %) being assumed.

In 1979 the VAT-derived resources required to help cover budgetary expenditure represented some 0.789 % of the total revenue from VAT."

"... In all, the preliminary draft 1980 Budget presented by the Commission (totalling 16,286 million EUA) would have required, in the way of own resources, a VAT portion of some 0.89 % as compared with the maximum portion of 1 % ..."

"... the European Parliament did not approve the draft budget, even though, at the second reading, overall expenditure was cut back to 15,411 million EUA and the VAT portion reduced to 0.77 % approximately."

"... The Commission considers that the whole set of measures proposed ... or already adopted should keep the EAGGF budget down to 10,400 million EUA, which is a level comparable to the 1979 figure (10,384 million EUA) and about 800 millions EUA less than in the draft budget for 1980.

The new budget proposal for 1980 provides for overall expenditure totalling 14,712 million EUA and a VAT portion of 0.68 %, which is 0.21 % less

than the percentage required by the preliminary draft submitted by the Commission in June 1979."

"... one might have the impression that the danger of resources proving insufficient in the short term was receding. This impression would be wrong, however, the present situation being delicate in several respects.

The Commission's new budget proposals are based, firstly, on certain savings due to the market situation (both domestic and world-wide) and the active export policy pursued in 1979 (which helped to put stocks on a more balanced footing in 1980) and, secondly, on the achievement of some real control over production, particularly in the sugar and milk product sectors."

"... Thus, it must be remembered that any such savings would result from an unstable market situation which could change at relatively short notice."

"... At this stage, the Commission need simply state that any amendment of its proposals would obviously mean some adjustment of the budget estimates ..."

"... a further 1 % increase "across the board" would mean expenditure rising by 47 million EUA in respect of 1980 and
151 million EUA in respect of the twelve months;"

"... The Commission can, however, without prejudice to its final proposals, supply certain estimates of agricultural expenditure, on the basic assumption that control over markets and prices will be achieved in accordance with its proposals.

- a) The Commission thus estimates that the total 1981 appropriations for the EAGGF Guarantee Section should amount to 11,600 million EUA, which is 11.5 % more than in its new budget proposal for 1980.
- b) On the other hand, if no control is achieved over the CAP mechanisms or prices and if agricultural expenditure continues to rise at the same rate as during the period 1975-1979, the appropriations for 1981 would have to total some 13,700 million EUA, that is, 18 % more than the expenditure

incurred if the Commission's proposals are adopted. It should also be noted that, if the proposals of the Committee of Agriculture are adopted, expenditure in 1981 will rise by up to 2,000 million EUA (17 %) more than it would if the Commission's proposals were adopted."

"... On the assumption, however, that the 1 % VAT limit is not exceeded, the total own resources potentially available will increase only by some 1,650 million EUA, i.e. by less than 10 %, between 1980 and 1981.

If one makes the modest assumption that non-agricultural expenditure in 1981 will be only 25 % more than under the new budget proposal for 1980, and if the Commission's proposals concerning the agricultural sector are adopted, the margin of own resources potentially available will be some 2,200 million EUA. This would necessitate a VAT portion of about 0.80 %. On the other hand, if agricultural expenditure continues to rise as in recent years, the 1 % limit will be reached in 1981, just as it would if the proposals from the Committee on Agriculture were adopted."

Extracts from Communications of the Commission to
the European Council

I. Communication of 7.12.1978 (COM(78)700)

"... - The Common Agricultural Policy is and always has been a cornerstone in the construction of the Community. Its objectives, as defined in Article 39 of the Treaty of Rome, have lost none of their validity ... It is also a major factor in world trade. Its political, economic and social consequences range far beyond agriculture. In addition the way in which its budget is borne by the Community rather than by member governments has been an engine of European integration."

" - In recent years the application of the Common Agricultural Policy has met with serious difficulties. It faces three fundamental problems. First, the imbalance between supply and demand in several major agricultural markets is worsening. Secondly, incomes disparities within the agricultural sector remain substantial. Thirdly, monetary upheavels have disrupted the common agricultural market."

" - The imbalance between supply and demand in several major agricultural markets is worsening. Structural surpluses exist for milk and sugar ...

... These increasing imbalances are due to a certain number of factors. A rapidly growing productivity leads to an explosion of production; this evolution is encouraged by the level and the unlimited nature of price support. Internal consumption is stagnating, while export opportunities are limited. The problem is aggravated by such extraneous factors as certain import obligations."

" - The Commission asks the European Council to endorse the following guidelines for future policy ... :

- a) Prices : The Commission believes that a rigorous price policy is essential so long as major market imbalances exist ...
- b) Milk : The biggest single problem is in the milk sector. From the beginning of the 1979/80 marketing year, the Commission proposes that any increase in milk production would automatically induce either a reduction in intervention prices or an increase in the co-responsibility levy in the milk sector. The co-responsibility levy would make additional funds available for financing key elements of our milk policy ...
- c) Structural policy : Existing structural directives should be strengthened and adapted to take better account on regional needs, specific market difficulties, and the changing economic environment ..."

"... - The Commission believes that alongside the restoration of market equilibrium and dismantling of Monetary Compensatory Amounts there would be a reduction in the expenditure on agriculture. This involves some provision of funds for transitional expenditure to alleviate the social consequences."

II. Communication of 22.11.1979 (COM(79)690 final)

"... In making its proposals the Commission has been guided by the following principles :

- high priority must be given to bringing balance to agricultural markets, especially for milk and sugar. This should be done by increasing internal consumption inside and outside the Community where this is feasible; and by restraining production,
- for products in structural surplus, the cost of getting rid of future increases in production must fall on producers themselves,
- unbearable income effects for small and medium-sized producers with no alternative types of production must be alleviated. The Commission is undertaking immediately a further examination of the situation of these producers,
- available resources for the restructuring and development of agriculture should be concentrated on poorer farms and less developed regions.

The Commission's proposals include ... a milk package involving a new approach to co-responsibility which would comprise a basic co-responsibility levy and a supplementary levy related to the costs of new surplus disposal ..."

"... If these measures are not taken, the Community's own resources will soon be exhausted by the agricultural budget. Other more drastic measures adversely affecting the CAP would then be necessary.

The Commission, therefore, invites the European Council to endorse the broad objectives ... and to ensure that early decisions are taken on the new proposals, with a view to alleviating the budget and to strengthening the Common Agricultural Policy."

List of documents and publications concerning agricultural
price proposals 1980/81

- Proposals concerning agricultural structural policy (presented by the Commission to the Council) - COM(79)122 final - 19.3.1979

- Amendments to the Common Agricultural Policy aimed at balancing markets and rationalizing expenditure (Communication from the Commission to the Council) - COM(79)710 final - 29.11.1979

- Commission proposal concerning price fixing for certain agricultural products, and certain related measures
COM(80)10 final - Volume I 7.2.1980
 Volume I Add. 14.2.1980
 Volume II 15.2.1980

- The Agricultural situation in the Community - 1979 Report
COM(80)11 - 23.1.1980

- The growth of agricultural expenditure and its effect on the Community budget (Meeting paper of Commission services) - SEC(80)419 - 21.3.1980

- Opinion of the European Parliament - PE 64.448 - 26.3.1980

- Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee - AGRI/136 - 27.3.1980

- The Commission of the European Communities proposes agricultural prices for the 1980/81 marketing year : Green Europe - In Brief No. 7 - February 1980

- Difficulties on agricultural markets and proposals for restoring balance Green Europe - In Brief No. 8 - February 1980 (not yet published)

- Common Agricultural Prices for 1980/81 - The Facts : Green Europe - In Brief No. 9 - March 1980