



The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

Gt. Brit. Agric



GIANNINI FOUNDATION OF
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS
LIBRARY

AUG- 2 1968

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT UNIT • UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

Farmers and the Common Market

B H Davey & S J Rogers

1

THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT UNIT

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

In recent years the forces of change have been reshaping the whole economy and, in the process, the economic framework of our society has been subject to pressures from which the agricultural sector of the economy is not insulated. The rate of technical advance and innovation in agriculture has increased, generating inescapable economic forces. The organisation of production and marketing, as well as the social structure, come inevitably under stress.

In February 1966 the Agricultural Adjustment Unit was established within the Department of Agricultural Economics at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. This was facilitated by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation at Battle Creek, Michigan, U.S.A. The purpose of the Unit is to collect and disseminate information concerning the changing role of agriculture in the British and Irish economies, in the belief that a better understanding of the problems and processes of change can lead to a smoother, less painful and more efficient adaptation to new conditions.

Publications

To achieve its major aim of disseminating information the Unit will be publishing a series of pamphlets, bulletins and books covering various aspects of agricultural adjustment. These publications will arise in a number of ways. They may report on special studies carried out by individuals; they may be the result of joint studies; they may be the reproduction of papers prepared in a particular context, but thought to be of more general interest.

The Unit would welcome comments on its publications and suggestions for future work. The Unit would also welcome approaches from other organisations and groups interested in the subject of agricultural adjustment. All such enquiries should be addressed to the Director of the Unit.

Unit Staff

Director:	Professor J. Ashton, M.A., B.Litt, M.S.
Head of Unit:	S. J. Rogers, B.Sc. (<i>Econ</i>)
Administrative Officer:	I. F. Baillie, C.M.G., O.B.E., M.A.

The Agricultural Adjustment Unit,
Department of Agricultural Economics,
The University,
Newcastle upon Tyne 1.
Tel: Newcastle 28511 *Ext.* 794.

FARMERS AND THE COMMON MARKET

B. H. DAVEY & S. J. ROGERS

Paper No. 1

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT UNIT
UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

1967

I. INTRODUCTION

Background

If, later this year, the negotiations for British membership of the European Community commence, one of the major issues which will arise is the problem posed for agriculture and the economy at large of changing over to the European system of supporting agriculture by means of import levies, support buying and subsidisation of exports. Agricultural and food issues will occupy a crucial role in the negotiations, not only because the future prosperity of British farming will be at stake, but also because of the effects which the E.E.C. Common Agricultural Policy (C.A.P.) will have on our cost of living and balance of payments.

The White Paper published by the Government in May 1967 (The Common Agricultural Policy of the European Economic Community, Cmnd. 3274) described the basic differences between the C.A.P. and the British system of supporting agriculture. In brief, there are three essential differences:

- (1) Producers' returns in the E.E.C. are largely dependent upon the successful maintenance of market prices by levies and tariffs on imports, by support buying for those commodities where import protection alone is insufficient and by export subsidies. This does not afford producers the same degree of assurance as our own system under which returns from the market are supplemented by deficiency payments up to a guaranteed level.
- (2) Under the E.E.C. system the main cost of agricultural support is borne by the consumer in the market prices paid for food items. In the U.K., on the other hand, the cost is largely borne by the taxpayer, the consumer paying a price which approximates to the world market price for the commodity.
- (3) There is also a difference in the regime applied to imports. The E.E.C. operates a basically protectionist system under which the interests of domestic producers are safeguarded by means of import restrictions. The U.K. system allows relatively free access to imports and supports home producers through deficiency payments.

This is a rather simplified version of the differences between the E.E.C. and U.K. agricultural systems. For instance, the U.K. does exercise some restraints on the level of agricultural imports and the taxpayer in the E.E.C. does bear part of the cost of agricultural support. But the differences in method and their impact on the economy are substantial. These differences, in turn, reflect a basic difference in the situation of the E.E.C. and the U.K. in that the E.E.C. is largely self-sufficient in temperate foodstuffs whereas the U.K. imports about one-third of its requirements.

The effects of adopting the C.A.P. were estimated by the Government (Cmnd. 3274). It was expected that the aggregate net income of the industry would be at

about the same level as if we were outside the Community, but this income would be distributed somewhat differently as between commodities, types of farm and areas. Because of the differences in relative product prices and factor costs arable farms and lowland cattle and sheep farms will fare better than those concentrating on milk, pig and poultry production. The increase in the cost of food to the consumer might be between 10–14 per cent, equivalent to an increase of $2\frac{1}{2}$ – $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the cost of living, reflecting the different method of financing agricultural support. The annual net cost to the U.K. balance of payments of applying the C.A.P. might be £175–250 million because the proceeds of the import levies, which would be substantial in the case of a major food importing country like the U.K., must be paid into the E.E.C. Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, in addition to any direct payment which may be required.* It is small wonder then that on 2nd May, 1967, the Prime Minister, announcing the Government's decision to apply for membership of the E.E.C., singled out for special mention the problems affecting 'the cost of living . . . the structure and wellbeing of British agriculture . . . and balance of payments'.

In the six months immediately preceding the decision to apply for membership a lot of information was published which analysed and assessed the implications for farming and the economy of adopting the C.A.P. This literature included the results of analyses conducted by University agricultural economists, the results of an N.F.U. study on British agriculture and the Common Market and more popular articles in the daily, weekly and farming press. These publications described the E.E.C. agricultural policies and support arrangements and provided information on the wider implications of the C.A.P. for agriculture, the cost of living and balance of payments.

Entry into the E.E.C. will give rise to substantial changes in the price relationships and institutional framework within which U.K. agriculture will have to operate. To find out what opinions farmers had formed about the possible effects of British membership of the Community on their own farming, on agriculture and on the economy as a whole and the steps required to adjust to the new regime, a postal survey was conducted by the Agricultural Adjustment Unit.

The Questionnaire

A questionnaire was designed which would enable farmers' knowledge of the C.A.P. to be measured and their opinions about possible membership of the Com-

*For a full description of the C.A.P. and an analysis of its impact on the U.K. the reader is referred to the following publications:

1. Dr. J. Van Lierde. *Adaptation in European Agriculture and the Common Agricultural Policy. Economic Change and Agriculture*, Oliver and Boyd, 1967.
2. *The Common Agricultural Policy of the European Economic Community*. Cmnd. 3274.
3. T. K. Warley. *Agriculture: The Cost of Joining the Common Market*. Chatham House and P.E.P. European Series No. 3. April 1967.
4. *British Agriculture and the Common Market*. N.F.U. Information Service. November 1966.

mon Market to be assessed. The questions fell into three groups. The first section asked about the enterprise pattern on the farm, farm acreage and number of workers employed; farmers were also asked to indicate when they started farming as it was thought that this might affect their views on the Common Market. The second group asked for farmers' opinions about the Common Market. Questions were asked about the likely effects of the C.A.P. on the respondents' own system of farming, in terms of expected changes in profitability, whether any changes in system of farming would be made and the length of transitional period which the farmer thought would be needed to enable him to adjust his farming to the new conditions. He was also asked for his views about the effect of entry into Europe on agriculture as a whole, whether any special arrangements for farming should be sought during the negotiations and if there were overriding political and economic advantages favouring British membership of the Community. Finally, in an attempt to measure the extent of knowledge concerning the C.A.P., questions were asked about the general principles underlying the policy and some of its detailed provisions; three general questions about farming in the Community were also included. A copy of the questionnaire is at Appendix I.

II. THE SAMPLE

The survey was based on a sample of farmers provided by the Agricultural Development Association at York. Altogether, some 8,800 addresses were provided by A.D.A. This sample, in the main, was comprised of members of the four agricultural societies which are affiliated to A.D.A.*, but it also included a sample of about 2,000 arable farmers. In addition, a small sample of 200 farms in the four northern counties of England was also available making a total sampling frame of 9,000 farms. The farms were concentrated in the Eastern half of England, the Midlands and the North-West, with relatively few farms in Southern England, the South-West and Wales. Because of the geographical distribution of the sample, its non-random nature, and its distribution as between type and size of farm, care must be taken in interpreting the results of this survey. In particular, one must be cautious in generalising from the results about the attitudes of farmers in England as a whole. Despite these limitations this enquiry provides an indication of farmers' knowledge of the Common Market and about the opinions they hold with regard to British membership of the European Economic Community. Especially, it is felt that the results are indicative of the views and opinions of the more forward-looking and influential farmers who play an active role in public affairs generally.

*Bath and West and Southern Counties Society, Peterborough Agricultural Society, Shropshire and West Midlands Agricultural Society, and Yorkshire Agricultural Society.

Initially, 9,006 questionnaires were distributed on 18th and 19th April, 1967. Two thousand one hundred replies were received within four weeks, a response rate of 23.4 per cent. A second approach was made between 17th and 25th May to those farmers who had not responded. This second approach was made after the decision to apply for membership of the E.E.C. had been announced and after the Government's White Paper on the C.A.P. had been published, with its attendant publicity and press comments. This brought in a further 1,230 replies, giving a total response of 3,330 (37 per cent). A response rate of 30-40 per cent is considered quite normal for this type of postal survey,¹ although it was hoped that the topic was of sufficient interest and importance to evoke a rather higher figure.

Of the 3,330 replies which were received, 330 were not used for the reasons stated below:

TABLE 1

	<i>Number of Replies</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
Incomplete information	79	23.9
Not engaged in farming, e.g. retired	118	35.8
Refused to co-operate	50	15.1
Received too late for analysis ²	83	25.2
Total	330	100.0

Thus 3,000 replies were available for analysis, 2,000 from the initial sample and 1,000 from the follow-up sample.

The regional distribution of the usable replies was as follows:

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF REPLIES BY REGION

<i>P.A.E.S. Region³</i>	<i>Number of Usable Replies</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
Northern	201	6.7
North-eastern	441	14.7
East Midlands	752	25.1
Eastern	768	25.6
South Eastern	5	0.2
Southern	73	2.4
Western	118	3.9
South-western	2	0.1
North-western	637	21.2
Wales	3	0.1
Total	3,000	100.0

¹ See, for instance, C. A. Moser, *Survey Methods in Social Investigation*.

² In order to minimise the burden of computer programming and to avoid a long delay in analysing the replies, a closing date was established to coincide with the receipt of 3,000 usable replies.

³ For definition of P.A.E.S. regions, See Appendix II.

The replies were classified by type and size of farming, the following system being used to classify farms by type:

CLASSIFICATION	TYPE OF FARMING CLASS
More than 50% of sales derived from:	
Milk	Dairy
Cattle and sheep	Livestock
Pigs, poultry and eggs	Pigs and poultry
Cereals, potatoes and sugar beet	Cropping
Horticultural crops	Horticulture
No more than 50% of sales from any main enterprise	Mixed

The distribution of the 3,000 usable replies was as follows:

TABLE 3
CLASSIFICATION OF REPLIES BY TYPE AND SIZE OF FARM

Type of Farm	Size of Farm—Crops and Grass Acreage													
	Under 50		50-99		100-149		150-299		300-499		500 & over		All Sizes	
	1st sam-ple	2nd sam-ple	1st sam-ple	2nd sam-ple	1st sam-ple	2nd sam-ple	1st sam-ple	2nd sam-ple	1st sam-ple	2nd sam-ple	1st sam-ple	2nd sam-ple	1st sam-ple	2nd sam-ple
Dairy 42	41	86	76	61	35	66	33	22	12	10	3	287	200
Livestock 17	11	26	15	18	8	34	15	25	12	22	11	142	72
Pigs and Poultry 114	59	28	19	16	10	29	12	18	8	16	2	221	110
Cropping 12	15	43	30	73	45	259	123	241	85	320	129	948	427
Horticulture 3	4	4	2	2	1	8	2	6	1	11	3	34	13
Mixed 19	16	42	24	40	25	94	44	88	30	85	39	368	178
All Types 207	146	229	166	210	124	490	229	400	148	464	187	2,000	1,000

A classification of farms according to the percentage of sales derived from each enterprise is not an ideal method. It ignores valuation differences and makes difficult any precise comparison with the national statistics on farm classification, which are, of course, based on Standard Man-days. It is still possible to generalise, however, and it appears that the sample differs from the national farming structure since it includes a much higher proportion of cropping farms, a lower proportion of dairy and horticultural farms, and a higher proportion of large farms. Except for horticulture, there are sufficient farms of each type for a meaningful analysis by type and size of farm to be undertaken.

It is interesting that there were some differences in the proportion of farm types and sizes between the initial 2,000 replies and the subsequent 1,000 received following the distribution of a reminder. The second group contained a higher proportion of small farms and dairy farms; in this way it was more representative of the national farming structure. There were statistically significant differences between the first and second samples.⁴

The remainder of the report describes the results of the analysis. Firstly, the knowledge group of questions have been analysed in Part III. In Part IV the replies to the opinion questions are discussed. Finally, the main findings of this enquiry have been summarised in Part V.

III. KNOWLEDGE OF COMMON MARKET FARMING AND AGRICULTURAL POLICY

The eleven questions about farming and agricultural policy in the Common Market can be grouped under three broad headings, namely:

- (i) the general principles of the E.E.C. Common Agricultural Policy (questions 23, 24, 25, 26).
- (ii) the detailed commodity and other support arrangements covered by existing C.A.P. regulations (questions 27, 28, 29, 30).
- (iii) farming in the six countries of the E.E.C. (questions 31, 32, 33).

Questions 23 to 30 concerned the C.A.P. as it exists at present. It is recognised that entry into the E.E.C. by Britain, Ireland and some of the E.F.T.A. countries might necessitate the amendment of some aspects of the C.A.P.

(i) General Principles of the Common Agricultural Policy

The replies to the group of four questions relating to the general principles of the C.A.P. are summarised in the following table.

⁴ Significance tests were applied to the statistical data and, in the cases quoted in the text, the differences were significant at the 5 per cent or 1 per cent levels. However, in the interests of simplicity, these analyses have not been included in the report. An example may suffice to indicate the general picture. On the knowledge score the sample differences were as follows (D_{2000} = dairy farmers in first sample, C_{1000} = cropping farmers in the second sample, etc.):

D_{2000} and D_{1000}	different at 5% level		
C_{2000} and C_{1000}	"	"	1% "
M_{2000} and M_{1000}	"	"	1% "
D_{2000} and M_{2000}	"	"	1% "
D_{2000} and C_{2000}	"	"	1% "
M_{2000} and C_{2000}	not significantly different		
D_{1000} and M_{1000}	"	"	"
D_{1000} and C_{1000}	"	"	"
M_{1000} and C_{1000}	"	"	"

TABLE 4
GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF C.A.P.

<i>Question</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>About the same</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	%	%	%	%
Would the deficiency payment system be replaced by price support based on import levies and support buying? ..	67	8	—	26
Would restrictions on trade in horticultural products between Britain and the Common Market be removed? ..	65	3	—	32
Would consumer food prices be higher, lower or about the same?	94	0	2	4
Would Government support of agriculture from general taxation increase? ..	12	66	—	22

Possibly the most striking feature of the replies to this set of questions is that the highest percentage of correct replies related to the question which has the least direct impact on the farmers as farmers, namely the likelihood of higher consumer food prices in the Common Market, although it is one of the crucial issues for consumers. This is perhaps not so surprising since this aspect has probably received more publicity than any of the other issues raised by potential British membership of the E.E.C.

About two-thirds of the farmers had a grasp of the general principles underlying the C.A.P. which jointly contribute to this rise in food prices. As pointed out in the introduction, these principles include a shift over from the British deficiency payment system to price support based on import levies against third countries and support buying in the domestic market, with a consequent decline in the support of agriculture out of general taxation (although not necessarily a decline in total government expenditure). About a quarter of the farmers were unaware of these fundamental changes in the method and financing of farm price support which will have to take place if we join the Common Market. About a third did not appreciate the basic economic feature of the E.E.C., namely that the six member countries have formed a customs union under which restrictions in international trade, including horticulture, between members will be removed. This is rather surprising for, whilst there is an element of uncertainty regarding certain features of the support arrangements in the E.E.C., there can be no such doubts about the general principles of trade and support policy in the Common Market.

(ii) Detailed Support Arrangements in the E.E.C.

A much higher state of knowledge was displayed about the detailed support arrangements which have been formulated in the Common Market, especially the prices received by farmers for their produce.

TABLE 5
DETAILED ARRANGEMENTS WITHIN C.A.P.

<i>Question</i>	<i>Higher</i>	<i>Lower</i>	<i>About the same</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Would farm-gate prices of cereals be higher, lower or about the same? ..	82	3	6	9
Would farm-gate prices of beef be higher, lower or about the same? ..	83	2	5	10
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	
	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	
Would the calf subsidy and beef cow subsidy have to be withdrawn?.. ..	61	9	30	
Would farm improvement grants, and grants for farm amalgamations and structural improvements have to be withdrawn?	27	40	33	

That farmers should have a good knowledge of agricultural prices in the E.E.C. is only to be expected because of the effects which changes in prices would have on farm incomes if we joined the Common Market. Not surprisingly, the groups of farmers who would be most directly affected by the higher prices for cereals in the Common Market—cropping, pig and poultry, and mixed farmers—had a greater appreciation of them, but, as Table 6 shows, there were no great type of farming variations in the case of beef prices, which would also be higher, except for mixed farmers and the very small group of horticulturists.

TABLE 6
KNOWLEDGE OF E.E.C. FARM PRICES BY TYPE OF FARM

<i>Type of Farming</i>	<i>Per cent of farmers who knew that cereal prices would be higher in E.E.C.</i>	<i>Per cent of farmers who knew that beef prices would be higher in E.E.C.</i>
Dairy	75	83
Livestock	74	82
Pigs and Poultry	85	82
Cropping	84	83
Horticulture	68	66
Mixed	86	89
All Types	82	83

There seems to be a slightly poorer state of knowledge about the future of the various production grants under Common Market conditions. Only 61 per cent knew that the calf subsidy and beef cow subsidy would probably have to be withdrawn to conform with E.E.C. regulations concerning free competition between member states, and especially state aids which could distort the cost of production of particular commodities. But this is understandable since each grant or production subsidy would be examined by the Common Market authorities after entry to determine its compatibility or otherwise with Community regulations. Moreover, relatively few of the respondents appreciated the emphasis in the C.A.P. on assistance for improving the structure of agriculture in member countries. Only 40 per cent knew that existing E.E.C. regulations would permit the continuation of farm improvement grants and grants for farm amalgamations and structural improvements. One would have expected a higher proportion of correct replies to this question, particularly since three-quarters of the farmers knew that farms are, on average, smaller in the Common Market and in view of the widely discussed farm structural problem in Europe necessitating the wholesale amalgamation and consolidation of small and fragmented holdings into larger and more economic units. The advantage which Britain holds over the E.E.C. countries in this respect has often been used to stress the relatively strong competitive position which British farming occupies vis-à-vis Europe.

(iii) Farming in the Common Market

The final group of questions in the knowledge section of the questionnaire were concerned with more general aspects of farming in the Common Market. The replies to these questions are summarised below.

TABLE 7
FARMING IN THE COMMON MARKET

<i>Question</i>	<i>Larger</i>	<i>Smaller</i>	<i>About the same</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Compared with Britain:				
Are farms in the Common Market larger, smaller or about the same size? ..	3	75	13	9
	<i>Higher</i>	<i>Lower</i>		
Is the level of self-sufficiency for food supplies in the Common Market higher, lower or about the same?	52	15	17	16
Is the proportion of the working population engaged in agriculture higher, lower or about the same?	73	6	6	15

Three-quarters of the farmers knew that, on average, farms are smaller in the Common Market countries than in Britain and that a higher proportion of the working population in the Common Market is engaged in agriculture. But only half knew that the level of self-sufficiency for food supplies was higher in the Common Market; one might also have expected a higher proportion of correct replies to this question since Britain is, of course, the major food importing country in the world and has operated for many years a food policy based on fairly free access for imports. Some statistics relating to the size of farm, level of self-sufficiency and proportion of the working population engaged in agriculture in the U.K. and the E.E.C. are given in Appendix III.

Overall Knowledge of Common Market Farming and Agricultural Policy

Although the replies to the individual knowledge questions are of some interest, indicating differences in the state of farmers' knowledge between various aspects of E.E.C. agriculture, an assessment of the overall knowledge of Common Market farming and agricultural policy is probably of much greater significance, especially to those who have been concerned with conveying information on the Common Market to farmers, since such an assessment is indicative of the success they have achieved. Each reply to the questionnaire was therefore coded with a 'Total Score' corresponding to the number of correct answers given to the eleven knowledge questions on the questionnaire; the range in scores was from 0 to 11.

The distribution of the total scores was as follows:

TABLE 8

OVERALL KNOWLEDGE OF C.A.P. AND COMMON MARKET FARMING

<i>Total Score</i>	<i>Number of Farmers</i>	<i>Assessment of Knowledge</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
0	65	Poor	5
1	42		
2	56		
3	94	Moderate	14
4	138		
5	202		
6	277	Fair	37
7	356		
8	441		
9	534	Good	44
10	539		
11	256		
	3,000		100

By and large, therefore, the farmers in this sample had a fairly good overall knowledge of agricultural conditions in the E.E.C. There were, however, some interesting differences as between type and size of farm as the following table shows.

TABLE 9
AVERAGE SCORE BY TYPE AND SIZE OF FARM

(i) TOTAL SAMPLE—3,000 FARMS

				<i>Under</i> 50 <i>acres</i>	50-99 <i>acres</i>	100-149 <i>acres</i>	150-299 <i>acres</i>	300-499 <i>acres</i>	500 <i>acres &</i> <i>over</i>	<i>All</i> <i>Sizes</i>
Dairy	6.4	6.4	7.3	7.6	8.4	8.8	7.0
Livestock	6.2	6.1	5.8	7.0	7.6	8.8	7.0
Pigs and Poultry	7.3	7.5	6.7	8.1	9.5	8.8	7.6
Cropping	5.5	6.4	6.9	7.4	7.9	8.4	7.7
Horticulture	5.3	4.8	4.0	7.5	6.4	8.6	6.8
Mixed	7.5	6.2	7.5	7.7	8.1	8.6	7.8
All Types	6.8	6.5	7.0	7.5	8.0	8.4	7.5

(ii) INITIAL RESPONSE—2,000 FARMS

Dairy	6.6	6.7	7.1	8.1	8.4	9.2	7.3
Livestock	5.7	7.0	5.4	7.4	8.4	8.5	7.2
Pigs and Poultry	7.5	7.6	8.3	8.4	9.5	8.8	7.9
Cropping	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.8	8.2	8.6	8.1
Horticulture	5.7	5.5	6.0	7.0	6.8	8.5	7.1
Mixed	8.2	6.2	8.1	8.4	8.3	8.8	8.2
All Types	7.2	6.8	7.2	7.9	8.3	8.6	7.9

(iii) SECOND RESPONSE—1,000 FARMS

Dairy	6.2	6.1	7.6	6.6	8.4	7.7	6.6
Livestock	7.0	4.5	6.6	6.1	6.1	9.5	6.5
Pigs and Poultry	7.0	7.3	4.2	7.6	9.5	9.0	7.0
Cropping	4.2	5.3	6.5	6.7	7.3	7.9	7.0
Horticulture	5.0	3.5	0	9.5	4.0	9.0	5.9
Mixed	6.8	6.1	6.6	6.1	7.5	8.1	6.9
All Types	6.4	5.9	6.6	6.6	7.4	8.0	6.8

Two main features emerge from this analysis. Firstly, there is a clear tendency for larger farmers to have a better knowledge and understanding of the Common Market than smaller farmers. This could be due to two reasons—the possibility that larger farmers are better educated and more intelligent, or because they spend

less time on manual farm work and have more time available to take an interest in the world outside the farm gate. It is interesting that farmers in the 50-99 acre group seem to know less about the Common Market than farmers with less than 50 acres; this could be the result of the inclusion of part-time farmers in the latter group. There was also some variation between types of farming, in that pig and poultry, cropping and mixed farmers had a better knowledge than dairy and livestock farmers.

Secondly, the scores in the initial response of 2,000 farms were higher than those in the follow-up response of 1,000. This suggests that the first sample represented the more forward-looking and better-informed sections of the farming community, whereas the second sample may be more typical of the general run of farmers. It may be, therefore, that the results of the survey may be biased in favour of the upper bracket of farmers and give a more favourable impression of the state of knowledge about the Common Market than is justified. This view is reinforced by a comparison of the size and type of farms in the sample and the structure of farming in England and Wales.

It was thought that the time of starting farming might influence the total scores, with the newer, and presumably younger, entrants into the farming industry having a better knowledge of the Common Market than their elders. The farmers were therefore divided into two groups (a) those who started farming before 1945 and (b) those who began in 1945 and after. The overall rating of the two groups was as follows:

TABLE 10
KNOWLEDGE OF COMMON MARKET BY
TIME OF STARTING FARMING

<i>Knowledge of Common Market</i>					<i>Time of Starting Farming</i>	
					<i>Before 1945</i>	<i>1945 and after</i>
					%	%
Good	39	50
Fair	37	35
Moderate	18	11
Poor	6	4
Total	100	100
Average Score					7.2	7.9

It is apparent, therefore, that the newer entrants into farming do have a better knowledge of Common Market farming and agricultural policy than elder farmers. As will be seen later, they are also less conservative in their views about British entry into the E.E.C.

IV. OPINIONS ON THE COMMON MARKET

The group of opinion questions can also be grouped under three main headings:

- (i) the effect of joining the Common Market on the respondent's own farming activities (questions 9 to 19).
- (ii) The effect on U.K. agriculture as a whole, including the need for safeguards for British farming in the E.E.C. (questions 6, 7, 8 and 20).
- (iii) general views about the desirability of British membership of the E.E.C. (questions 21 and 22).

(i) Effects on Farming of Joining the E.E.C.

Entry into the Common Market would have a substantial effect on the pattern and profitability of British agriculture. While aggregate net farm income could be at the same level as if we were outside the Community, this income would be distributed very differently between commodities, types of farm and regions. Cereal growers, beef and sheep farmers would benefit from higher prices for their products, but dairy, pig and poultry farmers would be faced with higher costs for feed—their major input—without compensatory increases in their product prices. Thus, those lowland areas of the country which are mainly arable or are producing cattle and sheep would do better than areas concentrating on milk and intensive livestock. These changes in relative profitability would inevitably affect the pattern of U.K. agricultural output. It is reasonable to assume that there would be an immediate response to higher cereal prices and some modification of livestock production, with beef expanding at the expense of milk, a switch to systems based on grass rather than concentrates and further specialisation and large scale production of pigs and poultry.

Farmers were asked to indicate their own assessment of the effects of entry into the Common Market on the profitability of their existing farming systems and whether they envisaged making any changes to their farming as a direct consequence of British entry into the Common Market. Farmers as a whole seemed to take a rather pessimistic view of their prospects in the Common Market. Less than a quarter of the farmers thought that their profits would be higher in the Common Market. Only a third of cropping farmers and a quarter of livestock farmers thought they would earn higher incomes in the E.E.C., although these two groups could be expected to benefit most from higher Common Market prices for cereals and beef. On the other hand, these farmers viewed their prospects in a more favourable light than dairy, pig and poultry farmers and horticulturists.

TABLE 11

IF BRITAIN JOINED THE COMMON MARKET DO YOU EXPECT THAT PROFITS FROM YOUR PRESENT FARMING SYSTEM WOULD BE HIGHER, LOWER OR ABOUT THE SAME?

				Higher	Lower	About the same	Don't know
				%	%	%	%
Dairy	8	51	33	8
Livestock	25	33	34	8
Pigs and Poultry	12	49	32	6
Cropping	32	17	43	8
Horticulture	11	55	30	4
Mixed	21	28	42	9
All Types	23	30	39	8

In view of the uncertainty regarding the current negotiations, it was not surprising to find that only about 30 per cent of the farmers had plans for changing their farming systems as a direct result of British entry into the Common Market.

TABLE 12

CHANGES IN FARMING SYSTEMS ACCORDING TO ASSESSMENT OF EFFECT OF ENTRY INTO E.E.C. ON PROFITABILITY OF OWN FARMING

<i>If Britain joined the Common Market do you expect that profits from your present farming system would be:</i>					<i>Would you make any changes to your system of farming as a direct result of British entry into E.E.C.?</i>			
					Yes	No	Don't know	Total
					%	%	%	%
Higher	32	55	13	100
Lower	37	34	29	100
About the same	25	53	22	100
Don't know	12	27	61	100
Total	29	46	25	100

A higher proportion of those farmers who expect their profits to be reduced in the Common Market intended to modify their farming systems. Even in this group, however, nearly two-thirds of the farmers had no plans at present to change their farming in the Common Market. The younger, newer entrants to farming were slightly more positive in their intentions. Thirty-two per cent of farmers who began farming in and after 1945 had plans to modify their farming in the Common Market compared with 26 per cent of those who began before 1945.

There was, however, a much greater correlation between farmers' overall knowledge of the Common Market and their plans for changing their farming systems in the E.E.C. Farmers with a fair or good knowledge were much more likely to be formulating their plans in anticipation of entry into the E.E.C. than those with a poor or moderate knowledge.

TABLE 13
CHANGES IN FARMING SYSTEMS ACCORDING TO OVERALL
KNOWLEDGE OF COMMON MARKET

<i>Knowledge of Common Market</i>	<i>Per cent of farmers having plans for changing their farming systems in E.E.C.</i>					
Good	34
Fair	33
Moderate	20
Poor	6

The survey provides a broad indication of the way in which the decisions of individual farmers could affect the pattern of U.K. agricultural output if we join the Common Market. The farmers who said that they would be modifying their farming systems also indicated the specific changes in crops and livestock which they proposed to make. Their replies enable some assessment to be made of the changes in production. These findings have to be interpreted with some care both because of the small number of farmers involved and because no attempt was made to quantify the changes on individual farms.

TABLE 14
NUMBER OF FARMERS INCREASING OR DECREASING
PRODUCTION OF SELECTED ENTERPRISES IN THE
COMMON MARKET

<i>Enterprise</i>						<i>Increase</i>	<i>Decrease</i>
Cereals	490	57
Roots (Potatoes and Sugar Beet)	117	185
Dairy Cattle	124	120
Beef Cattle	451	45
Sheep	138	82
Pigs	117	186
Poultry	29	146
Horticultural Crops	31	124

The pattern which emerges is not unexpected. There may be substantial increases in beef and cereals production and a smaller expansion in sheep. On the other hand, poultry and horticultural production may decrease and so may pigs and roots, though probably not to the same extent. Dairy cattle may show little change.

Some diversification may take place on dairy and livestock farms. This would be counter to recent trends towards the simplification of farming systems and the concentration and specialisation of production. By way of contrast, on cropping and mixed farms there could be a greater degree of concentration and specialisation. But the small number of farms involved means that only the broadest predictions can be made of future changes in enterprise patterns on different types of farm.

(ii) British Agriculture in the Common Market

By a small margin, it seems that a majority of the farmers in this sample feel that British agriculture would not benefit from entry into the existing Common Market system.

Nevertheless, nearly two-fifths of the respondents thought that farming would generally benefit from British membership of the E.E.C. However, when answering this question, farmers were influenced by the probable effects of entry into the Common Market on their own farming systems. A much higher proportion of dairy, livestock, pig and poultry and horticultural farmers thought that British agriculture would not benefit from entry into the Common Market; these farmers were also those who thought they would be more likely to suffer financially in the Common Market. Cropping and mixed farmers, on the other hand, were more disposed to accept that agriculture would derive general benefit from the Common Market, just as they expected their own farming to gain.

TABLE 15

Type of Farming	Do you think that British Agriculture as a whole would benefit from entry into the existing Common Market system?			If Britain joined the Common Market, do you expect that profits from your present farming system would be:			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Higher	Lower	About same	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Dairy	21	61	18	8	51	33	8
Livestock	30	55	15	25	33	34	8
Pigs and Poultry	34	56	10	12	49	32	6
Cropping	43	40	17	32	17	43	8
Horticulture	28	59	13	11	55	30	4
Mixed	40	42	18	21	28	42	9
All Types	37	47	15	23	30	39	8

There was also a difference in the assessment of the prospects for British agriculture in the Common Market between the initial and follow-up samples.

Forty-one per cent of the initial sample thought that British farming would benefit from entry into the E.E.C. compared with only 29 per cent in the follow-up. This difference, following the argument developed in Part III, leads to the conclusion that the majority of farmers probably think that British agriculture as a whole would not benefit from entry into the existing Common Market system.

The negotiation of adequate safeguards for farming could, however, partially offset this general pessimism. The survey provides an indication of the safeguards which farmers would like. The N.F.U. has stated quite clearly two major concessions which, in its opinion, should be obtained to protect the interests of British farmers. These conditions are (a) the re-appraisal and adjustment of the agricultural regulations adopted by the Six to assure as far as possible that entry into the Common Market would not be detrimental to British agriculture and horticulture and (b) the incorporation of procedures for an annual review—both at national and community level—into the arrangements for determining the Common Agricultural Policy. The results of this survey suggest that these conditions are generally, but not overwhelmingly, supported by farmers and growers.

TABLE 16
SAFEGUARDS FOR BRITISH AGRICULTURE IN E.E.C.

<i>Question</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Do you think that the Common Market regulations should be modified to accommodate British agriculture?	69	20	11
Do you regard an annual review system as an essential part of agricultural policy formation?..	67	28	5

In particular, over a quarter of the respondents did not regard an annual review system as an essential part of agricultural policy formation. Some care must be exercised in interpreting the replies to this question because of the possibility that farmers equate an annual review system with the current British system of supporting farm prices. The unexpectedly high percentage of 'noes' may signify disillusionment with the deficiency payment system—indeed many of the farmers who replied to the questionnaire indicated a wish to see the end of subsidies and their replacement by 'fair' prices to the consumer—but coming so soon after a particularly favourable award in the 1967 Annual Review it may be surprising that a substantial minority of farmers do not accept the necessity for an annual review system.

There was little variation between size and type of farming in the demand for modification of the C.A.P. and the need for an annual review. There was, however, a difference in the degree of insistence on these safeguards for British farming in

the E.E.C. as between farmers who began farming before 1945 and those who started in 1945 and afterwards. A lower proportion of the younger farmers starting farming after the war think (a) that the Common Market regulations should be modified to accommodate British agriculture and (b) that an Annual Review is an essential feature of agricultural policy formation.

TABLE 17

<i>Safeguards</i>	<i>Time of Starting Farming</i>	
	<i>Before 1945</i>	<i>1945 and after</i>
Per cent of farmers who want E.E.C. regulations to be modified to accommodate British agriculture	70	67
Per cent of farmers who regard an Annual Review as an essential feature of agricultural policy formation	72	63

Even so, a majority of the younger farmers indicated a wish for these safeguards to be negotiated to protect the interests of British farming if we join the Common Market.

The E.E.C. authorities have proposed that a review of the C.A.P. should be undertaken annually before the common prices for the ensuing year are fixed. Although this will not be an annual review in the U.K. sense, the review will include a report on agricultural markets and farm incomes. Consideration will also be given to developments in production, consumption and trade, and their financial implications. In this way the farmers' wish for an Annual Review will be partially met. But it will be rather more difficult to satisfy the N.F.U.'s other major requirement. It has taken a good deal of often protracted and difficult negotiations for the Six to agree on the existing regulations and they are unlikely to accept readily that they should be modified to accommodate new entrants into the Community, despite the change in circumstances that would occur following the expansion of the E.E.C. to include Britain and perhaps Denmark and Ireland. It should, however, be much easier to negotiate a suitable transitional period to allow British agriculture to adapt itself to the new conditions inside the E.E.C.

Farmers were asked to indicate the length of transitional period they thought they would need to adjust their farming to Common Market conditions. It seems that a transitional period of three years would be required by these farmers to give the majority of them time to make the necessary adaptations to their farming systems, whilst six years would provide ample time for 86 per cent of farmers in the sample to adapt to the new conditions.

Cropping farmers consider themselves able to adapt their farming to Common Market conditions more quickly than other types. Horticulturists and some live-stock producers may need a rather longer transitional period.

TABLE 18

LENGTH OF TRANSITIONAL PERIOD NEEDED TO ADJUST FARMING TO
COMMON MARKET CONDITIONS

Type of Farming					Less than 1 year	1-3 years	3-6 years	More than 6 years	Don't know
					%	%	%	%	%
Dairy	12	40	31	7	10
Livestock	14	36	25	12	13
Pigs and Poultry	14	37	34	9	7
Cropping	19	42	27	4	7
Horticulture	2	34	34	15	15
Mixed	11	42	34	5	8
All Types	15	41	30	6	8

(iii) General Opinions on the Common Market

Farmers were asked to indicate their opinions regarding the general economic and political implications of Britain joining the E.E.C. The farmers who replied were broadly in favour of British membership of the Common Market, notwithstanding the possible undesirable effects—for some farmers at least—on agriculture. There were, however, rather more doubts expressed about the political consequences of membership. This may overstate the general position, however, for a higher proportion of the initial sample were in favour compared with the follow-up sample.

TABLE 19

GENERAL VIEWS ON BRITISH MEMBERSHIP OF E.E.C.

Question		Yes	No	Don't know
		%	%	%
Irrespective of any effects which entry into the Common Market might have on British agriculture or your own farming, do you think there are over-riding economic factors in favour of British membership of the Common Market?	Initial			
	Sample	57	24	19
	Follow-up			
	Sample	43	27	30
	Total			
	Sample	52	25	23
Do you think there are reasons other than purely economic ones which favour British Membership of the Common Market? ..	Initial			
	Sample	50	35	15
	Follow-up			
	Sample	40	33	28
	Total			
	Sample	47	34	19

Here again, there were some interesting differences between size and type of farming.

TABLE 20

PER CENT OF FARMERS ACCEPTING OVER-RIDING ECONOMIC
FACTORS IN FAVOUR OF BRITISH MEMBERSHIP
OF THE COMMON MARKET

<i>Type of Farming</i>				<i>Under</i> 50	50-99	100- 149	150- 299	300- 499	500 & over	<i>All</i> <i>sizes</i>
Dairy	41	40	40	58	50	85	46
Livestock	54	32	31	53	57	70	50
Pigs and Poultry	49	45	62	59	65	78	54
Cropping	26	34	38	50	60	64	55
Horticulture	29	17	0	30	57	79	45
Mixed	46	39	55	49	53	67	53
All Types	45	38	43	51	58	66	52

TABLE 21

PER CENT OF FARMERS ACCEPTING NON-ECONOMIC ARGUMENTS
IN FAVOUR OF BRITISH MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMON MARKET

<i>Type of Farming</i>				<i>Under</i> 50	50-99	100- 149	150- 299	300- 499	500 & over	<i>All</i> <i>sizes</i>
Dairy	40	41	38	48	47	46	44
Livestock	54	34	27	37	62	55	44
Pigs and Poultry	46	38	62	49	65	61	49
Cropping	26	26	33	45	51	56	47
Horticulture	14	17	33	20	71	64	40
Mixed	40	38	55	43	47	56	48
All Types	43	37	40	44	52	55	47

The popular notion that large farmers are more in favour of the U.K. joining the Common Market than smaller farmers is confirmed by the results of this survey. So far as differences in attitude between types of farming are concerned, cropping, pig and poultry and mixed farmers were more in favour than the other types. In view of the probable effects of entry into E.E.C. on the relative profitability of beef and sheep production on the one hand and pig and poultry production on the other, one might have expected livestock farmers to be more in favour of the Common Market than pig and poultry producers. Such, however, was not the case.

There are a number of other factors which may be expected to influence farmers' opinions on the Common Market. These include the farmer's assessment of the probable impact of the Common Market on his own farming system, his knowledge of the E.E.C. and his age.

As might be expected, a farmer's assessment of the probable effect of the Common Market on the profitability of his farming business is a major influence on his general views about U.K. entry into the E.E.C.

TABLE 22

<i>If Britain joined the Common Market do you expect that profits from your present farming system would be:</i>		<i>Irrespective of any effects which entry into the Common Market might have on British agriculture or your own farming, do you think that there are over-riding economic factors in favour of British membership of the Common Market?</i>				<i>Do you think there are reasons other than purely economic ones which favour British membership of the Common Market?</i>			
		Yes	No	Don't know	Total	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Higher	75	11	14	100	59	30	11	100
Lower	36	42	22	100	34	45	21	100
About the same		57	22	21	100	51	33	16	100
Don't know	28	13	59	100	34	14	52	100

It is apparent that a higher proportion of those farmers who think they will benefit personally—or at least not lose—are in favour of British membership of the Common Market, whilst farmers who think they will suffer financially are more opposed to entry. Whilst it is true that farmers' attitudes to the Common Market are influenced by the direct effects which the C.A.P. would have on their own farming, it is not correct to suggest, as some people have done, that farmers are wholly in favour if they stand to benefit financially and wholly against if they think they will lose. Over a third of the farmers who expect to earn lower profits accept the economic and political advantages of membership, and a considerable number of farmers who expect their incomes to be higher or about the same are not in favour of U.K. membership of the Common Market, especially on non-economic grounds.

The post-war entrants into farming were more favourably inclined in their attitudes to the Common Market than older farmers.

TABLE 23
GENERAL VIEWS ON COMMON MARKET BY
TIME OF STARTING FARMING

	<i>Time of Starting Farming</i>	
	<i>Before 1945</i>	<i>1945 & after</i>
Per cent of farmers who think there are over-riding economic factors in favour of British membership of the Common Market	48	54
Per cent who think there are non-economic factors favouring British membership of the Common Market	43	50

Finally, the more farmers knew about the Common Market, the more likely they were to want the C.A.P. modified to accommodate British agriculture. But, at the same time, the more knowledgeable farmers were, the more likely they were to think that British agriculture as a whole would benefit from entry into the existing Common Market system. They were also more in favour of Britain joining the E.E.C. The position may not, however, be as simple as this analysis suggests, for the better informed farmers were also the larger farmers, who were as already discussed, more in favour of the Common Market than small farmers.

TABLE 24
ATTITUDES TO COMMON MARKET AND KNOWLEDGE OF E.E.C. SYSTEM

	<i>Knowledge of Common Market</i>			
	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Good</i>
Per cent of farmers who think that the Common Market regulations should be modified to accommodate British agriculture	45	70	72	75
Per cent of farmers who think that agriculture as a whole will benefit from entry into the existing Common Market system	9	16	36	51
Per cent who think there are over-riding economic advantages in favour of British membership of the Common Market ..	10	27	49	73
Per cent who think there are non-economic reasons in favour of British membership of the Common Market	12	28	48	60

The outlook of the better-informed farmers is presumably a reflection of their greater appreciation of the general competitive strength of British farming, vis-à-vis potential competitors in the Common Market, and especially the better structure and organisation of British agriculture.

V. SUMMARY

1. A postal survey was undertaken to obtain information concerning farmers' knowledge of Common Market farming and agricultural policy and their opinions regarding possible British membership of E.E.C.
2. A questionnaire was sent to some 9,000 farmers and 3,300 replies were received, a response rate of 37 per cent. The analysis was based on a total of 3,000 completed questionnaires.
3. The sample was concentrated in the East Midland, Eastern and North-western provinces, with smaller concentrations in the North-east and Northern England. The sample contained more large farms, more cropping farms and fewer dairy farms than in England as a whole.
4. Most of the farmers had a fairly good knowledge of Common Market farming and agricultural policy. The average score was 7.5 correct answers out of a maximum of 11. Larger farmers had a better knowledge than smaller farmers. Pig and poultry, cropping and mixed farmers scored higher than dairy and livestock farmers.
5. The farmers were rather pessimistic about their prospects in the E.E.C. Less than a quarter expected their incomes to increase. Cropping and livestock farmers saw their future in a more favourable light than others.
6. About 30 per cent of the farmers had ideas about how they might modify their farming if Britain joins the E.E.C. Farmers who expected their incomes to fall in the E.E.C. were more likely to be planning changes in their farming systems.
7. On the basis of an admittedly small sample, the major changes in the pattern of farming which can be expected if we join the E.E.C. are an expansion in cereals, beef cattle and sheep, and contraction in poultry, horticulture, pigs and roots. There may be little or no change in the number of dairy cattle.
8. Two-thirds of the farmers wanted the Common Market agricultural regulations modified to accommodate British agriculture. A similar number regarded an Annual Review as an essential feature of agricultural policy formation.
9. A transitional period of 3 years or less was favoured by more than half of the farmers in the sample to give them time to adapt their farming systems to the new conditions. A further 30 per cent preferred a 3 to 6 year transitional period. Cropping farmers thought they would be able to adapt their farming more quickly than others, but some livestock farmers and horticultural growers preferred a long transitional period.

10. On balance, despite some pessimism about the general prospects for British farming in E.E.C., a majority of the farmers supported British membership of the E.E.C. Larger farmers were more in favour of entry than smaller farmers. Cropping, pig and poultry, and mixed farmers were more in favour than dairy and livestock farmers and horticulturists. Farmers were influenced in their general views about the Common Market by their assessment of the probable effects of the Common Market on the profitability of their own farming. Those farmers who expected to benefit were more in favour than those who thought they would lose financially.

11. The younger, newer entrants into farming knew more about the Common Market and were more favourably inclined in their attitudes to the E.E.C. than the older farmers. They were also more prepared for the changes which would accompany entry into the Common Market.

APPENDIX I

The Questionnaire

UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

Director:
Professor John Ashton.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT UNIT,
THE UNIVERSITY,
NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE, 1.

APRIL, 1967.

If Britain joins the Common Market, one of the problems will be how British agriculture should adapt itself in response to the Common Agricultural Policy. We are planning to examine the Common Market agricultural policy and its implications for British farming.

You probably have some ideas already about what the Common Market is likely to mean to you as a farmer and as a first step we would like you to tell us what you think about it. Please fill in the following questionnaire, fold it as indicated and return it to us—no stamp is needed. The information you give us will not be disclosed but it will form the basis of a published report.

I hope that you will co-operate in this enquiry. The foundation for better public decisions depends upon a fuller understanding of the problems of agriculture, and you can forward this end by providing information. Please return the questionnaire as soon as you can.

JOHN ASHTON.

FARMERS AND THE COMMON MARKET

1. Office use only

Computer Reference Number
County Code
Type Code

General Information

2. Please state the approximate percentage of your sales derived from the following enterprises in 1965-66:

	PER CENT
Cereals 	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text"/>
Potatoes and Sugar Beet...	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text"/>
Milk 	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text"/>
Cattle 	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text"/>
Sheep 	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text"/>
Pigs 	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text"/>
Poultry and Eggs	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text"/>
Horticultural Crops ...	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text"/>
Other Enterprises ...	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text"/>

3. What is the size of your farm in acres of crops and grass? (exclude any rough grazing)

	PLEASE TICK	
Under 50 acres 	<input style="width: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	1
50-99 acres 	<input style="width: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	2
100-149 acres 	<input style="width: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	3
150-299 acres 	<input style="width: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	4
300-499 acres 	<input style="width: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	5
500 acres and over ...	<input style="width: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	6

4. How many regular full-time workers do you employ?

5. When did you start farming?

	PLEASE TICK	
Before 1945 	<input style="width: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	1
1945 and after 	<input style="width: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	2

Opinions on the Common Market

PLEASE TICK

- | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 6. Do you think that British agriculture as a whole would benefit from entry into the existing Common Market system? ... | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 7. Do you think that the Common Market regulations should be modified to accommodate British agriculture? ... | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 8. Do you regard an annual review system as an essential part of agricultural policy formation? ... | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 9. If Britain joined the Common Market do you expect that profits from your present farming system would be higher, lower or about the same? ... | Higher | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Lower | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | About the same | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 10. Would you make any changes to your system of farming as a direct result of British entry into the Common Market? ... | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| If yes, please indicate which enterprises you would change: | | | |
| 11. Cereals ... | More | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Less | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No change | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| 12. Roots (Potatoes and Sugar Beet) ... | More | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Less | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No change | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| 13. Dairy Cattle ... | More | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Less | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No change | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| 14. Beef Cattle ... | More | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Less | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No change | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| 15. Sheep ... | More | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Less | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No change | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| 16. Pigs ... | More | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Less | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No change | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| 17. Poultry ... | More | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Less | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No change | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| 18. Horticultural Crops ... | More | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Less | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No change | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| 19. Other ... | More | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Less | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No change | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| 20. What length of transitional period do you think you would need to adjust your farming to Common Market conditions? | Less than 1 year | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 |
| | 1-3 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | 3-6 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | More than 6 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| 21. Irrespective of any effects which entry into the Common Market might have on British agriculture or your own farming, do you think that there are over-riding economic factors in favour of British membership of the Common Market? | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 22. Do you think there are reasons other than purely economic ones which favour British membership of the Common Market? ... | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |

Common Market Farming and Agricultural Policy

As far as you are aware, if Britain entered the Common Market under the existing agricultural regulations:

PLEASE TICK

- | | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------------------|---|
| 23. Would the deficiency payment system be replaced by price support based on import levies and support buying? ... | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 24. Would restrictions on trade in horticultural products between Britain and the Common Market be removed? ... | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 25. Would consumer food prices be ... | Higher | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Lower | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | About the same | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 26. Would Government support of agriculture from general taxation increase? ... | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 27. Would farm-gate prices of cereals be ... | Higher | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Lower | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | About the same | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 28. Would farm-gate prices of beef be ... | Higher | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Lower | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | About the same | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 29. Would the calf subsidy and beef cow subsidy have to be withdrawn? ... | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 30. Would farm improvement grants, and grants for farm amalgamations and structural improvements have to be withdrawn? | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |

Compared with Britain do you think that:

- | | | | |
|---|----------------|--------------------------|---|
| 31. Farms in the Common Market are ... | Larger | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Smaller | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | About the same | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 32. The level of self-sufficiency for food supplies in the Common Market is ... | Higher | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Lower | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | About the same | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 33. The proportion of the working population engaged in agriculture in the Common Market is ... | Higher | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| | Lower | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| | About the same | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 |
| 34. For office use only ... | | | |

APPENDIX II

P.A.E.S. Regions

REGION	COUNTIES	
Northern (Newcastle)	Cumberland	Durham
	Westmorland	Northumberland
North Eastern (Leeds)	Yorkshire	
East Midland (Nottingham)	Derby	Nottingham
	Leicester	Rutland
	Lincoln (Kesteven)	Northampton
	Lincoln (Lindsey)	
Eastern (Cambridge)	Bedford	Isle of Ely
	Cambridge	Lincoln (Holland)
	Essex	Norfolk
	Hertford	Soke of Peterborough
	Huntingdon	Suffolk
South Eastern (Wye)	Kent	Sussex East
	Surrey	Sussex West
Southern (Reading)	Berkshire	Middlesex
	Buckinghamshire	Oxford
	Hampshire	Isle of Wight
Western (Bristol)	Gloucester	Wiltshire
	Hereford	Worcester
	Somerset	Warwick
South Western (Exeter)	Cornwall and Scilly Isles	
	Devon	Dorset
North Western (Manchester)	Cheshire	Shropshire
	Lancashire	Stafford
Wales (Aberystwyth)	All counties in Wales including Monmouth	

APPENDIX III

SOME STATISTICS ON FARMING IN THE U.K. AND THE E.E.C.

(1) PROPORTION OF WORKING POPULATION ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE 1964

<i>Country</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
France	17
West Germany	11
Italy	25
Netherlands	8
Belgium	6
Luxembourg	13½
E.E.C.	17
U.K.	3½

Source: E.E.C.: J. Van Lierde. Op. cit.

U.K.: The National Plan, H.M.S.O. 1965.

(2) DEGREE OF SELF-SUFFICIENCY FOR CERTAIN PRODUCTS, 1964-65

<i>Product</i>	<i>E.E.C.</i>	<i>U.K.</i>
Bread grains	105	46
Coarse grains	71	70
Total cereals	87	61
Beef and veal	86	70
Pigmeat	101	66
Total meat	93	66
Eggs	94	96
Cheese	98	42
Butter	102	6

Source: E.E.C.: Agricultural Policies in 1966. O.E.C.D. 1967

U.K.: Annual Review and Determination of Guarantees 1967.
Cmnd. 3229.

Appendix III *continued*

(3) AVERAGE SIZE OF FARM

<i>Country</i>	<i>Acres of crops and grass</i>
West Germany	25
France	44
Italy	17
Netherlands	26
Belgium	25
Luxembourg	41
E.E.C.	28
U.K.	76

Source: E.E.C.: Farms larger than 1 hectare (2.47 acres), Basic Statistics of the Community, 1966.

U.K.: Agricultural Statistics.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Bulletins

	<i>PRICE (excluding packing and postage)</i>
1. Farmers and the Common Market B. H. Davey and S. J. Rogers	5s 0d
2. Efficiency in Agriculture and the Share of the Domestic Market J. Ashton	5s 0d
3. Trends in Agriculture: A Review of Current and Future Developments B. H. Davey	5s 0d

Books

Economic Change and Agriculture Edited by J. Ashton and S. J. Rogers (Oliver and Boyd 1967)	42s 0d
---	--------

Details of the publication programme and a subscription scheme can be obtained from the Administrative Officer of the Unit.

October 1967

